

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 25, 2014

TITLE: 1902 Tennyson Lane – Amended
PD(GDP-SIP), Northside Prairie Senior
Living Community. 12th Ald. Dist. (31335)

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, Melissa Huggins and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 25, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 1902 Tennyson Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rita Giovannoni, Jim Shaver, representing Independent Living, Inc.; Gene Wells, representing Engberg Anderson Architects; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Pat Saiki and Dan Kabara. The project has evolved from two 2-story wings to one 1-story wing; the wellness center has been moved underneath the assisted living building, the offices, mechanicals and kitchen area have also been moved. They have reduced the parking by about 20 stalls. The far side of the building will still have windows but become a public space. Both main base sections of the building will be cast stone, then brick material through the first floor, the vertical bands between the windows and at the end will be painted metal to look like slightly weathered zinc, and fiber cement occurs above the brick on both portions of the building in two separate colors to provide some variety and differentiation between the two sections of the building. Between the panels would be extruded anodized aluminum channel applied to the face of the building with the panels set into it, providing a grip at the edge of the panels so you don't see the edges, giving it a more finished appearance. The site is stepping down in tiers towards the orchard area, then down another 5-feet for a detention area, which exposes more of the base of the building with retaining walls to support the grades.

The Secretary noted that at the GDP review, the level of street engagement was emphasized in relationship to the site plan where almost no street engagement is showing now with the SIP proposal; it's more separated from the street. There was also discussion that the orchard would be a way to engage people from the street but now it's behind a wall. The applicant agreed with the idea of engaging the public, but noted the need to remember that this needs to be relatively flat because many of the people who will live here are likely to be using walkers and wheelchairs. The intent is to have a wall that provides a flat area for the orchard, it's not meant to be a barrier to block the sidewalk from the entry.

Kevin Firchow, Planning Division mentioned that there are two areas for the Urban Design Commission to look at in regards to the “Assisted Living” portion of the building: the end caps and the relationship of it coming out of the ground, needs some way to have an active use in this corner of the building. The overall composition is also of concern with one portion of the building more successful than another. Ideally this could be a nicer concept if it was one base material (masonry) with projecting metal boxes coming out. Cost constraints make this impossible. The northeast elevation proportions show three materials; some simplification of that would be desirable. It’s a long façade without much area for breaks in material so it is difficult to change materials that way, we understand it is a challenge.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- If you move the activity area over to where you have all those walls and tried to activate that area, maybe the orchard could be a more natural flow.
 - Ken Saiki noted that they will work very hard to get that space as close to the street as possible. We will keep trying to push this edge further, but the more we mess around the less detention area they have.
- Maybe the wall could be brought back into the orchard area so that there is an area at the street that invites pedestrians. There’s not a lot of room for placemaking here but that may be an opportunity.
- I want to see what your landscape architect can do to resolve issue with the bioretention basin and retaining walls creating separation from the street and affecting the pedestrian feel of the project. Site design, not site engineering right now.
- I like the idea of eliminating the brick and bringing the hardiboard all the way down.
- If you do something at that end elevation your stone will change.
- Look at the number of window types and proportions, including the end elevation oriented towards Tennyson Lane; too much variety. Look at the building to the left (“Community Center”), it seems to have less variety of window proportions than the other building (“Independent Living”) and that contributes to its complexity and busyness.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0) with address of comments made during discussion.

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 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1902 Tennyson Lane

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