

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 3, 2006
TITLE: 4609 and 4610 Rustic Drive – Amendment to a Previously Approved PUD(GDP-SIP), Duplexes. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist.	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 3, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 3, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amendment to a previously approved PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 4609 and 4610 Rustic Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Marc Nelson and Douglas Nelson. The amendment involves alterations to both the building elevations and building envelopes for Lots 22 through 28 designated for duplex development within the “Nelson’s Addition to Rustic Acres” subdivision. It is the applicant’s desire to provide for reduced size building envelopes, as well as smaller sized redesigned duplex structures on the lots. Doug Nelson, noted that the requested changes were due to problems with costs and market for development of duplexes and size as previously approved where proposed builder / buyers desired smaller, more compact units, as well as problems with siting, differentially oriented driveways on each of the duplex lots as well as functional driveway length. Nelson emphasized that the revised plans, on the most part, still minimized the use of snout garages, provided for the differential orientation of driveways, as well as utilized shared driveway arrangements to minimize the impact of garage doors facing the street. Nelson noted the color of materials were as previously approved for each corresponding lot which utilized brick and stone on the front elevation with a change from the 3/4 to 6/12 roof pitch, featuring architectural shingles with high grade vinyl siding. Nelson noted that both the neighborhood and alderperson for the area, Lauren Cnare, supported the amendment. Following this presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- An overall site plan needs to be provided to evaluate the proposed modified duplex development in context with the surrounding area and subdivision.
- Provide all elements of the proposal in the application packet consistent with the detailed presentation on the project; including all four building elevations for each duplex type in addition to providing details on the relationship on how one material meets another. The size of the presentation and detail was not sufficient to consider the proposal.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Host-Jablonski abstaining. The motion for referral required address of the above-stated concerns and as detailed:

- Provide a comprehensive plan that shows relationship of buildings on the adjacent sites, sidewalks, connections, landscaping and driveways with building featuring a high level of design as previously approved including full scaled site plans and colored elevations, providing more scale and proportion, color, top and base treatment, as well as more cohesive design elements.

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 3, 3, 4, 5 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4609 & 4610 Rustic Drive**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	2	4	-	-	-	4	6	4
	2	3	2	-	-	3	3	3
	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
	7	6	-	-	-	6	8	7
	3	3	-	-	-	3	3	3
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Comments:

- Need to see an overall site plan at full sheet size which shows individual building placement and drives. Presentation drawings need to be large enough to visually understand the architectural detail.
- We need more info before we can make an informed decision.
- Need more information presented to make a determination. Need overall site plan and complete building elevations.
- Entire submittal was lacking.
- Need comprehensive plan to assess design quality.