

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 9, 2008
TITLE: 5101 Unity Way, Lot 1, Liberty Place, Planned Residential Development (P.R.D.), Eleven Duplex Structures. 16th Ald. Dist. (08185)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 9, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeannie Schaefer and Steve Shulfer, representing David Bisbee; Brian Munson of Veridian Homes, and Ald. Judy Compton, District 16. The modified plans as presented by Schaefer and Shulfer featured the following:

- A photo array corresponding to the property's location within the Liberty Place subdivision, in context with existing residential development.
- The site plan has been modified to straighten out the alignment of the internal road, the reorientation of the 11 duplex buildings by using the internal private road featuring a variation and four different building types, including ranch style and townhouse structures.
- Building materials consist of the use of cultured stone for the base material, two types of vinyl siding with an asphalt roof shingles.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Good job on renovation of the site plan but still a problem with the single double garage doors instead of two singles with the proximity of the buildings based on their closeness requiring more adjustment.
- Concern with basic building types as it relates to the private intimate alley, building types don't work, main entries to building need to stand out versus garage doors on the effected elevations facing the interior street, a suburban style house does not fit within setting.
- Suggest that one building footprint type be used such as A1.1 in the submittal. Break up garages such as type 1 at rear, more successful whether one or two story (A 1.3) concern with how gutters will work.

Ald. Judy Compton spoke in support of the project noting that the neighborhood wanted a departure from the existing look of housing within the area where neighborhood of houses differ from existing cookie cutter neighborhood and provides for a diversity of housing types. Comments by the Commission continued as follows:

- Building Plan 3 is less successful than other building plan types.
- Site plan improved. Like the minimization of drives to garages at the private street and visitor parking location.
- Keep Building Plan 3 but reverse the unit pattern; move doorway central with garages moved outward.
- Try to make front doors on garage elevations extend forward of garage façade.
- Extend porches out at least 5-feet in depth and out in front of the main façade.

Speaking in support of the project was Brian Munson representing the Veridian Architectural Review Committee.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated comments with a notation to look at the building typology to create more of a rhythm.

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 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5.5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5101 Unity Way

	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	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	5	-	-	-	6	3	4
	7	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	5	4.5	5	-	-	5	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	7	6	-	6	5	6

General Comments:

- Improved to the point of approvability...just. This is a difficult site, but the snout-house concept with buildings too close is not the only solution for this site.
- Better site plan, look at building types.
- Challenging site means something has to give. Sometimes the 2-car garage needs to give rather than people-friendly architecture.
- Great improvements, but the scale of garages to the alleyway is still a concern.
- Much improved but look at building typology rhythm.