

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** May 28, 2014

TITLE: 302 Samuel Drive – PD(GDP-SIP) and Conditional Use for “Tuscany Apartments” for 174 Dwelling Units with Underground Parking. 9th Ald. Dist. (33418)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 28, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 28, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PD(GDP-SIP) and conditional use located at 302 Samuel Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Craig Enzenroth, representing Gallina Corporation. Ald. Ahrens spoke on the project. Landscaping has been strengthened with an increase of canopy trees in the center and a main commons facility in the center of the two wings is provided for this non-age restricted development. The building steps down from four-stories to two-stories in the center with more variety integrated in the rooflines. The duplex lot is the last remaining lot. The larger building will utilize king sized brick ranging from buff to a red color, EIFS above in an ivory color, Tuscan sienna shingles, white windows and deep bronze railings. A little bit of stone will be used at the main commons.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On the elevations I really appreciate the aerial. It’s so symmetrical along this axis, have you thought about just a few areas, without changing unit plans or having all one roof form, to bring a little bit more variety. Make it look like it grew organically a bit more than if it sprung up at night.
 - We have to take a look at what happens plan-wise.I think it’ll help on those tower elements.
- It seems like the plants are kind of thrown in, the foundation plants. It doesn’t really accent or play off the architecture. Work with the massing, bring some out instead of just one long line of plantings. The curve doesn’t seem to do much down the center.
- The curved walk in the centerpiece doesn’t make sense with the symmetrical, the whimsy doesn’t make sense. I’d just as soon see one line of shrubs rather than curve it. Or have it be a straight walk through the ground cover. Something that’s more substantially related to the building.
- As far as the belt around the building, there’s a sprinkling of plants. I don’t see that relating to the building. I’d rather have nothing than have groupings that don’t relate to the building.
- That’s a lot of edging. Use a spaded edge or it will just be destroyed by the lawn mower.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0). The motion provided that the landscape plan be modified to address comments made and be further reviewed and approved by staff.

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 rating for this project is 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 302 Samuel Drive

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