

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 7, 2008
TITLE: 2317 Allied Drive - Allied Neighborhood Revitalization, Phases I and II, PUD(GDP) and Phase I, PUD-SIP. 10th Ald. Dist. (10286)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 7, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, John Harrington, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm and Bonnie Cosgrove. Richard Slayton arrived at 6:05 p.m.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 7, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the Allied Neighborhood Revitalization, Phases I and II Plan. Appearing on behalf of the project were Stu Levitan, Steve Holzhauser, Jim Klett, and Jeffrey Bogart, all representing CDA, and Mark A. Olinger, Director, Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development. The plans as presented provide for the approval of an overall PUD-GDP in support of the Allied Revitalization Development Concept. Phase I of the project provides consideration of a PUD-SIP to develop 48 rental units in five different building types, two of which involve the renovation and improvement of two existing buildings. The Phase II development within the overall PUD-GDP provides for 61 additional units. A review of the site plan and building elevational details provided for the following:

- On-street parking will be provided on Streets C and A, as well as both sides of Street D.
- Considerations for the use of pervious pavement provided in both the public right-of-way and on-site.
- A review of the various building types and elevational details emphasized the use of brick masonry, fiber cement panels and fiber cement stucco.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- In regards to the proposed courtyard feature at Jenewein Road and Allied Drive, the Urban Design Commission is in favor of enlivening the courtyard.
- Concern with corner courtyard being dead.
- Site design and architecture well designed.
- Concern with program for use of durable materials being maintained, budgeting impacts may lead to the use of vinyl versus fiber cement.
- Look at the terminal views through the corner courtyard plaza area not being the side of a garage or view of cars in a driveway.
- In terms of affordability or budget issues, building the principal structures should be the priority to where budget is put in materials instead of detached garages.

- On the affordability issue, lots of flat roofs more expensive than pitched with areas where pitched roofs merge into flat roofs creating maintenance costs (long-term), needs to be resolved.
- On Sheet A 220, rendering makes trellis look upward instead of being flat against the wall as proposed.
- Consider development of basements; cheap to construct with townhouses.

**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, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 7.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2317 Allied 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	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	7	7	6	-	-	6	7	7
	6	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	-	5.5	-	-	-	-	7	6
	6	7	-	6	-	-	-	-
	6	6	-	-	-	7	7	7
	7	7.5	6	8	-	8	8	7.5

General Comments:

- Open spaces (especially corner plaza) will be critical to program and design to accommodate uses.
- Interesting, good designs and nice mix of public/private space. Consider entrance on the court from Building A.
- Very good start to project with some tweaking needed.
- Generally well-thought out site planning and building massing, with handsome architecture. However, concerns remain: affordability and maintenance of lots of flat roofs/drainage from sloped roofs.
- Good looking buildings. Corner courtyard needs careful design to ensure a lively space. Don't forget the bike path.
- Hope design will hold with budget.
- Concern about flat roofs, vinyl siding not an option, save money elsewhere.