

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** March 10, 2021

TITLE: 9301 Crosswinds Lane - Amended (GDP-SIP) for Two New Residential Buildings.
9th Ald. Dist. (64039) **REFERRED:**

REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: March 10, 2021 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Russel Knudson, Tom DeChant, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad, Syed Abbas and Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 10, 2021, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of two residential buildings located at 9301 Crosswinds Lane. Registered and speaking in support were Conrad Gorman and Patrick Patrello, both representing Gorman & Company.

These are the final two buildings on the expired PD. The site plan does show the impervious area is equal to what was previously approved, they are requesting to add a dog run area. The biggest change was an increase in square footage, but that did not increase the area where the building hits the ground. Sixteen condenser units are housed on the roof and will be screened. Because these buildings have been built over several years the architecture is not identical. Material changes include a hip roof, two brick colors that are subtly different, and varying windows give differentiation from other buildings. The balconies on the façade that faces the golf course have been expanded.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Are these two the most alike of all five buildings?
 - The other three were built years ago due to the condominium recession.
- I would encourage to explore ways to get more character between the two new buildings to stay in step with the previous design.
- Are these all part of the same condominium association?
 - We're going to amend it for these two buildings to join the association.
- But the five buildings total are not necessarily connected to the overall development?
 - The parking lots will be connected, the structures are independent and the buildings are not physically connected, but all five buildings would be the same owner's association.
- The plans for the garages, one interior parking space for each unit?
 - Two per unit. Two levels of parking and two stalls and a storage unit for each condo. The surface is for guests.

- Your landscaping looked pretty nice, a nice variety of trees and shrubs. I was a little surprised to see Purple Sand Cherries specked in there, that's an unfortunate choice with the other plants. That's a landscape plant of the 60s and 70s that's fallen out of favor. I would encourage you to lose those and bulk up the other plants you have in there.
- On the large blank parking plinth exterior, instead of false windows could they have louvers or shutters?
- I agree with that. The others nearby have more care paid to the way the base was rusticated and detailed to emulate some openings, ins and outs that is more in scale. It could benefit from more attention to detail at that rusticated base.
- The entry on both façades seems kind of underwhelming, it almost looks like a service entry. It doesn't feel very welcoming and doesn't feel like a main entrance. Is there any way we can change the material, add more glass to have it be more of a queue for a main entrance?
 - We can take a look at all these items.
- Where you're showing the implied lintel at those openings, they don't have to be that low, that could be a much bolder statement to give this something substantial for the brick building to sit on.
- I find the scale and use of those timber posts to be confusing against such heavy massing of stone and brick. I question it on this façade, the size of those posts in relation to that pretty heavy plinth behind it.
- On the opposite side with the balconies, I'm not sure what was approved before, I also question the scale and height of those, they seem pretty delicate compared to everything else.
- In the elevations when I look at the site plan there's another road and parking in front of that building, and then another neighborhood sidewalk and the sidewalk for the occupants of the building. It's pretty far away from MidTown Road, there's significant landscaping in front of that elevation wall, it does really conceal what the renderings highlight, that exaggerated foundation wall. I think it would recede a little bit. It's much further back from the road isn't it?
 - It is quite a ways. When you're on site the walk is a little higher grade than the parking lot. It does conceal quite a bit of that.
- If it was pushed down it would look odd next to the other buildings.
- The existing site seems to have some fairly mature trees. The plan doesn't indicate the fate of those particular trees, could they be kept? Is that rendering accurate in terms of the maturity of those trees?
 - I don't remember what the trees look like off hand. I'd have to go back on site. We'd like to keep as much as we can.
- From a 3D map online it looks like there's the same maturity as you see for the existing three buildings in the front. That may ease some concerns here.
- Maybe the driveway and cul-de-sac could be reconfigured to work around those.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Abbas, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-3) with Braun-Oddo, DeChant, Abbas, Harper, Bernau voting yes; and Knudson, Klehr and Asad voting no.

The motion requested the following:

- Make the entryways more inviting.
- Add more detail in the foundation wall similar to the adjacent buildings.
- Make every effort to protect and keep any mature trees that may be in front of those buildings.
- Remove the Purple Sand Cherries from the landscape plan.