

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 25, 2007	
TITLE: 1902 Hawks Ridge Drive – PUD(GDP-SIP), Minor Alteration. 1 st Ald. Dist. (06225)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: April 25, 2007	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Cathleen Feland, Richard Slayton, Robert March, Paul Wagner and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 25, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP), minor alteration located at 1902 Hawks Ridge Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Tim McKenzie. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the project was previously reviewed and approved under the address of 9201 Mid-Town Road involving the development of 156-units of multi-family residential development. Under consideration are modifications to the previously approved plans that were altered administratively prior to recording to eliminate a single common entry pedestrian access to a 26-unit building (Building #4) located along the site's Hawks Ridge Drive frontage in favor of providing three individual pedestrian pathways to individual units as approved by staff. It is the developer's desire to eliminate consideration for pedestrian access to the building's Hawks Ridge Drive frontage in favor of the development of a landscaped lawn incorporating an aspen/birch glade. Tim McKenzie provided further elaboration on his request to eliminate the pedestrian pathways, noting that during the City approval process, previous considerations for on-street parking along Hawks Ridge Drive were eliminated diminishing the functional need to provide for stoops and walks to the street. He noted that the original plans features utilizing one single shared pedestrian walkway to the building had been replaced with an administratively approved modification by staff featuring three walkways to individual units. Although originally agreeable with the alternative plan, he felt that the elimination of on-street parking and issues with the use of patio doors with no lock sets presented an issue with security in providing for the three pedestrian pathways. He emphasized the alternate plan to eliminate the walks would provide for additional landscaping featuring a no-mow (fescue) lawn with aspen/birch plantings in a grove-like fashion. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Clarify the issue with the "City" removal of on-street parking.
- Question the use of patio doors to units (sliders) instead of regular doors with locking mechanisms. The problem is with patio doors where the cost of functional doors with locking mechanisms would not be significant. The provision of stoops and patios with walks to the street make it safer; with people on it provide eyes on the street for the Urban Design Commission's normal thinking.
- The argument relevant to providing the pedestrian connections can go both ways. Providing the connections is better versus screening approach for security. The alternative proposal is contradictory.
- Further consideration of the alteration requires that the applicant provide more information relevant to the Traffic Engineering's requirement to eliminate on-street parking.

- The alternate plan creates a nice grove, like the use of aspens; mix with birch but need more ground story plantings. Relevant to the issue of security, consider sliding doors that have locks, in addition to porches as an option or patios that act as a porch and utilize the open space area.
- Put lockable doors on those units having pedestrian access to make sidewalk work.
- Consider large enough patio or porch areas with landscaping connect to the public walk.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2-1) with Barrett and Feland voting no and March abstaining. The motion to refer required address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Provide documentation and plans to illustrate the nature of the proposed alterations, including building elevations and site plan details where any alternatives should provide for patios and landscaping to be integrated enough to relate to the street sufficient enough to consider the option for the elimination of the individual pedestrian sidewalks that create a sufficient strong connection to the street, including providing a hard barrier to the public walk. The motion also restated the need to provide documentation from the Traffic Engineering Division on the elimination of on-street parking including dates when approved and/or denied.

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 2, 4, 4.5, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1902 Hawks Ridge Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	4.5
	-	-	9	-	-	4	5	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	5	-	5	-	-	4	4	5
	2	-	-	2	-	1	2	2
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	4	-	6	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Why are we seeing this project?! Poor reason to ask for alteration.
- Design changes forced on you by parking change have been detrimental.
- The connection – visual, functional and psychological, between the units and the sidewalk is crucial to good urban design. This design needs more work in that regard.
- We are moving down a very slippery slope – once again Traffic Engineers are dictating urban design.
- Process which eliminates street parking is of concern.