

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 17, 2012

TITLE: 5925 Sharpsburg Drive – PUD(SIP) – One-
Story Retail Component of “Grandview
Commons.” 3rd Ald. Dist. (27835) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: October 17, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 17, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 5925 Sharpsburg Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeff Rosenberg, representing Veridian Homes; Brian Munson, representing MREC VH Madison Investors, LLC; Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Ald. Lauren Cnare, representing District 3. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Michael Schmitt and Dan Day, representing Rollie Winter Associates; and Dan Brinkman, representing Veridian Homes. Registered and speaking in opposition were Barbara Davis and Paul Reilly. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were John Driscoll, Dean Matuszak, Nicole Jenkel and Heather McFadden. This building sits at the corner element as the end cap of the grocery store site. This building is a one-story, 2-3 tenant retail building with an outdoor space along Cottage Grove Road with a pergola covering. This building has doors out to the street and parking lot and addresses the street while bringing additional services to this project. Trash storage and meters will be in the center of the building indoors. Lee discussed the architecture of the building to include three types of masonry and a fiber cement panel system; it was suggested to use the larger modular brick. The Commission discussed the pergola as an important element to maintain the retail character of the building, the importance of the layout of the building, alternative planting materials and the vibrancy of this building. Additional comments by the Commission were as follows:

- Need American Cranberrybush Viburnum instead of Compact European.
- Look at the alignment of trees as it relates to the creation of the “alley” off of the pergola on the adjacent grocery site across the drive aisle.
- Substitute out all Spirea with native alternative.
- Make sure that the pergola features width on the west elevation is consistent with the horizontal banding above the windows on the building.
- Look at the building as situation on the site to help resolve alignment issues with the alley on adjacent grocery site.
- Replace the use of “Miscanthus sinensis ‘Red Flame;’” it is invasive.

- Make sure the building color matches the vibrancy of the colored elevations and perspective renderings and vary bands of brick below windows.
- The architect and applicant shall make sure that tenant build-outs as they occur provide for adequate conglomeration of rooftop utilities and screening consistent with the building's architecture.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion required address of the above stated comments.

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 6, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5925 Sharpsburg Drive

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

General Comments:

- Resolution of center pedestrian mall is important.
- Too many “pedestrian” plans.
- Really nice little retail center.