

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 25, 2007
TITLE: 6500 Normandy Lane – Ninety-One Unit Condominium Apartment Building, PUD(GDP-SIP) (Formerly 502 Yellowstone Drive). 19 th Ald. Dist. (06080)	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) for a 91-unit condominium apartment building located at 6500 Normandy Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jerry Bourquin and Steve Yoder. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Ald. Mark Clear. Plans as presented by Yoder and Bourquin featured the following modifications:

- The two future phase southerly wings of the building containing approximately 40-units in each wing have now been removed from the scope of the project with potential future consideration based on sales of the current phase under consideration.
- The building has been redesigned to include a bend at its center, in combination with the incorporation for all first floor level units porches with at grade entries with the building featuring two lower levels of parking beneath.
- The unit count has been downsized from the previously proposed 96-units to 91.

Following a review of the building plans including elevational details, the Commission noted the following:

- The downscaled plan does not show how the proposed development relates to the remainder of the center and theater. Consider getting rid of the shared corridor walk-up beyond the first floor units to provide a more urban feel.
- Troubled by the scale of the building, needs more of an urban engagement and offer some variety.
- Flip the party room location to the front of the building and eliminate the offset in the interior hall.
- Use different color brick instead of cut stone at the base of the building.
- Flip interior stair at center to create a common area on all floors.
- Eliminate vinyl siding on the upper elevation, in addition to a replacement for the rusticated block at the base of the building.
- Architectural detailing of materials on the building elevations need further work.

- The top of windows float in a sea of siding. The amount of siding between window tops and siding on upper story elevations is a problem.
- Need blow-up parts of the building elevations to provide more details on such a big building, need to see details such as railing details.
- Eliminate the use of high pressure sodium fixtures in favor of metal halide.
- Provide options for on-site storm drainage.
- Provide more specific detailing on driveway, landscape and grading with further consideration of the project.
- Provide additional information on how individual ground floor entries and porches are developed to be usable space rather than just a stoop, as well as how other outdoor areas relate to the adjacent entries, how outdoor spaces are designed to make open space usable, create private space, usable space and connections to walk.
- The landscape plan features a plantings in a swath about 3-4 feet wide around the building. Move landscaping out at least 15-feet to provide individual defensible space for units. Define bike parking areas with plantings, in addition to entries along with eliminating white ash due to insect infestation issues.
- The building needs to engage the street with more of an urban feel. The typology of the building needs to be rethought, it is too suburban.
- The previously proposed future phases combined with current proposal presents an issue with the building form.
- Bike parking outside of the building needs to be “salted around” utilizing hitching post style racks.
- Eliminate EIFS on projecting porches especially at grade. The façade of the building needs to have more vertical elements due to the long expanse where the top floor needs to be embraced, not transparent.
- The brick colored change is not prevalent on the building’s corner in the perspective renderings, the color change occurring in one flat plane not appropriate.
- The non-projecting gable feature should project.
- Study the banding of materials around heads and seals of windows.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns including issues relative to landscaping and architecture prior to any further consideration of the project.

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, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6500 Normandy Lane

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	5	5	-	5	5	5
	7	7	7	8	-	7	9	7.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	5	.	6	-	6	6	5
	5	5	-	-	-	7	6	6
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	7	6	5	6	-	6	7	6
	6	5	6	4	-	6	5	5

General Comments:

- Fair. This project may set tone for future Market Square development, and is a missed opportunity to set a higher standard.
- Good use of the site. Architecture needs some tweaking.
- Decent site concept. Love that a parking lot is being redeveloped into a higher and better use. However, the architecture really needs to come up a level.
- Needs better outdoor spaces (use a “belt” of foundation planting).
- Good to see parking lots getting filled in with good development.
- Work on vertical elements, banding of materials around windows.
- Color change for top of brick. Switch party room location? Look at building architecture details. Eliminate split face block.
- Lighting must be metal halide. Brick banding needs more study. Brick colors should not change in flat plane wall surface. Wall areas between pilasters should off-set to read like a bay.