

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 19, 2007
TITLE: 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road – Revised PUD(GDP-SIP), 116-Units. 9 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (08182)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: December 19, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 19, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a revised PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Patrick McGowan, Gallina Investments. McGowan provided a summary of revisions to the plans in response to the Commission's previous review of the project as follows:

- The architectural changes to the building consist of a change to fiber cement siding, not vinyl, with rake and trim boards at all gable ends including corner boards, a six inch outside and four inch inside dimension.
- Drop off details at the main entry to the center building were provided to emphasize paint striping delineating two-way drive aisles from a single drive aisle around a center fountain feature, a narrowing of drive aisle width to 22 feet on both sides of the fountain feature, combined with a decrease in radius. The provision of signage for the drop off and office area including yield signage and a do not enter sign for cars approaching from the opposite direction.
- The elimination of four more parking stalls to incorporate more tree islands along the north side of the center building.
- The salting around the bike parking around the perimeter of all buildings to include 35 outside stalls and 68 interior lower-level stalls.
- Modification to landscape plans to replace ash trees.

Still an issue with connectivity from outward buildings to the rear poolside walk. Available areas are limited and already tight. The walkway's proximity to detention and retaining wall areas as well as an issue with the privacy of the adjoining Frank Lloyd Wright house to the east was noted as problematic. McGowan further noted the applicant's desire to maintain control access of the pool through the central clubhouse and center building complex. He further emphasized that sidewalks to the out buildings are precluded due to the location of drainage swells that channel water into the adjacent detention areas as well as conflicts with the five foot high retaining wall.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Concerned with pool access, maintaining the design of previous iterations.
- Concerned with space between pool and adjacent units within the center building; not getting used may be increased space around pool including some lawn area.
- Hide fence around the pool enclosure with plantings, especially at the corners.
- Consider including trees and a berm within the fenced area of the pool. Fence more contained around pool.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion for final approval required the following:

- Locate the fence enclosure around the pool so that one-third of the green lawn area is included within its perimeter on three sides. Relative to the green space within the fence enclosure, landscaping shall be provided around the fence to soften.
- The landscape plan shall be modified to introduce more herbaceous and native plant materials to offset the proposed use of barberry spireas and potentillas. The landscape plan shall also be modified to reduce by 50% the use of crab trees in favor of more native trees. All landscape plan changes shall be submitted to staff for approval.
- Bike parking at back of the garage entrance should be relocated to be more conveniently used; next to sidewalk areas.

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 3, 4, 5, 6, 6.5 and 6.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5.5	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	6	5	-	-	6	5	6
	3	5	-	6	-	6	3	3
	6	6	7	7	-	6	6	6.5

General Comments:

- Nice upgrades to materials and entry design drive-thru.
- Improved building materials appreciated, will benefit project value. Reduced parking and increased trees in parking lot positive. Address inaccessibility of green space and location of fence surrounding pool area. More mature plantings and trees.
- Poor site plan reduces value of beautiful pool to half of residents.
- Other than a community access to greenspace, revisions well done.