

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** March 9, 2016

**TITLE:** 5401 Tancho Drive – PD(SIP) for New Development Consisting of Seven Multi-Family Residential Buildings and a Clubhouse Building. 17<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (40995)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** March 9, 2016

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Lois Braun-Oddo and Michael Rosenblum.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of March 9, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PD(SIP) located at 5401 Tancho Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, Rosheen Styczinski and Craig Raddatz, all representing Fiduciary Real Estate. All of the parking has been changed to angled parking and reduced from 179 to 144 stalls. All of the buildings also have under-building parking. The building plans and clubhouse plans have been refined and the greenspaces have been enhanced. A network of sidewalks throughout the site is maintained. The base of the buildings will now be stone without the additional concrete, in slate or gray color, along with brick and fiber cement siding in three different colors. Each building has a mix of flowering and evergreen plant material for a four-season effect, even in the winter. Greenspaces of varying sizes are shown for various activities. The applicants noted future consideration for a 90° parking layout instead of the angled parking arrangement on the site plan contained within the packet. In order to address parking demand on the site, the 90° parking layout would provide more surface parking stalls without a loss of landscaping. The trade-off would be a departure from a more pedestrian-friendly parking lot layout provided with the angled parking option as supposed by staff.

Chris Wells spoke to the Planning Division staff report, which asked that the Urban Design Commission consider the streetscape and how it can appear as a street rather than a parking lot, as well as how the buildings relate to the street. Building material simplification and the horizontal play of the façade should also be looked at. These types of projects should not be a series of buildings surrounding parking areas; somehow those parking areas become extensions of the streetscape. How do we balance this issue of making a walkable community that feels like an extension of our City grid, but how do we accommodate the necessity they have from a parking standpoint?

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Maybe you could strengthen the main spine and add canopy trees to make more of a streetscape. You could put canopy trees on one side and ornamental trees on the other.

- The street lighting could be done in such a way that it would make it more intimate. If you have more poles with lower illumination maybe 20-feet apart, like Johnson Street.
- Usually there's a terrace and a sidewalk, but with the parking at 90 degrees they're going to overhang that. Is there a way to introduce a terrace?
- Bring in more furnishings such as benches and seating, etc.
- Is that greenspace in front of the building really that functional?
  - (Staff) There is a requirement from Traffic Engineering that they have 5-feet clear for the sidewalks.
- Consider parallel parking in some areas.
- Sliding the sidewalk so you have greenspace on either side when you're walking, that's like a street. The parallel parking is very street-like.
- Are all of these buildings twin, can you do something so there's a mirroring of colors, a larger gesture rather than dropping down the same building? To create focal points in the overall architecture. To have more of a context to each other. So when you drive by it's not just buildings dropped into place.
  - There are two different building types. We did different color schemes on the 5020 project. These two buildings have this relationship to each other here, there's a hierarchy within that building architecture to create some priorities and some hierarchy on the site.
- Then the two center buildings relate to each other but are different a little bit from the other two on the outside.
- The parking seems non-pedestrian friendly. Try to change that sensibility about it.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for address of the above stated comments relative to landscaping, parking arrangement, furnishings and lighting.