

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> September 20, 2006
TITLE: 2 Greenside Circle – Planned Residential Development (PRD), 166-Units. 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald. Dist. (04275)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: September 20, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lisa Geer, Cathleen Feland, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Lou Host-Jablonski, Ald. Noel Radomski and Robert March.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 20, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) located at 2 Greenside Circle. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Rott, Jed Sanborn, Jason Franzen and Terrence Temple. The modified plans presented by Rott featured the following:

- Enhancements and further detailing to provide address of the Commission’s previously stated concerns and comments relevant to the project at its meeting of August 23, 2006, as well as with initial approval of the project at its meeting of September 6, 2006.
- In response to a request to clarify pedestrian connections to the City park at the southeasterly corner of the site; enhanced plan details featuring open space amenities and more detailed pedestrian walkway provisions were emphasized.
- A request to either eliminate or move two small boulevard medians west of the intersections of A Street and B Street was partially addressed with the elimination of one median, with the maintenance of the remaining median in combination with enhancements of pedestrian linkages along the south side of A Street, as well as enhanced greenspace amenities.
- A request to replace or relocate the building B type located off of the northeasterly corner of the intersections of A and B Streets to provide a more contiguous open space at the center of the site and provide for a building that relates better to its street frontages was addressed with its elimination and the development of a smaller “E” type, 4-unit structure in combination with the development of a 2-unit “A” type structure on the opposing southeasterly corner of the intersections of A and B Streets. The reduced size buildings allow for the enhancement of open space amenities at all four corners of the intersection, as well as enhanced pedestrian linkages to the park and pond.

Following the presentation, some concerns were expressed on issues with disconnectivity of the pedestrian network along easterly portions of the site, as well as the lack of crosswalks at intersections.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Wagner abstaining. The motion required that the applicant provide for more enhanced pedestrian connectivity along easterly portions of the site to the overall network, as well as provide crosswalks at intersections.

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, 6.5, 7, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2 Greenside Circle**

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

General Comments:

- Still a giant cul-de-sac, but...
- Improved plans – a long haul but worth it.
- Open space works much better to link the development and provide amenities for the residents. Landscape elements create nice destination areas.
- Much improved – needs more sidewalks.