

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> August 19, 2009
TITLE: 1802 Maple Crest Drive – Hawk’s Landing Golf Club Lot 53 – PUD(GDP-SIP) Allowing for the Replacement of Fifteen 6- Unit Buildings with Fourteen Duplex Units and Seven 10-Unit Buildings. 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald. Dist. (15685)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: August 19, 2009	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Mark Smith, Ron Luskin and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 19, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1802 Maple Crest Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, representing Hawk’s Condominium Corporation; and Jeff Haen. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the project provides for modifications to a previously approved Planned Residential Development (PRD), condominium project reviewed by the Commission in January of 2005. The project as originally approved provided for the development of 19 six-unit condominium buildings, four buildings on the southerly perimeter of the site have been developed. According to Bruce, eight of the previously approved 6-unit buildings will be modified to provide for the development of 14 duplex units and one single-family unit with seven of the 6-unit buildings to be replaced with seven 10-unit buildings resulting in an overall change in density from 114 units to 123 units. Bruce provided a review of a conceptual building elevation and proposed revised site plan. He noted that the architectural style and detailing of the existing four duplex buildings already developed will be implemented on the proposed buildings as modified. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- No problem with duplexes or a change from 6 to 10-unit buildings but concern with going taller.
- Nice mix on parcel.
- Good idea in general but not fond of duplexes with large snout garages in front; look at providing vehicular and pedestrian access that focuses on pedestrian access.
- Good change but combine duplexes to create rowhouses to create more open space in certain places in combinations of four.
- Agree with Planning staff’s request for more variety and variation in building design and architecture.
- Consider clustering buildings with like treatment in groupings but still differentiate in architecture, color and materials.
- Look at downsizing the mass of roofs.
- Look at pairing and reorientation of buildings on the non golf course side duplexes.

- Look at variation in architecture including rooflines, along with providing more existing context.
- Remove north/south connector and make pedestrian street, eliminate vehicle connections in favor of pedestrian street.
- Reorient to eliminate garages fronting on street; pull into a court or onto a side.
- Look at curve alignment for options that allow for better building orientation.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1802 Maple Crest Drive**

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

General Comments:

- Architectural variety would make development more interesting. Try to reduce duplex-y feel with garage facing “street.”
- Explore using pedestrian streets to access townhouses. Challenge is to make townhouses attractive with garage facing streets.
- Density is present for a much stronger pedestrian presence.
- Seems appropriate to existing development.
- Too early.