

## AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 9, 2008
TITLE: 92 Golf Parkway – GDP-SIP for Two Duplex Condominium Buildings (Four Total Dwelling Units). 18 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (09862)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: April 9, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a GDP-SIP located at 92 Golf Parkway. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ed Linville, representing Cherokee Investments; Dan Murray and Craig Makela, representing Cherokee Park, Inc. The project provides for two duplex condominium buildings on a lot abutting the Cherokee Golf Course adjacent to larger existing multi-family condominium development. Makela, Murray and Linville presented details on the proposed development of two duplex structures adjacent to the golf course, emphasizing the site's singular relationship with existing multi-family condominium development, as well as single-family development within the area. It was noted that the unique topography of the site provided issues with the site's proposed grading. Linville provided details on the design of the one-story structures as a departure from the existing Cherokee condominium development. He provided details on the design of the buildings' architecture emphasizing their prairie style. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Loop drive is redundant. Consider creating a "V" shaped access with the orientation of the twin homes with the center toward the road, providing screening along the side elevation of the end units from Golf Parkway.
- Concern with the amount of pavement proposed with the loop drive.
- Although an infiltration area is located adjacent to the drive it reflects an extensive amount of pavement, look at alternatives.
- Stormwater plan details need to be provided; want to know the percent of on-site retaining proposed with the plan.
- The False Heather has a problem with sandy soils, consider alternative.
- The scale of the site speaks to more of a detailed landscape plan than provided.
- Consider aligning and modifying the drive to a single, potentially located shared drive aligning with pond on the opposite side of Golf Parkway.
- Consider moving buildings to the street which provides for a large rear lawn.
- Need to show more context on existing conditions.
- Building architecture is great, look at providing windows either above garage doors or on the doors.

- The left drive aisle from right drive aisle with the looped drive should be eliminated to provide a connector that reorients the right unit to reduce the slope of the proposed grade.
- The building material colors are OK except for the yellow stucco.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Barnett voting no. The motion for initial approval required address of the above stated comments, specifically a new driveway plan that eliminates the looped drive, incorporating a single driveway access that minimizes pavement, provides for open space and assists eliminating grade issues with the right hand structure; in addition to stormwater details, a more detailed landscape plan and context information, as well as the movement of the right hand unit to resolve slope issues.

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, 5, 5, 6, 6.5, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 92 Golf Parkway**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5.5	7	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	6	8	6	6	6	6	6	7
	5	8	-	-	-	4	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	5	6	-	-	-	4	-	5
	6	6	5	-	-	-	-	5
	5	8	4	-	-	5	5	5
	4	6	3	-	-	3	5	5

General Comments:

- Good start.
- Site development, please.
- Lose the pavement. Nice buildings (except dominance of).
- Omit secondary drive.
- Nice design. Consider driveway options.