

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 27, 2016

TITLE: 3204 & 3228 Golden Copper Lane –
PD(SIP), Two 3-Story Apartment
Buildings with 80 Units. 7th Ald. Dist.
(38463)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 27, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Lois Braun-Oddo, Richard Slayton, Sheri Carter and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 27, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PD(SIP) for two 3-story apartment buildings with 80 units located at 3204 & 3228 Golden Copper Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, representing Oakbrook Corporation; and Michael L. Moreg. The updated landscaping plan was shown against the previous submittal with a slight reduction in the number of trees, but still well within the required point totals. The masonry has been reduced down from the 2nd floor to the first floor level. The roofline has been simplified based on the Commission’s previous comments. The proposed trash room underneath an outdoor patio area off the community room has been relocated outside. The building material palette has not changed. The roof overhang can be extended to 48-inches over the bay element but the transom would probably be lost.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The 1-story brick looks stunted. If you kept part of it 2-story and got rid of some of the other pieces, whether the trade off in cost might work. Bring everything down.
 - We did an initial look at that.It would work at the entrance to really accentuate the entrances of these buildings. And not have it in some other places, where it’s used it has enough presence.
- It would be best if you concentrated the use of brick at the building entrances.
 - Our initial thought was to get enough masonry on the first floor that it feels substantial enough. But we could look at some of that trade off at the entry points.
- If you did that, maybe changing the color or dimension of the siding so it’s a little bit different at the top. You could put a band and change the color.
- The entrances, even with those elements you have that are composite panel trim with the arch opening, it looks kind of odd aligned with the brick, I think that would help make those look a little bit more special.
- Is the dry stream bed functional or just aesthetic?

- It's both. We're taking stormwater off the site here and feeding it in at this location.

It just doesn't look like it fits here, but if it's working as a function then that's OK. I'd rather see the area planted with more trees, if cost is a trade off. Putting blue grass in an area like this isn't a good idea, it's not going to last and it's also a maintenance problem for you. I would get some other kind of ground cover in there.

- There seems to be an awful lot of blue grass, where the fescue could start to wrap around a little bit; take blue grass out of central island and minimize elsewhere so that there's a tree mass and more open space.
- Provide more tree plantings in parking lot.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the above mentioned comments to return to staff, simplification of the roof edge, redistribution of exterior masonry to increase its height at the building entrances, and address of landscape comments.