

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 23, 2007
TITLE: 8210 Highview Drive – Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for Sixty-Units of Assisted Living, Revised Plans. 9 th Ald. Dist. (05334)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 23, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 23, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 8210 Highview Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were David C. Baum, Jeremy Bartlett, Jon Natvil, Scott Kwiecinski, John W. Thode and Joe Hanauer. Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the plans had received significant modification since informational review of the project at the meeting of January 10, 2007. Staff noted that prior to the submission of the applicant currently under review, the applicant had met and consulted with the staff on two occasions regarding the proposed modifications to the plan where staff noted the applicant's responsibility to disclose the specific changes to the plan to the Commission as previously noted in order to provide for an appropriate reassessment of the issues assailed with the previous review of the project. David Baum, architect, in conjunction with Jeremy Bartlett presented details on the revised plans, which featured the addition of a drop-off at the front of the building adjacent to its Highview Drive frontage along with reconfiguration and enlargement of the rear surface parking lot with a provision for the banking of future 13 parking stalls. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- A problem with the south elevation on its left side where the grading plan is not indicative of what's happening at the corner, in combination with the elevational details; there is a drop-off of approximately 9 ½ feet not dealt with correctly. The wall should have a railing and landscaping to keep people from going through it, issue with how building addresses the corner. Consider flaring out the landscaping within this area toward the corner to resolve architecture.
- Concern with safety of rear upper retaining wall and drop-off; needs to have an integrated guard rail.
- The lower wing (west elevation) is too close to the street, may not be appropriate due to its dementia use, distance needed for comfort.
- The size and scale of the building may be too much and too big for the small site.

During discussion on this item, staff noted to the Commission that the applicant had failed to provide appropriate representations of the modifications to the project relative to its prior approval where significant comments were made regarding its need to provide for additional landscaping amenities within the two rear courtyard areas, the addition of a porch or stoop along the building's Plaza Drive frontage, as well as other requirements relevant to the site plan including landscaping within the bioretention area. Staff also noted that

the applicant had failed to provide an overview and comparison of significant elevational changes to the building relevant to the elimination of stoops or stairs to the street to be removed with the addition of the drive-up along Highview Drive. Staff requested that the applicant provide a detailed review of the previously proposed plan against the modified version, as well as address of the previous comments relevant to the project and how they apply to the current plan as proposed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2) with Barnett and Woods voting no. The motion for referral noted that the building mass and the site area on the plan as currently proposed was a central issue to be addressed; too much for the site as configured. The applicant was noted that future consideration of the project required direct reference of all previous iterations of the project against the current proposal, as well as previous issues with the development proposal.

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, 5, 5/6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8210 Highview Drive

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

General Comments:

- West side of building too close to street.
- Building is too close to plaza street; it's too wide for the site, and the dementia floor layout is substandard.
- Good plan species variety. Resolve grades/wall/railing at southwest corner.
- Too much building on too small a site, or reorganize the site drastically.
- Corner architecture treatment at Highview/plaza requires study and redesign.