AGENDA # <u>8</u>

POF:

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION TITLE: 6500 Normandy Lane – Ninety-One Unit Condominium Apartment Building, PUD(GDP-SIP). 19th Ald. Dist. (06080) REFERRED: REPORTED BACK:

City of Madison, Wisconsin

ADOPTED:

ID NUMBER:

DATED: June 20, 2007

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 20, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6500 Normandy Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jerry Bourquin, architect, Steve Yoder and Ald. Mark Clear. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- The flipping of the building to reorient patios as well as front entryway walks and stoops to individual units, as well as the development of a centrally located and shared main entry patio on Normandy Lane.
- Pedestrian linkages to the remainder of the Market Square retail commercial area have been provided.
- A scattering of bicycle and moped parking has been provided.
- A review of elevational changes include projecting elements which are emphasized with a flat parapet roofline, which also provides for screening of rooftop mechanicals and change of window patterning and paneling beneath.
- A review of the building material palette emphasized the use of stone face masonry in combination with two colors of brick.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Like changes to the elevation and architecture; still a problem with vertical elements, the parapet top doesn't relate to the rest of the roof on various vertical projections where the return to the regular roof looks fakish.
- If edge of roof pitch came around to tie vertical elements; may resolve issue.
- Restudy vertical projecting roof elements with the projecting parapet for consistency in detailing, fenestration, in addition to providing more views and details of the problem area. Look at different options on how to finish off at the top and how they return back to the roof.
- Relevant to site plan adjust parking to create more greenspace at curve along the central face of the building.

- The cut-ins and recesses onto the main hip roof areas be replaced with minor hip roofs. The vertical parapet's projections return to the pitch roof is problematic; resolve with fenestration detailing and the horizontal alignment issue.
- It was noted that the landscape, being as modified, caught the spirit of what was requested.

As part of the discussion, Ald. Clear spoke in support of the project especially the elimination of an asphalt surface parking lot, the addition of residential into the area, which will provide an opportunity for shopping by foot and bike for residents. The Commission generally liked the appearance of the vertical projections with the parapet type roof element but still found it necessary that it bridge and wrap back to the roofline horizontally, as well as the need to provide for on-site roof water infiltration.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion for initial approval required that the applicant study vertical projection roofline issue to tie architecturally back to the main roof whether pitched or flat, restudy vertical element for consistency in detailing fenestration and provide more views and details of the problem area on how they finish off at top and how it returns back to the roof with different options provided. Resolve the issue with the recessed cut-outs and how they meet the main roofline of the building and provide for more on-site roof water infiltration.

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, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 5 and 7.

	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	6	5/6	6	-	5/6	5	б
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	5	-	-	-	-	7	6
	7	6	6	6	-	6	7	6
	8	6	6	6	-	7	7	6.5
	7	5	6	6	-	7	6	6

General Comments:

- Architecture still needs some further work, but the site and building design improvements are welcome.
- Improved relationship to street by flipping entrance. Improved land use could spur new residential and revitalize retail. Tweak architectural elements at roof.
- Very appropriate infill in an area that desperately needs residential.
- Overall master plan well conceived. Architecture requires more study.
- Brick pier element's tops need more work do not fit overall architecture.