AGENDA#8

POF:

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** January 21, 2009

TITLE: 7710 South Brookline Drive – Addition to **REFERRED:**

> an Assisted Care Facility, Modified REREFERRED: PUD(SIP). 1st Ald. Dist. (13300)

ADOPTED:

REPORTED BACK:

DATED: January 21, 2009 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Bruce Woods; Chair, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, Ald. Marsha Rummel, Ron Luskin, Dawn Weber, Mark Smith, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm, and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for an addition to an assisted care facility at 7710 South Brookline Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Michael Buragas. The applicant reviewed the proposal that extends the exiting building to the east and replaces a surface parking lot. They stated that the design, materials, and colors from the exiting building will extend to the new addition.

Harris Webber and Jennifer Braun registered in support.

AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Luskin, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL** APPROVAL of an amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for an addition to an assisted care facility at 7710 South Brookline Drive, subject to the applicants exploring the installation of a sidewalk connecting the building to South Brookline Drive.

The motion passed on a vote of (10-0).

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.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 7710 South Brookline Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	5	6	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	5	-	-	-	5	5	5
	5	6	-	-	-	6	-	6
Me								

General Comments:

- Good addition/scheme. We need more housing.
- Good infill housing.