

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> September 21, 2011
TITLE: 6854 Stockbridge Drive – PUD-SIP to Construct 86 Multi-Family Units in Three Buildings. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (23445)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: September 21, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Melissa Huggins and Richard Slayton.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 21, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-SIP located at 6854 Stockbridge Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project was Brian Stoddard, the project architect. Appearing in support and available to answer questions was Jason Schmidt. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Ald. Lauren Cnare, District 3; Lori A. Nebel, and Julie Quartuccio. Appearing neither in support nor opposition but not wishing to speak were Lori Studnicka and Sandra Hardie. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions were Kelly Moore and Camille Lore. Stoddard described the site layout and surrounding developments. The project consists of three buildings with a total of 86-units. The site generally slopes from north-south and the buildings have been stepped down on the site. They have held a neighborhood meeting since their last UDC presentation and have also met with Traffic Engineering to work through some of the issues. Stoddard noted that one of those issues was a driveway location off of Stockbridge; they’ve lowered the building to 2-stories to reduce mass and density, and relocated the driveway entrance to the rear of the lots; this controls traffic flow onto the site from Stockbridge and how it flows through the neighborhood. Landscaping has been added to somewhat screen the parking lot. Testimony from members of the public noted the following:

- After looking at the plans there is concern with sufficiency of landscaping.
- Lori Nebel appreciated the changes to the driveway as the previous version was intended to go right into her driveway. She asked about the potential for more off-street parking that was discussed at the neighborhood meeting. Stoddard replied that they have added more surface stalls. She also inquired about the second floor access off of Stockbridge and Stoddard answered that it was done control the amount of parking on Stockbridge. She noted that the neighborhood is still requesting elevators included in this development. Various options for the on-street parking like 3-hour parking or no overnight parking would be addressed at the Plan Commission.
- Keeping this as an urban form seems contradictory; could you further explain that? Huggins remarked that peak roof form works well on a small house but when you take that to a building that houses 8-10 units it’s no longer a form that relates to a domicile; it doesn’t make sense architecturally. Because it adds so much height it also seems incongruous and doesn’t seem to fit in suburban sites with less dense residential development.

Ald. Cnare spoke about the back and forth between the developer and the neighborhood and thanked them for their work. Traffic Engineering has also been involved because of neighborhood concerns with traffic and circulation. She suggested looking at the parking regulations on the street and the potential for “no parking” areas.

The Commission had the following comments, suggestions and questions:

- Line southside of southerly driveway to the easterly building with canopy trees off of Stockbridge Drive.
- Redo the central gazebo feature to lessen the impact from surrounding parking.
- The six stalls at the dead end should be reworked with greenery.
- The landscaping in front of the easterly building needs to relate more to the series of sidewalks.
- Eliminate entry into underground parking, return it to greenspace and turn building easterly towards the greenway to create an l-shape, a portion of which becomes a retaining wall.
- The more appropriate urban form, particularly the roof level, is to have more of a flat roof. In particular the two-story is awfully busy with the varying rooflines. Eliminate peaked roof form in favor of a flat roof urban form; simpler with a more urban feel.
- Consider individual entries to units rather than one big walk.
- Engaging the street is a positive thing; parking on the street and walking to the front door is not engaging people, but there is a very real concern about congestion.
- What is the safety concern for parking on the street?
  - Cars get plowed in which makes snow banks higher, sightlines are blocked.You can address that by getting 2-hour parking in place, which would not affect the design of the building. One of our jobs is to determine the best design for the building. We recognize your valid concerns but there are other ways to deal with that but not through the design of a building.
- Staged parking doesn't make any sense.
- You've got an open sight and you can add trees to make it feel less like you're parking in a sea of cars.
- Move pergola out into open space, wrap surface parking area with canopy trees including buildings and look at alternative to turf between walks and parking areas.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the project in order for the applicant to address the above stated concerns. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

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 and 6.

**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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	5	5	-	-	4	4	5
	-	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Look at merging north building parking entry points.