

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 25, 2014

TITLE: 901 Sugar Maple Lane – Residential
Building Complex/Conditional Use for a
72-Unit Multi-Family Development. 1st
Ald. Dist. (34364)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 25, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lauren Cnare, Tom DeChant and Richard Slayton.

NOTE: 901 AND 1001 Sugar Maple Lane were considered together by the Urban Design Commission.

SUMMARY:

DRAFT

At its meeting of June 25, 2014, the Urban Design Commission GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL of a conditional use for a residential building complex located at 901 Sugar Maple Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Dan Schroeder, representing TR McKenzie; and Alex McKenzie. Bruce presented the changed plans to address the Commission's comments. The north-south pedestrian connection has been strengthened with a walkway and the addition of wayfinding architecture with an arbor feature at the end for a visual cue. The shed roof has been flattened and used a metal roofing material to define that, which is the same material on the arched roof element at the elevator. A series of colors are proposed with a consistent trim, roof and shed roof color for all buildings. The body of the building is a cut stone product in a modular size. The end elevations have been made more detailed. The central greenspace shows a retaining wall and a trellised patio area, four larger canopy trees mark the center area with some tree-scape around the ends. Foundation plantings are grouped around the patio areas to help define those patio areas as well.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- In the staff report there's a recommendation that another connection be provided between Sugar Maple and Cherry Blossom. Does that mean vehicular or pedestrian?
 - I think that means pedestrian (as shown in the plan set for 1001).
 - I can't imagine you'd want a road in there.
- The Planning Division report states that 901 could use "more aggressive landscaping" (along Valley View Road, 901). Has that been achieved?
- I think there are some opportunities to enhance what's going on with the landscaping in the center court between Building #5 and #6. It would be great to make the tree islands larger in the surface parking lot to the east and put trees in that would relate more to the open space plaza, but if nothing else, move the islands in so these trees become part of it also (1001)

- The trellis you have is fine in terminating that piece, it's a small piece where if we had another piece midway (trellis) along here that would herald this green; little things like that that make it feel more like a pedestrian walkway rather than a sidewalk. (1001)
 - We could go vertically with some of that.
- This grouping of trees is kind of out of keeping with the rest of what's going on here. I'd like to see it be integrated with the open space between Building #5 and #6 (1001). You've got some nice bones there, it just needs to be taken to the next level.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-0).

No rankings were provided for this project.

DRAFT