## AGENDA # <u>4</u>

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 16, 2005		
TITLE:	502/602 Troy Drive – PUD(GDP-SIP), Community Gardens, Prairie, Farm, and Housing Development	REFERRED:		
		REREFERRED:		
		<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: November 16, 2005		ID NUMBER:		

City of Madison, Wisconsin

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

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) on property located at 502 / 602 Troy Drive for a community gardens prairie farm and housing development. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jim Glueck, architect and Kathleen Lake, landscape architect of JJR, and Greg Rosenberg of the Madison Community Land Trust. In response to the Commission's previous review of the project, the modified plans, as presented, featured the following:

- A landscape buffer had been added in front of the common house and adjoining surface parking lot to create a gathering space and provide effective screening with the adjacent surface parking area.
- A request to provide an accessible pedestrian connection to the southeast of Troy Drive could not be addressed due to accessibility issues in addition to the presence of culverts, ditches, around a proposed detention area facility combined with conflicts with grades and existing trees and shrubs.
- A previous request to provide a four-foot fence along the easterly property line adjacent to surface parking stalls was responded to with the provision of deciduous and evergreen shrubs combined with existing vegetation to be maintained within the area to provide effective screening.
- A previous request to make the chimney element of the common house more of a statement was no longer an issue due to project costs which would not allow for a chimney to be installed and therefore, was removed from the plan.

Following the presentation, a review of the building material selection was provided; Glueck noted that the fiber cement siding as previously proposed on the residential structures was still desirable as well as the use of a corrugated metal siding and roof on the common house, but costs are leading to the use of vinyl with an architectural shingle as possible options. Glueck then presented color ranges in vinyl samples which were close to those colors as originally proposed on each of the building elevations. The colors of the vinyl siding range from clay tan, cobblestone, pewter and sage with consistent trim colors. Rosenberg noted that the actual choice of materials and colors on each unit will be left to residents of the co-housing project.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the project. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required that:

- A gravel pedestrian path shall be provided to the southeast to connect to Troy Drive.
- Confirm that all lighting fixtures be fully shielded, metal halide.
- Vinyl siding is approved as a fallback to the fiber cement siding with corner boards to be fiber cement, miratec or similar materials for both the corner boards and window trims in similar colors as displayed.

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 7, 8, 8, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR:	502/602 Troy Drive
---	--------------------

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	8	7	7	-	-	8	7	7
	7	7	8	8	-	8	9	8
	9	7	8	8	-	8	9	8
	9	7	7	8	-	7	6	7
	7	7	7	6	-	7	7	7
	9	6.5	9	8	-	9	9	8
Me								

General Comments:

- Superb project.
- Very nicely designed comprehensive project, especially site.
- This is a model project that should set the standard for all multi-family developments throughout the City.
- Great site plan will promote neighborhood interaction. Try for fiber cement.