

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 19, 2010
TITLE: 9052-9062 Paddington Way – Planned Residential Development (P.R.D.), Modifications to Previously Approved Building Elevations. 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald. Dist. (18466)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 19, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Mark Smith, Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, Dawn O’Kroley.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 19, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of modifications to previously approved building elevations for a PRD located at 9052-9062 Paddington Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Stoddard and Terry Temple. The project was originally approved as PRD in 2006. The project now has 156-units in five different building types. Because of the proximity of buildings to each other, which is at some points 9-feet, and due to financial issues they decided to switch out some of the masonry for stucco (EIFS). Questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Confusion over why what you are asking for has already been built.
- Why is it here after construction rather than before?
- The original application for a minor alteration was denied; it was built anyway.
- We rarely allow EIFS to come down to grade; I think we’ve got a problem. This has to be back filled.
- This is an egregious violation. When you attempt to make this large a change you have to come back through the process first. The process would have been a successful one. At this point I don’t see that ever getting through the process.
- The building is not integrated to the site.
- It looks like a premanufactured building just sitting on the site.
- What was approved couldn’t be more different than what you constructed.
- It’s your responsibility to bring back something that is more in keeping with the original design intent.
- Troubling building is already constructed. The building as approved, the side elevation responds to front elevation. Rarely support EIFS to grade. Desire to refer in light of no landscape plan and inadequate details.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The referral motion required that the applicant look at

alternative proposals for masonry, treating EIFS in an alternative way, details of landscaping and address no base treatment on side elevations.

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 3 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9052-9062 Paddington Way**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

General Comments:

- Changes like this must be submitted in advance of construction.
- Referral – bad scene man.