

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 7, 2012
TITLE: 2628 Arbor Drive – Amended PUD(SIP), Multi-Family Residential Building. 10 th Ald. Dist. (22567)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 7, 2012	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Tom DeChant, Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 7, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(SIP) located at 2628 Arbor Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Shawn Schey and Sherwood Malamud, representing the Dudgeon Monroe Neighborhood Association. This proposal includes revisions for the building on Arbor and Knickerbocker Drives from a condominium building to an apartment building. Revisions are mostly internal, increasing the amount of units to 36. Exterior architecture is Tudor style based on input from the neighborhood. An underground parking garage would house 31 cars and most units would have views of the lake. The Secretary noted concerns raised with the landscape feature on Knickerbocker which do not show stairs to the street; Bruce replied that all of their entrances are focused on Arbor Drive. He sees the elevation on that side as still being successful.

Sherwood Malamud spoke in support as President of the Dudgeon Monroe Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood has had significant input on the project and the developer has really responded to that input. Shawn Schey spoke in support on behalf of the developer’s design that reflects the neighborhood association’s input.

Commission comments and questions included the following:

- This is a family neighborhood. I’m curious why there are no larger units. There’s quite a market for younger families who are not buying and this seems like a good neighborhood for that. I’d like to see some 2 and 3 bedrooms.
 - We do have two 3-bedrooms, and fourteen 2-bedrooms. There’s still a mix. I feel like there’s an opportunity here for a different market, a different target population.
- While I really appreciate the neighborhood process, there is seeking input and allowing the professionals to decide. I think our job on the Urban Design Commission is to push the envelope when it comes to architecture. I would really hope in this urban environment that we would do something urban. It’s not an awesome architectural building and it reflects too many cooks in the kitchen. I would strongly urge

you to stop using faux architecture and that we start seeing things that are of their time. There's no way I could support this design at this time.

- I agree with what you're saying but that's what it is and that architecture is where we are now.
- I share those sentiments but something that is so far along (with already built phases), it's hard to impose at this stage.
- The main focus of the building before used to have a lot of flat roof. The other option feels more like a flat roof option with some curious historic references placed on the third floor. Stylistically it's uncomfortable and it looks like a lot of asphalt shingle on that side.
 - If we were to take the center roof elements and return to the original design, I think we can do that.

That would be much better. I'd look at how you turn the corner too; eliminating a gable on the corner. I would like to study that so that I can keep the neighborhood in the loop.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Huggins and O'Kroley voting no. The motion provided for the following:

- Return the roof to its original design.
- Study the corner treatment.
- Look at how the roofline turns the corner at Knickerbocker.

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 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2628 Arbor Drive

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

General Comments:

- Meh.