

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 30, 2016	
TITLE: 4325 Nakoma Road – Referral from Plan Commission for New Development of “Oak Park Place-Nakoma.” 10 th Ald. Dist. (45164)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: November 30, 2016	ID NUMBER:	

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

Due to technical issues, this is an abbreviated version of the Commission’s review of the project.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 30, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** as a referral from the Plan Commission for new development of “Oak Park Place-Nakoma” located at 4325 Nakoma Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were William Simpson and Shawn McKibben. The applicants spoke to the proposed site plan changes required by Traffic Engineering to flip the entire site plan to relocate the driveway entry from the southerly lot line to the north but did not have a site plan to present that reflected this change, including landscaping, grading, lighting, etc. The applicants suggested that the Commission envision the original site plan flipped with everything being the same.

Overall the Commission felt that the building was incoherent, that the overall building design does not follow its function, does not relate to the street and the overall building design is too institutional in a primarily residential setting.

More detailed comments and concerns were as follows:

- Need more context to see how the building relates to its surroundings, it’s incoherent, there’s a problem with the entire composition.
- Reads institutional, not residential.
- Doesn’t relate to the top of Nakoma Road.
- The front and back look like two different buildings; front and rear heavy with the sides airy.
- The building doesn’t relate to the street.
- Without a flipped design, it’s hard to make comments; need a design that actually is before us; if we are to make a recommendation.
- Re-examine window space/placement walls, etc.
- Would recommend that the design as submitted is not approvable.
- The design is too institutional.

- Need to establish an entrance that relates to the street, will establish better base for the overall building design.
- Doesn't relate to its context and how people will perceive it.
- Read as a box with random windows and spacing.
- The building doesn't give a story that supports its design; the interior floor plan isn't expressed in its architecture.
- The entrance has a commercial storefront appearance that doesn't relate to the rest of the building.
- Parts and pieces are not pulled together.
- Use of small residential scale materials are not appropriate for a building this size.

ACTION:

On a motion by Carter, seconded by DeChant, the Commission **DECLINED** to make a motion on this design due to a lack of all the full plans that satisfy the criteria for submission; need revised plan. The motion passed on a vote of (6-0).