



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 5817-5830 Gemini Drive
Application Type: Planned Development (PD) – Initial/Final Approval is Requested
Legistar File ID # [67174](#)
Prepared By: Kevin Firchow, Acting UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Bradley Servin, Architectural Design Consultants, Inc. | Scott Frank, Oak Park Place

Project Description: The applicant is seeking initial/final approval for a Planned Development (PD) for the development of a 12-unit townhouse development in Grandview Commons on an undeveloped property. The unit mix will include eight (8) two-story, 2-bedroom units and four (4) three-story, 3-bedroom units. Each unit will have a two-car private garage for vehicle and bike storage.

Project Schedule:

- The UDC received an informational presentation on September 22, 2021.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this proposal on December 13, 2021.
- The Common Council is scheduled to review this rezoning request on January 4, 2022.

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **advisory body** on the PD request. As with any Planned Development, the Urban Design Commission is required to 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 (which are attached).

Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Planning Division staff requests that the UDC provide findings and recommendations related to the aforementioned Planned Development standards, as required by the Zoning Code.

Summary of Design Considerations

This property was previously approved for a 12-unit condominium development in 2006. That approval has expired. That development was paired with an 11-unit condominium development on the opposite side of Gemini Drive, which is not part of the current request.

As part of the current review, the Planning Division requests that the UDC include feedback related to the following design-related elements:

- **Façade Composition.** Staff request UDC's feedback regarding the revised façade details, including materials and material transitions, location and proportion of windows, and related elements.
- **Massing and Vertical Articulation.** As requested during the informational presentation, staff request UDC's feedback on the overall townhouse massing and rhythm, which features a predominant two-story mass with three-story elements and single-story projections.
- **Entrance Orientation.** As requested during the informational presentation, staff request UDC's feedback regarding the design and prominence of the individual unit entries.

- **Relationship to Abutting Senior-Housing Development.** Staff recommends that the UDC also provides comments regarding the relationship between this building and the proposed adjacent building at 5817 Halley Way, also scheduled for review at this meeting.

Finally, as a reference, staff includes the following comments that were provided at the informational presentation:

- Appreciate some of the more simplistic geometries. Having trouble with the materials, particularly the stone. Not seeing any rhythm or pattern of why the stone exists where it does, if at all. Wondering if it would be more successful with no stone at all, give the geometries more purity and simplicity in their form. Do appreciate you've started showing some of the downspouts, maybe even try to incorporate the rhythm of those more consistently as well.
- The garage stepping up the hill, the glass guardrail at those walk-out areas might be more consistent with the trellis or privacy screen if you went more of a horizontal aluminum railing system, the glass is a bit distracting and doesn't provide any privacy.
- Struggling with the towers, feel like if the units were the same height it would appear more cohesive.
- They seem odd. I like the stone on the front side but not on the garage. Those pillars are unique. Something about those towers seem out of proportion or out of scale to the rest of the development.
- The driveways seem kind of short, though it's a tight site.
- The green towers, I actually would debate, I find the proportions of the taller ones more successful than the lower ones. If you are going to have dividers between units I'd recommend having them consistent.
- On the rear to have those patios outside is such a lovely idea, not quite sure about privacy or where you have dividers vs. where you don't, suggest reviewing.
- The garage and driveway side could really use some plant material, like trees anchoring the corners and breaking up the monotony. It's a difficult project type and plan on such a slope but it would be great to break up that elevation with some mid-size or canopy trees but also help with heat effect.
- As far as stormwater, thinking about where that is going, opportunity for driveway sections to be permeable sections.
- I like the tower forms, nice way to deal with this grade situation. The sidewalk looks like an ice slide in the winter, I don't know if that's the project's responsibility to make it accessible or a City problem, but it concerns me a little bit.
- Thinking about kids, have you considered making one or two of these units a four-bedroom? We're often trying to encourage room for families.
- It feels tight and it's not a great view, and there is a privacy issue.
- What is the intent of materials and color on this project? This is a festive looking project.
- I have mixed feelings about the stone on the front of the building. It's hard to tell what that stone will look like. I do not like it on the back, and have concerns that the garage sides of this building are unattractive compared to the front. Wherever you have the stone on the back, if that was replaced with the red that's on the front it would be nicer to look at.
- The lack of space for landscaping is problematic, go to great lengths to do something interesting at the ends of the buildings.
- I like the way the garages are arranged to allow the residents to spend less energy heating and cooling that space.

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