

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 18, 2010
TITLE: 9401 Mid-Town Road – Amended PUD(GDP-SIP), Multi-Family Residential Project. 1 st Ald. Dist. (19556)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 18, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 18, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 9401 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Donald Schroeder, representing TR McKenzie. Staff noted that a previously approved PUD(GDP-SIP) on this parcel provided for its development with a combination of single-family duplex and multi-unit development. A revised PUD(GDP-SIP) provides redevelopment with two, twenty-eight unit apartment buildings along Mid-Town Road and two, four-unit apartment buildings on the property’s Silverstone Lane/Hawkstone Way frontage. Schroeder presented details of the redevelopment of this parcel that follows the same architecture and exterior colors as the adjacent development to the east. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Try not to mimic the architecture exactly; look at a range of colors and detailing so it’s not as “cookie-cutterish.”
- This looks a little jumbled.
- Look at increasing parking below grade and within buildings, to avoid more impervious area.
- The concept, circulation and impervious areas gives me some concern, especially the lack of connectivity to the adjacent development to the east. This is sort of an ambiguous space.
- Look at integrating the grade change into the site and building design to provide some efficiency and cohesive connectivity to the adjacent site.
- Somehow making these buildings different architecturally would be good.
- Look at how the 4-units are oriented; maybe rearrange them so they don’t aim directly at each other and minimize pavement.
- Look at putting the park/open space in the middle and having the circular drive around it.
- There has to be a more efficient way to get things to work; look at circulation.
- The biggest concern here is the parking and how it works.
- Would like to see the two larger buildings speak to each other somehow in a cohesive unit.
- This is the time to fix the way we’ve annexed land in this part of town.

- I think it's really bad planning to have two developments that look alike but aren't connected in any way.
- It's really important to say this is multi-family, this is an apartment building; let's look like one, get some interesting flatter roofs, more urban looking.
- Not being cookie cutter and embracing an urban form.
- This strikes me as a disjointed sea of asphalt. Needs some more thought.
- Would like to see more integration between both sites as well as the buildings.
- The parking has a very "Thompson Drive" feel to it.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 3 and 4.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9401 Mid-Town Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	3	3	-	-	-	3	3	3
	4	5	-	-	-	3	-	4
	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Comments:

- A sea of parking! Address parking and circulation. Try to connect to adjacent parcel. It's disjointed. Work on enhancing urban form of "interior" street and building styles. Unhappy snow plow zone.
- Vehicular circulation does not work well; very inefficient.
- Lacks cohesion on many levels.