

## AGENDA # 12

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 23, 2008
TITLE: 1507 Burningwood Way - PUD-GDP-SIP for Three Single-Family Homes and One Outlot. 18th 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 23, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Bonnie Cosgrove, John Harrington, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton and Richard Wagner.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 23, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP-SIP located at 1507 Burningwood Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Murray, Rita Melone, and Ann-Marie Kirsch, all representing Cherokee Park, Inc. Ann-Marie Kirsch provided an overview of the previously approved rain gardens, bioinfiltration areas, including site/grading details noting that they remain as previously approved and oversized in satisfaction of previous approvals by the WDNR and the City Engineering Division. She noted that alterations would require reconsideration of facilities already approved for development on the site; therefore, no changes are proposed based on acceptance of the original approval requirements. Based on this factor, the relocation of rain gardens between buildings or the movement of building envelopes to free up yard areas and usable open space was not considered. Murray then presented details of the prototypical “prairie style” building design as previously presented with a summary review of the architectural design criteria contained within the draft covenants which would act to guide development of the now single-family lots consistent with the concept of the homes’ prairie style architecture.

Following a review of the design covenants, Murray noted that the lots would be developed as individual owners with their own architects in general conformity with the proposed covenants and design concept, but with independence to develop each building site. Staff noted that the level of “independent” development noted by Murray may be inconsistent with the “prairie style design concept” as presented, where the architectural review covenants provide no direct tie back to the development of the lots to be developed according to the “prairie style” concept as presented. Staff noted its previous request that the applicant provide an overall site development plan dealing with landscaping and grading issues with further specification of typical landscaping to be employed around individual building footprints, including typical building elevations, building materials and color palettes customarily required with approvals of single-family PUD developments of this nature referencing previous approvals of similar developments by Veridian and projects done by architect J. Randy Bruce. The following discussion emphasized the need for the architectural guidelines to be sufficient enough to ensure general conformity with the concept of architecture proposed for these lots, at the same time maintaining some flexibility for their individual development. Staff noted that similar projects of this nature provide the appropriate guidelines, plans and details for their development consistent with the architectural concept as proposed, at the same time allow for flexibility where details as presented require some additional work.

Specific discussion of the architectural review criteria noted issues with the standards for metal soffit, including other elements of the material list as not specific enough to limit materials inconsistent with the prairie style of architecture; where the architectural review standards present difficulties to carrying over the concept of the “prairie style” architecture depicted within the elevations and renderings.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion for final approval required design guidelines be modified and be further developed and include coordinated building elevations, site plan, landscape plan and other relevant details that effectively provide for the development of each lot consistent with the “prairie style” architecture as proposed, at the same time provide some flexibility for individual development of each lot. In addition, the Commission recommended Ed Linville, the project’s architect be assigned to the architectural review committee for the development of these lots.

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, 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	6	6	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	-	5	-	-	5	6	5
	6	5	6	6	-	6	6	6
	6	-	7	-	-	-	6	6

General Comments:

- Covenants need more specificity to insure high quality architecture like 92 Golf Road project.
- Need tighter, clearer architectural design guidelines.
- Appreciate the thought behind the rain gardens. Tightening of architecture and landscaping. Criteria is needed to lessen widely diverse interpretations.
- Guidelines are weak. Otherwise fine.