

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 13, 2008
TITLE: 733 County Road M – PUD-GDP for 66 Apartment Units. 9 th Ald. Dist. (05443)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 13, 2008	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 13, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for a PUD-GDP located at 733 County Road M. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kenton Peters and Chuck Nahn, representing the Neighborhood of Quarry Ridge. Appearing in opposition was Frederic Ross, representing the Applewood Hill Homeowners Association. Peters provided a summary of changes to the project in response to the Commission's previous comments, highlighting the following:

- A review of the site and building plans emphasizing the preservation of existing natural vegetation around the perimeter of the building pad.
- Chuck Nahn spoke on the stormwater management plan noting the incorporation of potential bioretention areas around the perimeter of the building pad, the site's driveway entry and at the center of a turn around at the terminus of the entry drive to the property. Both Nahn and Peters emphasized the utilization of green roofs on the end modules of the two opposing ends of the interconnected structure.
- Peters noted reduction in surface parking as previously requested by the Commission with the elimination of 16 guest and residents surface parking stalls along the easterly façade of the interconnected building in areas now noted for use as potential bioretention areas. The overall reduction in parking reduces the amount from the previously proposed 128 stalls (90 lower level enclosed stalls with 38 surface parking stalls) reduced to a total of 112 stalls (90 underground, 22 surface) in response to the Commission's concern.
- In regards to traffic issues, Peters noted that discussions with the adjacent seminary to provide for shared access as requested.
- Additional landscaping and screening in the form of the addition of conifer plantings as an enhancement to existing landscaping is proposed along the property's County Trunk Highway M frontage, as well as adjacent to single-family lots at the southerly end of the site and proposed building.
- Relevant to the connectivity and access issue, attempts to work with the adjacent single-family subdivision (Applewood) for pedestrian connectivity were noted as not receptive by the subdivision's residents where the applicant maintains his willingness to provide access to any adjacent development as well as the adjacent Diocese property.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Consider enhancing the natural environment for what is there in the form of existing landscape vegetation. Plan for additional landscaping amenities is too linear, too formal, the concept is OK but needs to be more complementary.
- There appears to be no address on proposed building materials and colors. The applicant noted that those issues will be dealt specifically at the SIP level in response to the Commission's concerns about the potential "white" coloration of the proposed residential structure.
- At minimum provide and identify potential pedestrian access to adjacent properties.

Several Commission members raised concerns with the need for additional detail on the proposed residential development. As a follow-up staff provided a detailed explanation on the requirements for the development of a Planned Unit Development-General Development Plan (PUD-GDP) in response to the issues raised.

ACTION:

On a substitute motion by Wagner, seconded by Cosgrove, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0). A prior motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel for referral requesting additional details on the site plan as well as location of building entrances and other elements was withdrawn by Barnett. The motion for initial approval required address of the above stated requirements, in addition to:

- All issues relevant to pedestrian connectivity to adjacent sites be addressed at the SIP level, including the coloration of the building and material palette to depart from its current white/stark appearance.
- Relevant to the architecture the Commission noted its encouragement that something of architectural merit be provided at the SIP level relevant to the final form of the proposed residential structure in regards to detailing materials and fenestration.
- The applicant shall consult with staff prior to a return for final approval to ensure that all previous elements associated with this redevelopment proposal are reconstructed and organized as part of the fully detailed PUD-GDP packet for final approval by the Commission, including the previously reviewed tree study and analysis.
- Fully dimensioned and detailed site plans.
- Corrected text and notations relevant to the number of parking stalls as well as other consistent detailing relevant to the current extent of the project.

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, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 733 County Road M

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	-	-	-	5	5	5
	5	-	5	-	-	5	5	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	7	5	-	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
	5	5	4	-	-	5	-	5
	-	7	-	-	-	5	-	-

General Comments:

- Terraces will potentially enhance social interaction; include seating areas.
- Need to see the architecture more clearly. But concept and site/massing is approvable.
- We'll need more detail later, but this is a generally good project.
- Model helps, but site context drawings need to be at the table.