

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 3, 2011
TITLE: 6854 Stockbridge Drive - PUD-SIP to Construct 86 Multi-Family Units in Three Buildings. 3rd Ald. Dist. (23445)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 3, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 3, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD-SIP located at 6854 Stockbridge Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Brian Stoddard. Registered and speaking in opposition were Blake Theisen, Ann Simonson and Robert Simonson. Stoddard presented details of the site located south of Interstate 94 east of Sprecher Road surrounded by medium density multi-family development. The plans call for 86 dwelling units with 1.6 parking stalls per unit to be located primarily underground with surface parking internalized. The buildings are brought up to the street on Stockbridge with the building opening to greenspace, integrated into the neighborhood because of the single-family development across the street to the south. The buildings are 2-stories on the end and 3-stories in the middle, divided as a 28-unit building, a 30-unit building and another 28-unit building.

Blake Theisen spoke in opposition to the project, noting density and traffic concerns. Given the density that was established, that was all predicated on a traffic pattern which has now changed. He encouraged the Commission to review this and request a new traffic study. He is also concerned with the driveway location as it is not adjacent to a roadway access (not aligning with street directly south), it is directly across from a residential driveway. The building heights are a stark contrast to the existing buildings in this neighborhood. Ann Simonson spoke as a neighborhood resident who walks the neighborhood quite a bit. She has noted the development across the street is similar in nature and that has caused an extensive amount of parking along the road which is a safety concern. She also noted the stark contrast in the height of the buildings with the rest of the area. She would like to see a redesign with the buildings set back farther from the road, not have sidewalks coming to the road, and allow for more greenspace. Robert Simonson also spoke to the noted increase in density across the street and would like to see this project decrease the density as this seems like too much mass of building in too small of an area that allows for too many units.

Huggins inquired about building materials for each of the three buildings. Stoddard replied that all buildings would use the same materials. She suggested having three distinct characters for the different buildings to create some sort of an interesting complex. The idea of an apartment building being a single-family house “blown up” is not the way to approach this; she would like to see this as urban living with a more appropriate roof type (not pitched or gabled). Smith noted there is no easy access to a collector street to take you directly to an arterial;

you will have to go through the neighborhood. He wondered if it helped or hurt the development to eliminate one of the access points to draw circulation more internally with moving the access to under building parking away from the streetside. O’Kroley commended the sense of scale. It was recommended to move the northerly building towards the open space/drainageway and eliminate the third story of the easterly building along Stockbridge across from single-family residents in combination with increasing the height of the northerly building adjacent to open space to offset; generally play with building heights to resolve issues with adjacent single-family development. The applicant was requested to consider relocating southerly drive more easterly and rethink central island within the centrally located surface parking area and cut down the number of walks to the street but provide the walks at the building.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6854 Stockbridge Drive

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

General Comments:

- Study 2 drives off Hill Parkway with greenspace between. Study grades assisting with reducing massing.
- Rework internal vehicular circulation. Eliminate access from Stockbridge. Enhance main entry.
- Where have I seen this before? Hmmm....