# **AGENDA#4**

## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 7, 2009

TITLE: Lots 30, 31, 32 Rustic Acres - Alteration to **REFERRED:** 

a Previously Approved PUD. 3rd Ald. Dist. **REREFERRED:** 

(16155)

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: October 7, 2009 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

#### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 7, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of alterations to a previously approved PUD located on Lots 30, 31 and 32, Rustic Acres. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jim Glueck, representing Appletree Homes, and Jeff Corbett. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the item under consideration involves façade alterations to a duplex building prototype approved as part of a PUD-SIP for Nelson's Addition to Rustic Acres. Staff noted that the residential subdivision in which this site was located provided for the development of a range of duplex, multi-family and single-family development based on specific prototypical designs for each of the residential unit types. Recent history of the project provides that the project's original developers, Doug and Mark Nelson attempted to alter the previous prototypical designs for the duplex structures in May of 2006 as a cost saving measure. The Commission referred consideration with directions to maintain the quality of the prototypical design for the duplex units as previously approved. Jim Glueck's request is to provide for a deviation from the previously approved prototypic duplex designs in favor of a proposed alternative where the remaining aspects for development of each of the three lots under consideration in regards to building setback, bulk, height and access will remain as previously approved. Glueck noted that the modifications involve a simplified roof structure and materials, changes to the siding materials such as vinyl as an alternative to the previously approved cement board material, along with the elimination of hanging decks on the side elevation and the downscaling of porch elements. Glueck noted that the alterations were necessary in order to meet current market demand. Staff noted the area's Alderperson's concerns, Lauren Cnare relevant to disappointment with the lack of quality in the development of the project as a whole inconsistent with the PUD-SIP as originally envisioned. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The departure from the use of cement board in favor of vinyl siding has issues; need to have more
  quality, need to maintain quality such as the use of solid corners, smart siding or an alternative solid
  product.
- Need something more substantial along Milwaukee Street.
- Need something better than vinyl with a brick face. What was proposed was complex but needed to be done right. The project as a whole has not been done right.
- Use solid band boards. Prefer solid siding product in horizontal banding and trim.

- Like revised design over previous, front nice, well proportioned but sides not well proportioned or as balanced.
- On the side elevations, look at gable projection should consider a shed roof or use different scale of windows on side elevation as with the front elevations, in addition shake and vinyl siding need something more.
- Need a slightly higher quality of finish on the units adjacent to Milwaukee Street and question the use of the mix of 8" and 4" siding.
- Not convinced that vinyl siding is appropriate.

Corbett spoke to the economic issues dealing with the departure from cement board to vinyl siding, which predominates the already developed lots within the area and is not necessarily cheap.

### **ACTION**:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Rummel and Wagner voting no and Woods, Harrington, Barnett, Luskin, Slayton and Ferm voting in favor. The motion required the following:

- The horizontal and vertical trim shall not be vinyl siding but solid, with windows on the first floor to match windows on the front elevations in size and location.
- Sidewalks are to be provided to the front doors.
- The banding board at the top story shall be a solid material and become the head trim of the windows.
- Gutter and downspouts shall be either box style or half round to fit architecture.

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, 6 and 7.

## URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Lots 30, 31, 32 Rustic Acres

	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
	7	7	-	-	-	7	7	7
	4	4	3	-	-	-	4	4
	6	6	6	6	-	6	6	6
	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	4

#### General Comments:

- Nice architectural improvement to what was previously approved.
- No vinyl siding. Improved architectural design is compromised by lower quality materials.