



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**Project Address:** 5817 Halley Way  
**Application Type:** Planned Development (PD) – Initial/Final Approval is Requested  
**Legistar File ID #** [67173](#)  
**Prepared By:** Kevin Firchow, Acting UDC Secretary

## Background Information

**Applicant | Contact:** Bradley Servin, Architectural Design Consultants, Inc. | Scott Frank, Oak Park Place

**Project Description:** The applicant is seeking initial/final approval for a Planned Development (PD) for the re-approval of a 99-unit senior housing development. That request was approved by the Common Council in 2015, following review by the Urban Design and Plan Commissions. The previous legislative file for UDC is ID [07173](#). Approvals related to that request have expired and the applicant is required to make a new application, which again will be subject to UDC, PC, and Common Council review.

### Project Schedule:

- The UDC granted Final Approval on a previous version of this request on June 10, 2015.
- The Plan Commission recommended approval of that request on June 22, 2015 and the Common Council approved that request on July 7, 2015.
- The UDC received an informational presentation on September 22, 2021.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this proposal on December 13, 2021.
- The Common Council is scheduled to review this proposal on January 4, 2022.

**Approval Standards:** The UDC is an **advisory body** on the PD request. As with any Planned Development, the Urban Design Commission is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval (which are attached).

## Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Planning Division staff requests that the UDC provide feedback and recommendations related to the aforementioned Planned Development standards, as required by the Zoning Code.

### Summary of Design Considerations

There have been multiple iterations of this request, dating back to 2007. Staff had several concerns during some earlier iterations of this development. Such considerations included the articulation of the exposed lower levels at street level, activation of the ground floor, and the vertical articulation of the longer facades. Staff's concerns had largely been resolved with the 2015 approved plans.

In regards to the current plans, staff request that the UDC's feedback include comments on the following:

- **Revised Exterior Materials and Composition.** Based on feedback from the UDC, the applicant has revised the materials compared to what was presented at the informational presentation.

- **Relationship to Abutting Townhouse Development.** Staff recommends that the UDC's comments also reflect the relationship between this building and the proposed adjacent townhouse development proposed at 5817-5830 Gemini Drive, also scheduled for review at this meeting.

Finally, as a reference, staff includes the following comments that were provided at the informational presentation:

- Strongly suggest revisiting your material selection. It doesn't support the form at all, not the right materials for this building. I like the concept of the base-middle-crown, but the colors and texture do not enhance the architecture at all.
- Looks very stratified, particularly with two different types of masonry, not enough middle to justify such a big base and big top.
- It almost looks like the brick on the bump-outs wants to go to the top. Is there a penthouse?
- It seems like the bands are a little too equal in proportion. I'm not sure if the brick should go all the way to the top or if the siding should be another color, they're all too similar in some ways.
- The sun shades or trellises seem underwhelming, they don't come out very far or accomplish much.
- The brick looks paper thin, that might add texture to the wall and give due credit to the brick being of a mass that the siding isn't. The long elevations are pretty long and at the level where people would be walking there's not a lot going on, just blank walls. That may go in keeping with what's behind those walls programmatically, but it's a rough elevation to walk against. Encourage you to consider some kind of detailing or way to scale that to have a bit of interest. Would also question it only being one building, though I understand the efficiency of that, those are some long elevations.
- The courtyard garden stuck out to me. Is it understood yet ventilation requirements and louver requirements to the garage areas?
- Seems like an opportunity to add a modest amount of berming or grading for an opportunity for a garden patio rather than just a small balcony.
- Thought to be a single building, wondering if there are any fire barrier requirements because of the length. o It will be fully sprinklered.
- Dark glass that's shown, is that the intent or the rendering? The lighter glass is more successful.
- The materials look similar in area. The coping bump-outs, if we created imaginary datum at that line and everything above it disappeared it might be more successful. Then you can bring the brick down. Start to play with the depth of the stone base, work with what is your base, middle and cap, it might help the project. That extra parapet is not called for at all.
- Where brick ends in the same plane as siding, that's where it starts to look paper thin. The brick should die into something at a 90 degree angle.
- Patio in the back, initial reaction is to embrace that space, could be a nice amenity for residents. Think about connecting that upper area to the walkway on the bottom. Consider terracing with some plantings midway through it.
- With the articulation you have, there's an opportunity between the different reads of each elevation to start to strengthen that articulation by getting some of those elements to read horizontally. Get some consistent rhythm around the different elevations. Consistency will help to strengthen that articulation.
- How are the undersides of balconies finished?
- Every corner is treated with masonry except for one that has siding, it sticks out. Have consistent language around the building.

**ATTACHMENT**  
**PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards**

**28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.**

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

**28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project**

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
  - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
  - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.
- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and

actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.

- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
  - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
  - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
  - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate setbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Stepback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate setbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
  - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
  - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
  - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance