



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 5817 Halley Way
Application Type: Major Alteration to a Previously Approved Planned Development (PD)
UDC is an Advisory Body
Legistar File ID #: [91588](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Scott Frank, Oak Park Place | Bradley Servin, ADCI

Project Description: The applicant is seeking approval for several modifications to a previously approved Planned Development (PD), including, as noted in the applicant’s Letter of Intent, changes to the unit quantity and mix, balcony and window locations, exterior building materials to reduce the amount of aluminum wood-grained siding, relocate the main building entrance, and expand the residential amenities. These modifications will also require consideration of an Amended PD(SIP) (Planned Development - Specific Implementation Plan) by the Plan Commission and Common Council.

Project Background: The original Planned Development for Capitol View at Oak Park in Grandview Commons was approved in December 2013. Since then, the Planned Development was amended two times, once in 2015 (Legistar File ID [07173](#)) and again in 2021 (Legistar File ID [67173](#)). Most recently, in 2021, the PD was amended to modify the unit quantity and mix which subsequently changed the windows and balcony locations.

That proposal was reviewed by the UDC and Plan Commission in December 2021 and was subsequently approved by the Common Council on January 4, 2022. Construction of the project never commenced and the applicant is now seeking approval to modify the 2021 approval as noted in the Letter of Intent and as reflected on the plans.

Project Schedule:

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on February 4, 2026.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this proposal on May 11, 2026.
- The Common Council is scheduled to review this proposal on May 19, 2026.

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **advisory body** to the Plan Commission on this request. For Planned Developments the Urban Design Commission is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in the PD Standards for Approval (attached for reference), but including, more specifically:

PD Standard (e), which generally speaks to coordinating “*...architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.*”

As noted above, the UDC is an **advisory body** to the Plan Commission on this request. Staff recommend that as an advisory body, the UDC should structure a motion as a recommendation to the Plan Commission with or without specific findings and conditions. For example, such a motion may look like the following:

“The UDC finds that the development is consistent with the approval standards for Planned Developments, with the following conditions being met...and recommends that the Plan Commission approve the proposed development.”

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff recommend that the UDC provide feedback and make findings on the development proposal regarding the aforementioned standards as it relates to the design considerations noted below.

- **Building Design and Composition.** As noted in the applicant’s Letter of Intent, the proposed changes in the unit composition and amenities are triggering changes to the overall outward appearance of the building, including as it relates to the materials, massing at the top of the building, balconies, windows and entries. As such, consideration should be given to the overall building design and composition as it relates to creating a cohesive architectural expression, including:
 - Creating and maintaining four-sided architecture and applying the same level of ornamentation and detailing across all elevations,
 - The application of materials being consistent in defining building components (top, middle, base).

Of particular note related to the first two bullets is the Longboard Dark Cherry Aluminum Siding and the stone veneer materials, which does not appear consistently across the building. Consideration should be given to whether simplifying the material pallet or applying the materials differently (i.e., more consistently across the building, adjusting the height of materials (e.g., stone and/or faux wood transitions), defining building components (top, middle, base), to create a rhythm or pattern to break up long facades, or as an identifying feature for entrances or corners, for example) would result in a more cohesive composition.

- Minimizing blank wall expanses, including those on the north, east and west elevations, and
- Maintaining a positive orientation to the street, including the design/detailing of building corners and entrances (north, south and west elevations, which do not appear to be consistently designed or identifiable across the composition (i.e., canopies, accent materials, etc.).

For reference, in summary and generally, the Commission’s Informational Presentation comments were focused on:

- Giving consideration to using the faux wood material more consistently across all elevations,
- Breaking up or reducing some of the larger swaths of the stone veneer material, including in the patio area,
- Minimizing/reducing blank walls, and
- Revising the coping finish at the top of the building and using a finish that creates a more positive termination.

Staff request the Commission’s feedback and findings on the overall building design and composition.

- **Architectural/HVAC Louvers.** While louvers are shown on the north and west elevation drawings on the updated floors, louvers were not shown along the base of the building where underground parking is located and where louvers are anticipated. It has been the current practice to locate wall packs and their associated louvers so that they are not located on street-facing or on highly visible facades, although they have been approved in some situations when found to be well-integrated into the façade’s design.

As part of the Commission's Informational Presentation comments, the Commission noted that louvers should align with windowsills and lintels to be more fully integrated in the design composition.

Staff request the Commission's feedback and findings related to the design and finish details of the proposed louvers. Staff recommend that the UDC address louver integration, finish details, and location as part of their formal action.

Staff note that as part of the original PD approval conditions of approval, *"No HVAC "wall-pack" penetrations/louvers are shown on the submitted plans. The addition of HVAC vents, grills, or louvers on outward-facing walls is not included in this approval and will require approval of an alteration to this PD should they be proposed at a later time."*

- **Landscape.** As indicated on the landscape plan, landscape is being shifted to accommodate the expanded amenities, including the pickle ball court and outdoor patio.

For reference, in summary and generally, the Commission's Informational Presentation comments were focused on:

- Giving consideration to reconfiguring some of the landscape to tie into and work well with the patio,
- Using taller plant material to break down/screen blank walls, and
- Grouping plants in larger massings to anchor the architecture into the site and open space.

Staff request the UDC's feedback and findings on the proposed landscape plan. Consideration should be given to the plant list in terms of providing year-round color, texture and screening, as well as size/scale at the time of planting.

- **Lighting.** While a lighting plan was provided, it appears that the plan only reflects lighting for the parking area. Staff note, and the applicant is advised, that if lighting is proposed on the building, including at individual balconies or high on the building, or elsewhere on site, including the amenity spaces, a revised lighting plan and light fixture cutsheets will be required.

The applicant is advised that further review of lighting will occur as part of the Site Plan Review process for compliance with [MGO 29.36](#). The applicant is encouraged to work with Building Inspection Division staff to confirm submittal requirements.

- **Signage.** As shown on the elevation drawings several signs are shown, including projecting signage, wall signage, and above-canopy signage. Some of the signs are in areas where there are blank wall expanses. Absent signage, consideration should be given to the design and detailing of these walls versus designing a blank wall to accommodate signage.

Staff note and the applicant is advised that while signage is shown on the elevation drawings, a separate review and approval is required for signage. Future considerations related to signage include sign size and maintaining proportionality with the building, mounting height relative to adjacent design elements/details (i.e., maintaining datum lines, centering signage in signable area) and visibility, appropriateness of the sign type (i.e., above canopy or ground sign versus projecting sign), and sign design being complementary to the building design.

Summary of Informational Presentation Comments & Questions

As a reference, a summary of the Commission's comments and questions from the February 4, 2026, Informational Presentation are provided below.

The Commission inquired about the north elevation where there were previously three volumes, noting this version is accepting the grade and expressing that in the building. It might need more, such as bookending the two ends.

The Commission asked why the top cherry material is so scarcely applied. The applicant replied that costs are a factor, as well as not wanting so many materials shifting; this is more refined and quieter while adding some color, matching the sister building would be too much.

The Commission liked the application of materials, and how they overlap and intercept. However, they did want to see more of the wood on the northeast perspective. It is a very sophisticated use of materials and how they intersect, hopefully that stays throughout the project. It may be beneficial to revisit the cantilevers and balcony sizes and how they return, but this overall concept is a strong project.

The Commission noted that there is a lot of stone pretty high up; looking at how to better break up some of the stone mass may be good, including in the patio area.

The Commission commended this lovely outdoor space. The pattern of windows is fairly consistent except one area, where there are the narrow short windows. The applicant noted those windows are responding to the floor plan, bringing light into spaces like a bathroom or closet.

The Commission talked about the height of the stone wall, the ramp coming down, and the possibility of steps to break up some of that stone mass. The applicant replied that the residents are 55+ and it seemed right to keep it simple with just the ramp. The Commission suggested it could benefit from a second look.

The Commission inquired about the west elevation, the gray blank wall, that used to be glazing and is now closed off. The applicant noted this was previously a fully glazed stair, but they felt it was overkill. There is still a slice of windows down the entire stairwell and along the whole base of the building, as well as a lot of exposure on the main traffic areas, where they have added signs to strongly identify.

The Commission noted this is a real opportunity to reconfigure some of the landscape to tie in and work well with the patio. Using taller plant material to help break down the mass of the stone masonry, the layout of the path could be beautiful and dramatic, right now it looks uninspired. There are planting material opportunities for not just reorganizing the plants but taking a swing at grouping plants in larger massings to anchor the architecture into the site and open space.

The Commission inquired about locations for louvers. The applicant replied every unit has a louver, for the most part there aren't any on the primary façade. There are two units in the building with louvers in the recess, otherwise they are on the side in the patio, and they will color match on those two units.

The Commission asked if there was any way to line up the louvers with the window sills/lintels. The applicant responded that there is flexibility there.

The Commission talked briefly about how the top of the building is finished and whether the coping is working.

ATTACHMENT
PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards

28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
 - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
 - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.

- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.
- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
 - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
 - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
 - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate setbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Stepback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate setbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
 - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
 - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
 - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
 - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance