

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 21, 2016

TITLE: 301 Cross Oak Drive – PD(SIP), Multi-Family Townhome Development Consisting of Nine Units. 9th Ald. Dist. (44467)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 21, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Rafeeq Asad, Lois Braun-Oddo, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton, Sheri Carter and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 21, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PD(SIP) located at 301 Cross Oak Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Steve Shulfer. The 9-unit townhouse style building would contain identical units. An access curb cut off of Blossom Drive is proposed, with a secondary exit point onto the alleyway. Landscaping will be used to screen the single-family development south of this property. The property owner is looking at using five different colors of materials, with some gabled roofs and dormers, vinyl windows and vinyl siding.

The Secretary noted that this is a PD, which approved townhouse development 10 years ago. Being a PD should be superior design, and what is being proposed here is not an acceptable premise for being a Planned Development. Site layout is dictated by the fact that the area is already dominated by townhouse development, and the lot was intended for these types of densities. It’s acceptance of the overall design, building materials and landscaping consistent with what is expected with PDs.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Is there any way you can enlarge the porches in front to accommodate a table and chairs? Also can you find another material other than vinyl.
 - We did talk at length about siding; he wants to go with vinyl for cost reasons. For the front porch area, we’ve got back balconies and that’s where most of the activity will take place.
- But that doesn’t interact with the neighborhood.
- You’ve got to have quality material.
- The back is more successful than the front with all those gables tacked on. The simplicity of the line is better than all of that fussiness. Having more of the shed roofs would be fine. If you were putting your money into the materials, even the playfulness and color could be a way to do it.
- I appreciate the last page with the context with development. I’m not going to advocate for gables, but the way the gables are used, the different colors, porches and bays, all as a composition and they don’t

short change the garage side. They have a simplified palette and a nice rhythm, and some of these design elements could find their way into this and make it more successful. The middle one on the left integrates some of the landscaping to conceal the parking. And larger front porches on these as well.

- The windows seem rather skimpy in the living spaces.
- And the character of the windows are completely different from back to front.
- If you're going to discontinue the use of stone as a base as you return to the garage elevation, what happens when that occurs? Does it stop at a vertical pier on the corner, or on the side of the building, and what material is going to replace that stone between the garages?
 - Right now we're returning it about halfway to that bay that I talked about, and trying to find a transition point there.
- I don't want to see the exact same landscape plan for every unit. Play around with it.
- Look at the site as a complete piece where the units are coming into this landscape that was there rather than putting decorative landscape in front of it.

ACTION:

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