

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 22, 2007	
TITLE: 4809 Freese Lane – Planned Residential Development (PRD). 16 th Ald. Dist. (07299)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: August 22, 2007	ID NUMBER:	

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 22, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a Planned Residential Development located at 4809 Freese Lane. Speaking in favor of the project was Jim Glueck, architect and Bill Perkins, Executive Director for Wisconsin Partnership Housing Development. Perkins provided a summary on the number delays in bringing the project back for the Commission's final consideration since its initial approval in May of 2005. Perkins noted significant issues with cost of construction, coordination of financing resources as it relates to market conditions as the underlying cause of delay for bringing the project on board. He emphasized that the substantial cost associated with all of the above factors has acted to provide an impediment for providing this affordable housing opportunity associated with this project. Staff noted conflicts with the site's unique configuration, which includes extensive wetlands as impediments to provide for the address of the Commission's previous concerns. Glueck then presented a revised proposal which featured the rearrangement of units that features either one car lower level or two car lower level attached garages to each duplex unit. The building architecture as well as material palette was noted to be as previously proposed. Glueck noted that the development of the parcel under the Planned Residential zoning (PRD) limited flexibility in the location of building sites on the property, as well as the extensive wetlands and required buffer at the rear of the site, therefore rendering address of the Commission's previous comments not possible. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The turning radii between the main driveway entry and the central core drive aisle needs to be tightened. Glueck noted it was necessary to meet fire access requirements.
- The back up space closest to the most easterly building is too close to the adjoining duplex structure.
- The revised plan has a problem with the proposed extension of pavement up to the lot line on both the southeasterly and westerly perimeters of the site.
- The revised plan has a problem with providing usable open space adjacent to or in close proximity with individual units.
- Concern with the lack of porches in areas that provide for social interaction; shared and play space.
- Choosing an attached garage building form presents a challenge to an already problematic site, in addition to issues with the lack of solar orientation.

- Prefer previous scheme, more human. This is a difficult and hard site where the building type doesn't fit on the site.
- Consider a building type on the lot that doesn't emphasize parking with garages, including a carport as an alternative. It was noted by Glueck as well as staff that covenants required attached garages.
- Worried about a place for people/kids; spaces for enjoyment. Revised plan has cues for drivers in its design that the dominant feature of the site plan drive aisles' for garage access for cars as well as promoting car speeds.
- Problem with understanding entries into buildings not clearly detailed.
- Landscape treatment could help provide more clarity of the space for people adjunct to the units.
- Eliminate surface parking stalls along the southerly rim of the central drive aisle in order to provide for a pedestrian sidewalk to the street, utilize on-street parking in combination with pulling the buildings in to make the vehicular circulation area tighter.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Woods voting no and Wagner abstaining. The motion for referral cited issues with the modified site plan, failure to address issues previously discussed and investigated with initial approval of the project. A prior motion by Woods, seconded by Slayton to grant final approval failed on a vote of (2-6) with Woods and Slayton in favor, with Wagner, Rummel, Barrett, Barnett, Host-Jablonski and Ferm voting no.

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, 4, 4, 4, 4.5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4809 Freese Lane

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	3	58	-	-	-	4	-	4
	4	5	5	-	-	4	4	4
	3	4	5	4	-	4	3	4
	4/5	6	6	-	-	4/5	5	5
	2	3	3	3	-	3	1	3
	3	6	6	5	-	5	5	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5

General Comments:

- Critical lack of design for human interaction between neighbors.
- Needs more imagination applied to site design.
- Critically bad and huge policy failure. Creates substandard affordable housing with few redeeming qualities. Difficult site doesn't help.
- Basic site plan with building type are not well matched.
- Low quality site planning. This applicant chose a difficult – ultimately inappropriate – building type, but then proceeded to attempt to force it into this challenging site. Applicant has not made the modifications as directed by the conditions of the initial approval.