## AGENDA # <u>13</u>

## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 22, 2007		
TITLE:	719 Jupiter Drive at Grandview Commons, PUD-SIP for an Assisted Living Facility. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (07310)	<b>REFERRED:</b>		
		REREFERRED:		
		<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
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 **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 719 Jupiter Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brandon Cook, Joseph C. Hanauer, Scott Frank and Jim Klett. The development of an assisted living facility on the easterly ½ of the block as a component of the Oak Park development is intended to provide for the completion and development of the block as a complement to the adjoining condominium facility also under consideration. The 58-units proposed with the development include provisions for assisted living including dementia care. Following a review of the site and building plan details the Commission noted the following:

- Like the architecture, the secure garden and traffic flow to adjacent building (condominium development).
- There is an issue with the entry feature located at the corner of Gemini Drive and Jupiter Drive it is a fake entry counterintuitive, a tease, need to provide for entry opportunity.
- Like architecture too, bike parking underneath awnings, but concerned with blank appearance of the right hand side of the north elevation.
- The blank walls adjacent to the courtyard entry need more attention.
- Consider moving plantings on the outside of the courtyard space to be more inviting.
- The west elevation is too cute, too many materials, changes are plain, appears as retail; simplify make more bold, reinforce and apply to the other elevations including the courtyard.
- The elevations lack level and scale and lacks coherency, look at options for the treatment of corners not as entries.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns as part of final consideration of the project. It was further noted that the presentation did not provide an overview of the proposed development against the overall development plan for the "Grandview Commons" subdivision as routinely required, which provides an update as to the relationship between previously approved and built projects within the subdivision against those being proposed and those yet to be developed.

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, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

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

General Comments:

- •
- Look at architecture clarify/simplify. Architecture is <u>too</u> active, not unified. Site plan concept is OK, but building façades need redesign. ٠