

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> September 6, 2006
TITLE: 2 Greenside Circle – Planned Residential Development (PRD), 166-Units. Aldermanic District 1. (04275)	<b>REFERRED:</b>  <b>REREFERRED:</b>  <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: September 6, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Lisa Geer and Robert March.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 6, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the development of the property located at 2 Greenside Circle of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) with 166 dwelling units. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Rott, architect; Terry Temple and Jason DeNoble. The revised plans as presented by Rott reflected the following:

- The theme is to build a true neighborhood, a link between developing and existing neighborhoods adjacent to the site, containing pedestrian-friendly amenities, encouraging gathering and interaction, unified by common architectural character, appropriate scale and landscaping amenities.
  - Pedestrian linkages emphasized, especially at the center of the site on a north-south axis between existing adjoining developing neighborhoods containing a central plaza area and enhanced pond feature, including bridge and other amenities as details within the revised plans.
  - Pedestrian linkages are a minimum 8-feet in width including sidewalks added along the main axis of the private looped road system.
- Details of the photometric and lighting plan were provided.
- As requested, a review of a site section relative to the existing topography of the site and proposed development.

Following the presentation the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Although modifications to the plans have been provided in address of previous comments, concerns not fully addressed. At least drawings don't communicate well.
- Connections to the park not clear. Consider turning building at the northeasterly intersection of "A" and "B" Streets (building type B) to engage the street.
- Provide an overlook area to facilitate gathering around the pond as an amenity beyond greenspace for adjacent residential buildings.

- Consider the relocation of the intersection treatment (circular design/roundabout) movement toward the pond area.
- The two small boulevard medians might be better off eliminated to enhance adjacent greenspace in front of residences along both the north and south sides of “A” Street west of its intersection with “B” Street.
- Architecture is on the right track.
- Consider moving the two small medians toward the central access to provide further emphasis of the feature at the core of the project.
- The angled building at the northwesterly corner of the intersection of “A” and “B” Streets has no relation to surrounding streets; move or replace with a building “A” type or another alternative that would fit better and relate better to adjoining streets, as well as provide more greenspace. Or as an alternative, reconfigure building “B” to fit better in relationship to adjoining streets.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion required address of the above and the following:

- Movement of the gathering spot or plaza closer to the pond, in combination with the replacement or relocation of the building “B” type located at the northwesterly corner of the intersections of “A” and “B” Streets to provide a more continuous open space at the center of the site and provide for a building that relates better to its street frontages.
- Provide enlarged details on open space areas within the development.

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, 6, 6.5, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2 Greenside Circle**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	7	6	7	-	6	7	6.5
	-	7	-	-	-	-	6	6
	5	7	6	7	-	7	7	7
	4	7	6	5	-	6	6	5
	5	8	7	7	-	7	8	7

**General Comments:**

- Provide the open space closer to the pond as possible and overlook the destination, link the open space areas as a more viable corridor. Trail around the pond.
- This site is very tightly packed. With a few changes to the center of the site, there can be an extension of the green corridor in, and a real improvement.
- Site plan is still lacking focus, concept; council ring and “plaza” doesn’t cut it.
- Needs better arrangement of greenspace.