

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: October 4, 2006 |
| TITLE: 9201 Mid-Town Road – PUD(GDP-SIP), Residential Project. 1 st Ald. Dist. (03833) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: October 4, 2006 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Cathleen Feland, Ald. Noel Radomski and Lisa Geer.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 4, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a residential project located at 9201 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Don Schroeder. Bruce noted to the Commission the modifications of the project as follows:

- The landscape plan has been modified to provide additional amenities around the detention pond and pathway areas. The landscape plan also has been corrected to be more easily readable and legible, as well as providing for a full planting schedule and worksheet. The landscape plan also has been modified in regards to its treatment around the bioretention area relative to its consistency with the grading plan details. The landscape plan has also been modified to provide for additional landscaping amenities on the garage side of the 4-unit building south of Building 3.
- Consideration for the use of fiber cement as a replacement for vinyl was noted as not cost-effective for the project.
- Variations of the architecture of the 4-unit buildings has been provided, along with the elimination of surface parking stalls along Mid-Town Road. In addition, variations in the types of brick and siding applications and color palettes were presented for the various building types developed with the project.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Examine the pairing of end garages on adjacent buildings to allow for share drives and to reduce total number of driveways (regarding the 4-unit condominium buildings).
- Examine the softening of the view from Building #3 across to the garage doors of the southerly 4-unit condominiums, in addition to placing trees within the landscape islands between adjoining paired garages for the 4-units.
- Add additional tree islands across from the 4-units adjacent to Building #3.
- Add trees in all islands that currently contain only shrubs.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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, 6, 7, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9201 Mid-Town Road

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 7 | 8 | 6 | 7 | - | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | - | 5 | 6 | - |
| | 5 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | - | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | - | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| | 7 | 8 | 7 | - | - | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | 7 | 8 | 6 | - | - | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| | 5 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Beef up landscaping in general, especially between units and add trees in all tree islands.
- OK for a suburban apartment complex. Nice moderation in parking. The one negative: why does it turn its back on Mid-Town Road? Mid-Town should evolve as a true urban arterial, much as say, Monroe, or Willy Street has. Instead it is evolving as a typical, 1960s suburban highway – very anti-urban and very much against our recently adopted Comprehensive Plan.
- Add more tree islands in 2 long parking rows.
- Condo garages are a concern.
- Need to soften garages, break up long stretches of surface parking.
- Another apartment/condo on the west side. All buildings should front the street.