

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 11, 2014

TITLE: 901 Sugar Maple Lane – Planned Residential Development/Conditional Use for a 72-Unit Multi-Family Development. 1st Ald. Dist. (34364)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 11, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare, Richard Slayton and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 11, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a Planned Residential Development/Conditional Use located at 901 Sugar Maple Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, representing TR McKenzie Co.; Scott Alt and Donald Schroeder. Bruce gave a brief overview of the site plan and surrounding neighborhood. The development is a series of 3-story buildings along Valley View Road, with 2-story buildings along Sugar Maple and Cherry Blossom Way. The largest building is L-shaped, 3-stories with 44-units and also houses the community center and office functions, which opens out onto the recreation area. There is a shared greenspace with some single-family homes facing onto the backside of that, with a large detention stormwater area. A somewhat defined roadway network in through the development shows angled parking to make that as much of a road and not a parking lot as possible. The parking ratios are approximately 1.7 stalls per unit with most being below grade. Exterior materials are stone, horizontal vinyl cladding and a board and batten at the dormer elements.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Why no flat roofs?
 - We think in this setting the pitch was appropriate.
- What’s the topography?
 - Valley View sits higher and the site generally slopes this way, but most of the grade happens right in through here. And there’s about a 20-foot fall from this road. We do have a pretty good sized buffer here.
- Will there be walpaks?
 - There will be a couple of openings.

A lot of times the shorter elevations are more successful than the longer elevations, but I think maybe it’s because they don’t have the dormers. Because there’s not a predominance of entrances or balconies I think you’re going to see them. I’d encourage some of these elements be incorporated into the side if possible. Maybe just a simple gable.

- A little asymmetry would be nice.
- Could you look at the roof of the lofts? Could you study it not being an asphalt shingled roof that springs from the feet? That curved element holds its own roof form. If it had a different roof form maybe it would break it up more. Maybe it wants to be a different material.
- I like that you have a good open space here. When you come back blow this area up so we see how this area works with the buildings. This is fine as informational but so we know the activities here and how it relates to the access.
- You couldn't work with one-way drives, you need two-way drives in here?
 - Yes I think so.
- This connection and this open space (pool), something really nice could happen along here that says pedestrians more than it says cars.

ACTION:

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

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: 901 Sugar Maple Lane

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

General Comments:

- Very prosaic design, not innovative. Site plan could emphasize pedestrian movement much more.
- Great potential for site features to connect areas of parcels...promenade, “green,” etc.