AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORTED BACK:

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: April 19, 2006

TITLE: Gemini Drive – Grandview Commons – **REFERRED:**

PUD(SIP), Twenty-Three Unit Condominium Project. 16th Ald. Dist.

(03451)

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: April 19, 2006 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Michael Barrett, Bruce Woods and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 19, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** on a PUD(SIP) for a twenty-three unit condominium project. Appearing on behalf of the project were Russ Kowalski and Gabe Albrecht. The project provides for the development of a 12-unit and 11-unit condominium buildings on opposing sides (north and south) of Gemini Drive within the Grandview Commons neighborhood. Both buildings feature entries and stoops along the street side façade with rear access to lower level parking for each unit within a double-wide attached garage. The façade treatment features the use of metal siding, painted panels and EIFS in pattern and textures. Both buildings feature flat roofs with interior roof drainage along with the provision of decks and screened porches. Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Issue with the use of EIFS down to grade or ground level, a vulnerable material. The solid line of garages at the rear of each building looks awful and requires a lot of shielding and screening.
- The colors of both structures are fun and playful but the EIFS is a problem. Durability at the lower level is problematic, as well as how it wraps around at the foundation level.
- Need to provide colored side and rear elevations upon further consideration of the project. In addition, find a mechanism to break up the expansive façade of the line of garage doors. Look at breaking up the monotony of the two car garage doors with mixing one and two-car wide garage doors, in combination with building architecture down to the ground.
- Mix of materials does not appear prevalent on the rear garage level elevations.
- Look at opportunities to break up the rear façade treatment.
- Look at fiber cement siding and/or panels in different colors rather than EIFS. Look at porous paving at the rear of both buildings to reduce the extent of asphalt and concrete surfaces.
- Further consideration of the project requires examination of opportunities for more on-site detention, along with adjusting the landscape plan to include both deciduous and evergreen plantings to provide screening around the perimeter of both sites, especially hard surfaces consisting of access, parking and drive aisle areas.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0).

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 5.5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Gemini Drive – Grandview Commons

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	7	6	-	-	-	7	7
	7	7 (front) 3 (rear)	6	-	-	6	7	6
	6	7	5	ı	-	5	6	6
	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	5.5
	7	7	-	-	-	6	8	7
	-	7	-	-	-	7	7	7
	5	6	5	-	-	6	7	6
	6	6	5	-	-	5	6	6

General Comments:

- Vary garage sizes and pay more attention to architectural detailing of the backside.
- Rear garage elevation needs more design attention. Front façades work well fresh and modern.
- Garage door sides must be screened I like the color features.
- Back should relate to front (architecture); front too busy though. EIFS is not acceptable; scuppers and not roof drains?
- This has the potential to be a very fun and unique residential project. Rear and side elevations need to be developed. Color is fabulous! Bravo!
- Coordinate landscape and drainage plan taking into account the bioretention areas. More rear landscaping to screen garage.
- Don't run EIFS to grade. Back of buildings too stark needs relief/more interest.