

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: September 22, 2010 |
| TITLE: 9401 Mid-Town Road – Planned Residential Development (P.R.D.), Multi-Family Residential Project. 1 st Ald. Dist. (19556) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: September 22, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 22, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a P.R.D. located at 9401 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Don Schroeder. Bruce presented a new site plan which addresses the Commission’s previous concerns regarding circulation and orientation of the buildings. The amount of pavement and circulation of pavement has been tightened up by eliminating duplicate drives, creating some open space in the center of the site and creating a nice streetscape along the edge of the site. He noted the difficulty of connecting these two developments due to a platted outlot for stormwater management with a significant grade change. He presented concepts for colors and materials, keeping the same architectural treatment for both buildings to give it a cohesive look. The color scheme would be changed slightly to make it fresher than the older buildings. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Consider switching open space to the west, towards street to make more public accessible open space away from parking garage.
- Much improved.
- If you switch some things around the open space becomes more public without having to look at the backs of the garages. You could incorporate some pocket gardens in this area.
- You need a stronger landscape design, the plant materials don’t work with the architecture.
 - Provide more shade trees on the west and south sides of the properties.
 - Line the greenspace with trees would provide some screening and frame it.
- Look at ways to bring the bike parking closer.
- Prefer buildings to have a more urban feel versus suburban, with use of gable/shed roofs instead of flat.
- Thank you for trying to connect the different buildings.
- Eliminate belt around building with lower shrubs, emphasize additional species around the buildings. The architecture is such that these pieces are lost. Get away from the smaller shrubs and use more deciduous trees.
- Screen left edge of central surface parking lot from street.
- Separate surface parking with green strip and walk to connect buildings on the west.

- Plant trees along the edge so you don't see cars but see plants.
- Great improvement.
- The site really cries out for some large scale shade trees. Framing the greenspace with large shade trees would be really make a difference.
- This is ready-made for residents to enjoy the greenspace.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided that:

- The Commission will be looking at the landscaping at the final stage.
- More shade trees and less short plantings.

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 5, 6, 6, 6, 6 and 6.5.

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 | 5 | - | 4 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 6 | 6 | - | - | - | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Landscape unacceptable. Consider architecture and solar positions (shade).
- Much improved, especially the site plan. Landscape plan to return at final.
- Much better circulation pattern and orientation to the street.
- Shift lawn to west?
- Fewer low shrubs, more deciduous trees and additional species.