

## AGENDA # 11

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 9, 2008
TITLE: 1507 Burningwood Way – PUD-GDP-SIP for Three Single-Family Homes and One Outlot. 18 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (09861)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: April 9, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP-SIP located at 1507 Burningwood Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Murray and Craig Makela, representing Cherokee Park, Inc. Prior to the presentation staff noted to the Commission that the proposed development site was the subject of a previous approval for three duplex structures. Market conditions, according to the applicant, now dictate the development of three single-family structures providing for more open space on the lots and a better integration with existing single-family development within the area. A review on the modified plans emphasized the compatibility of proposed single-family development with existing single-family development, less lot coverage and less impervious area. A review of the plans noted slight modification to stormwater landscaping and grading as previously proposed. Linville provided an overview of the single-family building architecture. Following the presentation staff noted to the Commission that similar projects as previously approved by Veridian and J. Randy Bruce provide for the approval of typical building elevations, building materials and color palettes, in combination with an overall site development plan dealing with landscaping and grading issues, with further specification of typical landscaping to be employed around individual building footprints with any departure from those approved by the Commission to be approved by staff as generally consistent with the plans as approved. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Look at relocating rain garden to be placed between buildings or pull in toward homes to free up yard area and usable open space.
- The plans as presented do not provide for the specific alteration to the individual sites when approved as duplex structures to be modified to reflect the proposed use of single-family structures. Specific details need to be provided in regards to landscaping, stormwater and grading.

### **ACTION:**

On a substitute motion by Barnett, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required an update to the stormwater, landscape and grading plans to reflect the lot's development for single-family purposes rather than as previously

approved for duplex structures. In addition, the applicant was instructed to provide specifics of the design covenants and text including providing more context relevant to the site's location and relationship to adjoining properties. A prior motion by Slayton, seconded by Rummel to refer the project in order to address the above stated concerns was replaced with adoption of the substitute motion.

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, 6, 6, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1507 Burningwood Way**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	5
	6	-	-	-	-	6	6	6
	6	6	3	-	-	5	6	5

General Comments:

- Much, much better.