

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 4, 2008
TITLE: 2317 Allied Drive – Allied Neighborhood Revitalization, Phases I and II, PUD(GDP) and Phase I, PUD-SIP. 10 th Ald. Dist. (10286)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 4, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton and Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 4, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the Allied Neighborhood Revitalization Plan. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jim Klett, Jeffrey Bogart, Stu Levitan and Kate Stalker, all representing the Madison Community Development Authority/City of Madison. The plans as presented featured the following modifications:

- The overall first phase plan has been expanded to include an existing building, “D” that will provide housing for residents while renovation and construction occurs with the development of the first phase SIP.
- An overview of the landscape plan emphasized the details of the corner plaza area at Jenewein Road and Allied Drive and its relationship with a proposed community room located on the ground floor level of Building “B.” The adjoining plaza area contains no outside furniture which is proposed to be borrowed from the adjoining community room for outdoor events. The design of the outdoor plaza features lower level bollard lighting including reused brick columns from existing buildings to be demolished to define the street edge of the plaza, combined with landscaping.
- Review of tot lot details emphasized that the facilities would be developed based on input from area residents. Low scale play structures at minimum in height are proposed to discourage use by older children.
- The project is looking at providing for a green roof integrated on upper levels of buildings “A” and “B.” A review of building elevations emphasized the details relevant to the color and building material palette with the use of fiber cement siding and fiber cement stucco applications.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Relative to architecture, agree with neighbors in regards to the request to provide for more color in the material palette.
- Like color on buildings “A” and “B,” a start, where on the townhouse roof a screen appears heavy.
- The buildings are handsome but bold colors would be nice.

- Still an issue with shed/gable roofs melding with flat instead of utilizing a flat parapet roof with a drainable surface. Concerned that when roof edge is flat, not to pitch it. The selection of gutter style and appearance important to the appearance of the building, along with the use of scuppers.
- Provide a walkway at drop-off at curb in “A/C” streets.
- The full bollards at the center of the circle feature within the plaza area will impede its use. Look at Monroe Commons as an example.
- Look at pulling columns around the perimeter of the plaza area closer to the City sidewalk.
- Make vestibule on west elevation of building “A” more glass toward the corner plaza.
- Proposed use of yellow on buildings should be approached in a sensitive manner.
- Don’t want to lose fiber cement siding in budget due to the cost of flat roofs interspersed with shed/gable roofs on the townhouses.
- Substitute the use of Norway Maple along with Honey Locust, suggest Kentucky Coffee Tree in place of Honey Locust.
- Provide storage for tenants.
- Consider involving community in constructing the play area.
- Incorporate a kiosk into the corner plaza area.
- Consider changing up color of buildings to provide for the use of individual color palettes for each individual building to give each building its individual identity.
- Still concerned with cost.
- The photometrics in the plaza area are not readable. Adjust upon further consideration.

ACTION:

On a motion by Woods, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns with further consideration of the project.

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 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2317 Allied Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	7	7	7	-	8	7	7
	6	7	6	-	-	6	6	6
	7	7	-	7	-	6	6	6
	-	7	-	-	-	-	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	8	8	7	7	-	7	8	7.5

General Comments:

- The hybrid pitched roof/flat roof design (Buildings C/F) is interesting and fresh, but concerned they will be too expensive to construct. Try to differentiate buildings by color. Tones for flat roofed buildings could be lighter/more modern versus traditional darker colors as presented.
- Great job on design of buildings and layout.
- Community/child designed and built play equipment could represent neighborhood pride.
- Current colors are bland. Listen to the neighbors...more color. Choosing more expensive flat roofs that are more expensive to maintain is not the best approach.
- Nicely done. As details are developed, the team seems to be on top of the social and design issues, and resolving them positively.
- Well crafted.