

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 7, 2015

TITLE: 841 Jupiter Drive – PD(SIP), Multi-Family Apartment Building with 54 Dwelling Units with Underground Parking. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (40142)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 7, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart, Sheri Carter and Lois Braun-Oddo.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 7, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PD(SIP) for a multi-family apartment building with underground parking located at 841 Jupiter Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Ulian Kissiov. Existing architecture in this area is both modern and traditional; he tried to connect this through the parapet. The crisp colors help with a more modern approach. The site is also extremely determined which doesn’t give much flexibility, the space is tight with green in the front and parking behind. There is not a pronounced entrance from the street; the distance from the street to the building is 90-feet so the entry is in the corner. Parking and stormwater treatment also played into the placement of the entry door. Building materials include light brick at the base with darker siding at the top. The treatment of a large wall will be done with landscaping. Planning staff has questioned whether landscaping can be sufficient to deal with the articulation of such a large brick expanse.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- To have an auto-oriented entry dominate the street front is a problem. It’s not quite acceptable.
- The walpaks need to not be on the parallel walls or on the returns. They should be clearly identified.
  - They’re always exposed but you don’t see them because you don’t see the building straight forward.
- Density is a Plan Commission issue.
- The large building footprint with the amount of surface parking speaks to the issue of open space and common amenities, and that you’re not doing anything with that whole setback to make that functional.
- There’s no usable open space except for the front.
- On your entry from the street, what if this were an entry? If people entered on the side and still used the central elevator corridor?
- What if you turned the building?
  - That exposes the parking to the street.

- I hate to be prescriptive when you see a design that's rationale. I don't care how nice this greenspace is, this is where I'd want to be (adjacent public open space). The reason for it doing the things it's doing, versus putting the parking lot in the front.
- I really like the composition.
- What if you didn't have such a strong parapet on the corner? If the backdrop were a simpler coping.
- Looking at the building behind it's a much more modern clean building. Relating to that is a stronger statement rather than having all these parapets popping up and down, a stronger line would make more sense.
- Even as a backdrop tier, these are very nicely detailed volumes.
- Get rid of the pop up roof forms.
- I'd prefer you use a deciduous tree. What you're showing just isn't going to work. They're not going to live there. I would rather see grape vine on a green screen.
- You need a better solution for screening that large wall. The landscaping will not screen that amount of exposure, it needs to be more massive.
- My big concern for the drive is that there's enough queuing space. You've made the right decisions with the space you have and how you're putting it in there.
- Consider a green roof.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.