

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 22, 2007
TITLE: 810 Jupiter Drive – PUD-SIP for a 24-Unit Apartment Building. 3 rd Ald. Dist. (07169)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 22, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Michael Barrett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 22, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-SIP located at 810 Jupiter Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Richard Hiller. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the project under consideration was previously approved with a similar site plan featuring almost identical landscaping amenities, building location, building style and architecture, as well as relative fenestration with some modifications proposed with the project as submitted. Staff further noted that the need for review of the project follows the expiration of the previously approved PUD-SIP for a 3-story, 26-unit apartment project approved by the Commission in August of 2003. The provisions of the Zoning Code provide that the prior approval has no lapsed and that reapproval of the project is now required. Following the introduction, Richard Hiller, architect provided an overview of the project with a comparison to elements of its previous approval and as follows:

- The building now provides 24-units where the site design and building are almost nearly the same as previous.
- The site and building plan comparison provide that the footprint is slightly adjusted.
- The building materials consist of hardiplank siding, green metal standing seam roof on the lower entry, red color brick with sculptured asphalt shingles on the upper.
- The landscaping and screening is generally the same, with provisions for rain gardens including stoops to the street featuring both inside and outside bike parking.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The upper roofline appears over powering.
- Good subtle detailing, including fenestration on all elevations.
- Consider increasing the bump out of the tower on the side elevation another 4-inches for a total of 12-inches.
- On rear and side elevations split face concrete block at the base is too expansive on the rear and on the side elevation provides that there are too many materials on the façade. In addition, the brick piers under

the balconies appear out of place. Consider bumping out floor on lower level and eliminate the brick piers, in addition to relieving the mass of the CMU wall.

- Change CMU to brick on the end elevation and wrap around.
- Provide window openings within the expanse of the lower rear CMU wall such as glass block.
- Remove crab apple trees in areas that conflict with adjacent overlying balconies, as well as provide for an alternative planting type.
- Change location of the “Fat Albert Blue Spruce” and eliminate the use of green ash for Kentucky Coffee tree.
- Soften the appearance of the rear CMU wall with landscaping.
- Distinguish between rain garden versus infiltration areas on the landscape plan. Note that rain gardens require planting, not a seed mix. Provide for protection during construction.
- The surface parking at the rear of the building should utilize 16-foot stalls with a 2-foot overhang to increase the width of adjacent landscaped areas.
- Consider the use of glass block openings to break up the rear wall and provide for natural light into the garage.
- The condo sign is excessive and too big under the standards of the Street Graphics Ordinance; redesign.
- Consider moving bike rack to the left of the entryway and relocate the landscaped area.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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, 6.5, 6/7, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 810 Jupiter Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	8	-	-	-	6	7	7
	6	7	6	6	4	6	7	7
	5	6	5	-	-	5	5	5
	6	7	7	-	-	6	6	6/7
	-	5.5	-	-	5	-	-	5
	6	8	6.5	6	-	6	6	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5

General Comments:

- Good project, just needs some improvements per our comments.
- OK project.
- Nicely designed building. Look at developing rear elevations.
- Generally strong design architecturally. Site has too much paving, but there it is.