

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 26, 2016

TITLE: 604 South Point Road/9702 Watts Road –
New Development Consisting of 8
Buildings with 299 Multi-Family Units. 9th
Ald. Dist. (43553)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 26, 2016

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 26, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new development consisting of 8 buildings with 299 multi-family units located at 604 South Point Road/9702 Watts Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Randy Bruce, representing John McKenzie. The Phase 1 site plan for the project has been revised to create a grand open court that centers the development off of South Point Road as a continuous open space all the way through to the recreation area. The featured greenway allows for pedestrian access into that same area. The revised parking areas allowed them to strengthen those courts in front of the 4-story buildings. The buildings have a range of heights, predominantly at 3-4 stories while stepping down to give interest to the architecture. This development uses timber forms in the architecture, along with a true stone base with fiber cement siding to look like Cedar. A tree-scape is shown around the perimeter of the site and within the courtyard, as well as tree islands and foundation plantings around the buildings themselves. Wal-pak units will be rotated 90 degrees and installed in the corners of the balconies.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- It seems to me like a lot of parking. Is there any chance you could bank some of that in case you didn’t need it? Some of those lots that back up to the central greenspace.
- You had the two little green triangles that look like grass that separates the new parking lots. I have no idea why they need to open, if they were heavily planted they would at least shield some of that so that they ought to be little bosks.
- You have this “mountain” architecture but the landscaping doesn’t look anything like that. It’s vastly repetitive. You could take this area and put in lots of Birch or Aspen, something to give you that flavor. You should carry that line of trees all the way through.
- It seems like the landscaping is just placed wherever there are openings.
- There’s an opportunity to play with perspective, if these trees created a line on each side that made it look longer than it was. Looking at the site overall, a major concept could really enhance the open

spaces. There's an opportunity to make something really interesting that works with the architecture. There seems to be a lot of very careful placement and not a bold statement being made.

- I would wipe out that whole canopy planting and start over. But you do need tall reaching trees.
- Is there any way to get that natural walking trail for this phase, through Phase 2?
 - We're struggling a little with that because of how the grades work and where access is coming from. We've got this confluence of vehicular access and parking and that's where we're making the connection. Other than bringing circulation back out and around, since the building spans across it there's no way to connect this phase directly with this.
- Can the space in Phase 2 happen as a part of Phase 1, just a walking trail even if it's not formal?
 - We're working with the City right now to try to get some City lands or landscape easement to really create something. It's kind of a work in progress.
- There is a lot of parking; if there is some off-set to that, some natural feature if you're not banking or removing parking.
 - I think the way it's broken up is effective. And stronger landscaping could help break it up even more.
- I would look at another timber member below the soffits that the bracket is actually holding up; it looks false.
- I really think they need to look at a way to reduce the parking.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion provided for an additional bracket below the soffits, a revised landscape plan and for the applicant to look at a parking reduction, both of which shall return to the Commission for final approval.