

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 7, 2006
TITLE: 9201 Mid-Town Road – PUD(GDP-SIP), Residential Project. 1 st Ald. Dist. (03833)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 7, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 7, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a residential project located at 9201 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Donald Schroeder of Knothe & Bruce Architects. Staff noted to the Commission that this property lies to the south of Mid-Town Road's intersection with Hawk's Ridge Drive and was recently annexed to the City along with other properties to the east, where the Mid-Town Neighborhood Development Plan was amended to provide for this property as well as adjoining properties' development for residential purposes. The project provides for the development of a 156-units of multi-family residential on the northerly 2/3 of the lot adjacent to its Mid-Town Road frontage consisting of two 28-unit buildings, one 26-unit building and a 74-unit building. All buildings are three-stories in height and feature lower level underground parking, with the 74-unit building configured in an "L-shape." The central component of the "L-shaped" building features 3-units including a clubhouse with a rooftop pool. The southerly 1/3 of the site will consist of five 4-unit condominium structures featuring rear access to the lower level attached garages, with the front of the buildings oriented toward Dregers Way. The 4-unit structures are two-stories in height. Internal private drive access is provided between the multi-family development and the 4-unit development across the project site featuring a reduction in drive aisle width where possible. The architecture of both the multi-family buildings and 4-unit buildings is complementary, featuring the use of asphalt shingles, horizontal siding and brick veneer. Following the presentation of the plans, the Commission noted the following:

- Reexamine the landscape plan treatment around the detention pond and pathway.
- The landscape plan is difficult to read and illegible; needs a planting schedule and landscape worksheet to be provided with further review.
- The landscaping, the bioretention area treatment and grading plans need to be coordinated and consistent in detailing.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Wagner abstaining. The motion required address of the above and as follows:

- Provide more detailed information on the landscape plan, including a worksheet and planting schedule, along with coordination and consistency with the grading and stormwater features.
- The elevations for the garage side of the 4-unit buildings south of Building No. 3 need a landscape buffer.
- Encourage horizontal siding to be fiber cement, not vinyl or aluminum.

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 6, 6, 6, 7, 7, 7 and 8.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9201 Mid-Town Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	6	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	8	-	9	-	7	9	8.5
	6	6	6	7	-	5	5	6
	7	8	6	-	-	6	6	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Tower with swimming pool a great idea.
- Sizable courtyard is a major plus. Parking is relatively restrained given the suburban location. Bike parking is ample.
- Submit a more legible landscape plan with a worksheet. Coordinate landscape with proposed stormwater devices.
- Well thought out master plan.