

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 22, 2014

TITLE: 9601 Elderberry Road – Concept for a Planned Multi-Building Complex for “Paragon Place” to Include 146 Rental Units in 4 Buildings. 9th Ald. Dist. (28969)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 22, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Lauren Cnare, Melissa Huggins and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 22, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a concept for a Planned Multi-Building Complex located at 9601 Elderberry Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Crohin, representing AG Architecture for United Financial Group, Inc.; Josh Pudelko, representing Trio Engineering; Tim Garland, representing Garland Alliance, Inc.; Joe McMurtrie, Ryan McMurtire and Judy Husar, all representing United Financial Group, Inc.; Alder Paul Skidmore, District 9; and Bob Zoelle. McMurtrie presented the concept plans for Lot 6 for 146-units in four buildings. The buildings have been moved closer to the edges to create an active street front and provide connectivity to the surrounding sidewalks. The buildings have been situated to maximize views of the sunset to the west while mitigating the appearance of the surface parking at the center of the site. The location of the amenity building will provide residents terminal views of the water feature of the development. They removed all the surface garages by changing the elevations to increase the ratio of covered parking by tapering the ends of the buildings to transition to two-stories on the edges; this reduces the massing of the buildings and provides a nice architectural feature. The landscape plan contains no more than eleven parking stalls in line without having landscaping. They have incorporated a significant variety of plantings in the plan and community gardens have been added. Many of the trees are not typically seen in these types of developments to create a sense of place. Building materials will include composite panels, natural stone and brick.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I’d like to see more views; the roof in the elevations just dominates. With the absence of the garage now I really see the building sitting on a big huge garage. I would encourage a little bit more refinement with the integration of stairs, balconies and porches to offset the image that this is an apartment building sitting on top of a parking garage. Either through landscaping, terracing, porches, stairs.
- Tell me about the water quality in that boomerang shaped pond.

- The property drops and feeds into an infiltration basin. We needed to provide the required stormwater. There will be a flow of water. It's planned for a minimum of 60-feet. There are landscape walls.

If the landscape architects were here, they would say they'd want a more organic shape rather than a bow tie.

- Think about terracing to at least hide raised portions of the exposed parking level. I don't feel four identical buildings would be appropriate.
- Provide a clear detailed presentation as to which building is which with context relative to proposed grading.
- Needs to convince us strongly on the roof issues.
- An improvement over last year, shows progress.

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 rating for this project is 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9601 Elderberry Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6	6	7	6	-	8	8	7

General Comments:

- Roofline and plinth issues. Undistinguished architecture.
- Much improved over last year. Need more perspectives to be convinced. Bury parking more effectively.