



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 6853 McKee Road (aka 6728 Mader Drive)
Application Type: Planned Development - Specific Implementation Plan
UDC is an Advisory Body
Legistar File ID #: [77465](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Roman Ryan, Ryan Funeral Home | Brad Koning, Sketchworks Architecture

Project Description: The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story funeral home with a chapel, gathering spaces, a warming kitchen, limited outdoor seating and offices.

Project Schedule:

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on October 12, 2022 on the General Development Plan.
- The UDC made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to grant Final Approval of the Planned Development – General Development Plan (PD-GDP) on January 11, 2023 (Legistar File ID [73955](#)).
- The Plan Commission conditionally approved the PD-GDP on January 23, 2023 (Legistar File ID [75171](#)).
- The Common Council conditionally approved the PD-GDP on February 7, 2023.
- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on May 31, 2023, on the Specific Implementation Plan.
- The UDC granted Initial Approval with conditions on September 6, 2023.
- Plan Commission approved this item at their September 18, 2023, meeting (Legistar File ID [79524](#)).
- Common Council approved this item at their October 17, 2023, meeting. As part of the Common Council's final approval conditions, the project is required to return to the UDC for Final Approval.

Approval Standards: As with any Planned Development, the Urban Design Commission shall provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections [28.098](#)(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval, including Standard (e), which states:

The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.

As noted above, the UDC's initial action included an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission, which ultimately was carried forward to the Common Council, for Initial Approval. That recommendation included various conditions and design related considerations, including the recommendation that the project return to UDC for final review and approval. As such, it is the UDC's role to review the revised drawings for consistency with the previously recommended conditions of approval. Staff advises that the UDC review the updated plans and confirm that the conditions of approval, as noted below, have been met.

Planned Development Zoning: The project site is located within the Maple Grove Commons General Development Plan Planned Development (est. 2010). The Planned Development does include general architectural guidelines for commercial buildings:

"Individual commercial buildings will be designed to be as oriented to, or more oriented to the adjacent public and private streets than to the internal parking lots through the inclusion of architectural features including but not limited to vision glass, usable entrances and fully screened utility and mechanical facilities along all street-side elevations."

As noted above, in January 2023, the PD-GDP was amended to include funeral homes as a permitted use.

Adopted Plans: The project site is located in the [Cross Country Neighborhood Development Plan](#) (the "Plan") planning area. The Plan recommends the project site for commercial/office land use development. In addition, the City's adopted [Comprehensive Plan](#) recommends the project site for Neighborhood Mixed-Use development. The Neighborhood Mixed-Use land use recommendation includes more prescriptive development objectives, including those related to building form and type, which in this case is 2-4 stories, and where free-standing commercial buildings would be appropriate.

Summary of Design Considerations

It is the role of the UDC to review the revised drawings for consistency with the conditions of approval as outlined below. Please note that as conditions of approval, they are required to be met. The UDC's role is to ensure these previously established conditions are met, however they cannot waive or change these requirements. Staff requests the UDC's final action to reflect the following:

1. The building design shall be revised to address the following design issues as noted by the Commission in their discussion, including looking at the windows again, the location of where there is stone versus stucco, and also the proportions and sloping and massing on the roofs.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised as follows:
 - To show approximately three times as many perennials along the building foundation on either side of the main entrance.
 - To indicate shredded hardwood mulch versus stone in the planting beds.
 - To show mulch planting beds for the plantings underneath trees.
 - The location of the trees along McKee Road shall be shifted to be further away from the building entry.

Summary of UDC Initial Approval Comments and Action

As a reference, the Commission's comments from the September 6, 2023, Initial Approval comments and action are provided below.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- Why not bring the stone up to head height? It's cleaner in the field, and easier to match up there than a random not yet placed mullion that might be off in the end.
- It seems a little arbitrary to terminate the stone at a mid-point of the mullion rather than the head height of the window.
 - It's kind of lining up with the transom mullion, it's the height we picked as a similar detail on a previous project and wanted to maintain that, it felt like a good height based on overall height of the building.
- (Alder Wehelie) Based on the community neighborhood meeting, how was the greenspace incorporated? There was a lot of concern about so much parking, and the neighborhood wanted more greenspace.

- The site is pretty limited, and they need sufficient parking for their larger events. Outside of our property line there is lawn from the property line up to Golden Copper Lane, about 25-feet wide from the sidewalk. There's the adjacent development coming in the future. We're trying to balance landscaping with parking needs as well.
- Looking at the 3D images, there are three elements, the chapel, the entry lobby and the two story area with building services. I see opportunity to express those forms, and have always had a problem when we stratify the materials. You budget for so much stone, and where we run out of money happens to be half way up the window, versus taking the chapel as a stone element intentionally, making the two story element its own expression because it's a two story element and it has different functions. I think the mixture of hip and gable roofs is a little inconsistent. The north and south is hips, and east and west is gables, or the other way around. Pick one or the other on a small building like this, make it more prairie style hip roofs or go with gables, but the combination of the two is kind of confusing. Where you have the R facing McKee you have the two story stone entry element, on the opposite side of the building it kind of loses that where it has a strength and presence on the northwest – it is kind of blank and stratified on the southwest. My main comment is using building materials to express building forms and elements and not just stratify them and spread it out all over the place. The proportions of the second story windows in relation to the first story windows. They don't seem to relate to each other. I even see where the EIFS reveal joints take those first story windows and go up. If we had a series of windows where the window jambs aligned with the first story, there would be a lot more visual harmony there. Finally, with the chapel if you're going to have such a roof dominated structure, maybe you increase your overhangs so the area between the eave and head of window isn't just a big swath of EIFS, it can actually come down and can provide the building with a little more shelter and more shade. I'm suggesting this in the questions portion in case there was something that precludes you from taking this further and incorporating any of these suggestions.
 - You said EIFS, it's going to be hand laid stucco with a texture to it, not just plain EIFS. As far as the window, there is some relationship to the window below from a size standpoint, it's the same pane size there is a consistent dimension there. The intent there with not putting stone on the backside all the way up the gable, we contemplated that and thought it was too busy having the portico die into that and felt it better served not pulling that stone all the way up on both sides. That's a preference we could reconsider based on your comments.
 - The roof forms itself, we looked at as providing the hip at the chapel and second floor as a way to soften the edge. We had that as gable in the last go-round and felt the Commission was against that overall expression of the gables. We felt in this large residential, specifically mountain style, a mix of roof types is appropriate. That's the design direction the Ryans wanted to go in.
- Were we able to address the Alder's comments about parking and greenspace?
- We had a response, do you want to follow up on that?
- (Alder Wehelie) Thank you, Chair. It would be helpful for Brad to show where that greenspace could be incorporated as per the request from the neighborhood.
 - There's quite a bit of greenspace at the north side of the building where the building is setback 30-feet, plus another 10-foot easement before you hit the bike path. There is good green space in front of the building. Then along the entire west property along Golden Copper Lane we have approximately 25-feet from the parking lot to the property line, then the property line to the street is another 45-feet, I believe. There's a pretty good amount of greenspace along that road. The building is not going to be right up tight and proper, it did align with the apartment building to the west and there's quite a bit of greenspace there. Quite a few people sit on their front stoops there. I'm not quite sure I've heard that comment about greenspace, but I do know we had comments about incorporating plantings with native grasses and plantings.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I raised a number of comments architecturally, I don't know if anyone agrees. Thoughts of the quality of landscaping?
- I did have mainly just one comment, I want to acknowledge that it is clear you're making a significant investment in your landscaping, we see that and I think the plan looks pretty good. One small exception, on the parking lot side your foundation planting has three daylilies just left of entry and four right of the entry. That's a pretty large space that could easily handle three times that number of a small perennial, I would ask that as a condition of our approval, whatever our motion is tonight, that would be noted to beef up those areas with I would say three times as many perennials so it's not just a big mulch bed with a plant every six feet on center. Otherwise this looks good, it addressed most of our previous comments. For the record, I'm okay with the patio on the west side being attached, personally I never had any issue with that.
- I agree, nice variety and selection of plant material. When this landscape matures it's really going to be pretty attractive. I second Shane's comments about the skimpiness of the plantings on either side of the entrance canopy. I would go a little further and suggest that those two sections of the wall are some pretty large blank spaces between the two windows that are on either side. I might suggest that those would be an excellent place to have some very narrow upright arborvitaes. There's a variety called north pole that only gets two or three feet wide, and eight or ten feet tall after they've been there for a while; those would look nice there. Then on either side of those, beef that up with those noted perennials, balancing out those evergreen accents. Just a suggestion, I don't really want to make that a condition I think it would look better and take away that blank stucco expanse that really jumps out at me. Another thing about the planting design is you have some areas clearly delineated as planting beds, make sure because you're general notes up on top, I realize those are generically attached to landscape plans, there's a note in there about stone mulch. We've made it clear as a Commission that only rarely do we want to see stone mulch used as a basis for planting beds, not only from an aesthetic standpoint but also the health of the plants, we'd want to see bark mulch or shredded hardwood there. On the long east and west strips you have a nice selection of trees going along there, but again with those, in some places you have groupings or ornamental grasses underneath and no indication on there that those would be incorporated into a planting bed. It says 'lawn' in between, but clearly you can have those shrubs and ornamental grasses just coming up through the lawn, they need to be separated. I want to make sure your landscape architects are going to make sure that's clear to the people doing the planting. Thank you for taking the advice of going toward the larger end of commonly available plants, you'll be happy that you did.
- Along McKee Road, some of those trees are pretty close to your central entry to the building. Even though they're upright columnar species they're really close in on that entry. I don't know if it's a matter of design or street frontage point requirements, but you might consider pulling them out from the entry a bit so you're not crowded with canopy right at the focal point of the entry.
- I agree on the window placement. I'm looking at the presentation renderings from your Informational Presentation, the north elevation the upper windows, I understand the proportion of the lights might be the same from first to second, but I'd encourage widening the windows on top to be the same as on the bottom. It makes the elevation read as a whole, whereas right now it has a heavy base and not as strong up on top. Before those windows carried up on the second floor and it read a lot better, I hope you might reconsider the width of those windows.
- I would like to see work done on de-stratifying the materials and making it more intentional versus spreading it runs until the budget runs out evenly, and would like to see some more generous overhangs given the domination of the roof on these elevations.
- I would like to point that out as well, you have three different spaces and the chapel is something unique and special and different from a social hall. To express them differently from the outside could be interesting. You have the center tower as your entry point and one side it's all stone but not on the other. The chapel that kind of looks like the social hall on the north elevation, you might consider only the center piece being stone and really separate the language between those massings, it might help the

roof language read better too, if you want to maintain a hip roof and gable roof.

Action

On a motion by Klehr, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission made an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission to grant **INITIAL APPROVAL** with the following conditions:

1. The project shall return to the Urban Design Commission for Final Approval.
2. The building design shall be revised to address the following design issues as noted by the Commission in their discussion, including looking at the windows again, the location of where there is stone versus stucco, and also the proportions and sloping and massing on the roofs.
3. The landscape plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. To show approximately three times as many perennials along the building foundation on either side of the main entrance.
 - b. To indicate shredded hardwood mulch versus stone in the planting beds.
 - c. To show mulch planting beds for the plantings underneath trees.
 - d. The location of the trees along McKee Road shall be shifted to be further away from the building entry.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

ATTACHMENT
PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards

28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
 - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
 - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.
- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way

to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.

- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
 - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
 - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
 - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate stepbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Stepback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate stepbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
 - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
 - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
 - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance