

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 21, 2007
TITLE: 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road – Revised PUD(GDP-SIP), 116-Units. 9 th Ald. Dist. (08182)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 21, 2007	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 21, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Patrick McGowan, Gallina Co. Prior to the presentation staff noted to the Commission that a development plan for this site is almost identical in all aspects as was previously approved by the Commission in October of 2004 as designed by another architect. The current proposal requires reconsideration and reapproval at this time due to the PUD zoning approved with the original proposal lapsing due to expiration of the time period to record and receive final sign-off on the previously approved plans. McGowan provided an overview of the similarities and modifications to the project as currently proposed, noting the following:

- The incorporation of a covered drop-off at the main entry to the center building, including the development of a fountain feature and alteration to vehicular drive aisle circulation in this area at the site's Pleasant View Road frontage.
- Addition of fountains at the corners, as well as at the front entry to the center building.
- A reconfiguration of the pool at the rear of the center building from its previous rectangular shape to a now more freeform shape with water feature.
- The addition of elevators to the two outer buildings.
- The building materials consist of a cultured stone base, vinyl siding, vinyl beige, vinyl window trim with metal lower accent roofs, cast stone lintels, including exposed foundation walls beneath porches, as well as EIFS accents on portions of the upper elevations.
- Signage will consist of two monument signs, one at the corner of Pleasant View and Old Sauk and one along the property's Pleasant View frontage aligning with the main entrance to the center building and its fountain feature.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Connectivity between the center building and outboard buildings needs improvement. Provide alternative pedestrian routes to the pool area from the outward buildings.

- Relative to architecture, a high quality material such as the use of cast stone at the base of the building and other materials is an issue with the use of vinyl siding. No problem with two different colors of siding; need more substantial corner boards, e.g. hardiboard at minimum, add rake boards for more definition against siding, differentiate architectural treatment up high to limit its extent on upper elevations.
- The metal roofs covering lower floor porches and extensions should be the same as the upper roof and are not necessary.
- Pull the two species of ash and substitute with big shade trees and beef up the overall landscape plan treatment.
- Replace Green Spire Linden at building corners with canopy trees of more substance.
- Concern with the circle at the front utilization of two-way traffic in combination with one-way traffic. Need striping to identify.
- Keep the setting of corner fountains formal.
- Handle pedestrian access from Pleasant View Road to the main building to come directly across.
- Beyond striping for circulation around fountain there should be more of a design solution for two lanes at front (along Pleasant View Road) and one lane closer to the building.
- Question the need for the extensive amount of parking on the site including both below and above grade where 180 stalls in total are provided for a total of 116 units.
- Reexamine the use of vinyl siding although previously approved with the project a number of years ago, standards have change.
- Relevant to the vehicular circulation, fountain issue create a visible queue to separate two-way along Pleasant View and one-way at the base of the building.
- Tree islands are required at a 12 stall interval, place islands at points that complement vehicular circulation.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion to refer required resolution of the two-way/one-way/fountain vehicular circulation issue, the provision of pedestrian connectivity from Pleasant View to the front of the center building, as well as enhanced pedestrian connectivity from the buildings to the pool area, provision of more details on the canopy and turn around geometry control movement with quality of curbing narrow on drive lane, a relook at building architecture; use of vinyl siding, roof rakes and other architectural treatments, resolve of landscape issues, identify clearly bike parking, in addition to looking at the bedroom to overall parking ratio in regards to the elimination of potential surface parking to add more landscaping eliminating approximately 4-6 parking stalls.

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 4, 4.5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 615, 639 and 653 Pleasant View Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	5	4	5	5	-	5	4	4.5
	5	5	4	-	4	4	5	5
	4	5	5	-	-	5	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	4/5	5	5	-	-	4/5	5	5
	5	5	-	-	-	5	4	5
	5	5	4.5	-	-	4	5	5

General Comments:

- Buildings this large really must be made out of substantial materials...
- Address building materials (vinyl siding), entry circle, connectivity in rear of building. Surface parking, planting materials.
- Needs improvement. Ideally, the residents should have greater pedestrian access to other buildings/areas.
- Site circulation issues – vehicular and pedestrian need resolution. Higher quality materials needed.