# **AGENDA #5**

## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: April 25, 2007

TITLE: 1500 Block of Burningwood Way – **REFERRED:** 

PUD(GDP-SIP). 18<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (Pending Annexation) 06226 **REREFERRED:** 

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: April 25, 2007 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Cathleen Feland, Richard Slayton, Robert March, Paul Wagner and Marsha Rummel.

#### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 25, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located in the 1500 Block of Burningwood Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Murray and Craig Makela. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the area for development was in process of annexation to the City, whereby way of prior agreement lands to be developed for duplexes or a portion of the land owned by Cherokee Park, Inc. that were the recent topic of an agreement between the City and the developer that provides for the preservation and purchase of extensive open space/wetlands, in combination with limited development. The project as proposed provides for the development of three duplex lots on a "private drive extension of the Burningwood Way right-of-way, combined with the extension of a proposed multi-use public pathway, in combination with fire lane that will potentially connect to lands yet to be developed across intervening wetlands and open space. Craig Makela, construction project manager and Dan Murray, supervising engineer then presented details of the development proposal for the three duplex lots, in addition to elevational details which orient the front façade of the building to relate to its private drive frontage in view of the adjacent Cherokee Lake west of the property and the adjacent Cherokee golf course to the east. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The choice of previously utilized building prototype on the site does not take advantage of the site's unique features and/or limitations. It provides great views of the building from the water but no good views from the building to the water.
- The layout and site design plan does not engage the site. The location of the buildings creates narrow spaces between some long driveways where the buildings don't engage the site, the streetscape dominated with snout garages not a goal of urban design.
- It was noted that the utilization of a building type that was done before may not work on a unique site. The site with views east and west (golf course and lake views) as designed for the west or front elevation emphasizes the predominance of snout garages with minimization of windows to provide complementary views. The building elevations provide for more window openings, enhanced views of the adjacent structures along the north and south elevations.
- The site needs a building type that works better with its constraints.

- Not the right building type for the site, there may be a more efficient floor plan layout that will help deal with the garage issue.
- Normally the Commission is not concerned with interior floor plans but there appears to be a lot of space dedicated to circulation where adjustments could make the building's smaller to engage the site more.
- In acknowledgement that the applicant had done various building type studies to fit the lot, it was noted that the applicant should bring back previous site design considerations including alternative building type proposals.

## **ACTION**:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 4, 4, 4, 4. 75, 5 and 7.

## URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1500 Block of Burningwood Way

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	4	-	-	-	4	4	4
	-	5	-	-	-	8	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.75
	5	4/5	-	-	-	5	5	5
	3	4	7	5	-	5	4	4
	4	4	4	-	-	4	4	4
Me								

#### General Comments:

- Buildings do not successfully respond to both lake and golf course views.
- Building concept needs reworking; these homes as designed do not take good advantage of this beautiful site. Also, bike path should be on the fire lane, not separate.
- Needs to better engage the site especially views to the lake. All sides and all levels should have windows including the sides.
- Site plan needs a major revisit.