## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** September 5, 2018

TITLE: 7941 Tree Lane – Planned Residential **REFERRED:** 

Building on a Multi-Use Site. 9<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (52865) **REREFERRED:** 

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: September 5, 2018 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant and Amanda Hall.

## **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 5, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for a Planned Residential Building located at 7941 Tree Lane. Registered in support of the project were Stephen Smith, Joe'Mar Hooper, both representing Common Bond Communities; and Scott Anderson.

Smith reviewed the project location and proposed site plan for a 4-story senior housing project, noting the unusually shaped lot that works with the length of the site. There is a 5-foot grade change to the east. Underground parking will be accessed from the west and will include parking for 23 cars below with 33 surface stalls. They provided a darker base on the parking structure plinth. The team was asked to relate this project to the Heartland building with a base, middle and top articulated with color variations. They cannot install street trees due to a sanitary sewer along the street. A retention pond with native plantings is proposed to collect parking lot drainage.

- I have concerns about the long spans of elevations that look flat. Good job of material usage, but changes could be plan changes as well. Affordable housing projects often dumb down the design to cut costs; we should express the elevations of this building the same way we would on any project. All projects deserve that level of design.
- Look at recessing the top, it's so flat. Do more with tectonics. The adjacent building is really nice, if you want to have that relationship.
- If there is a change in materials there should be a change in plane.
  - o (Applicant) Would you rather it be more monolithic? We could simplify the skin, we tried to articulate with color. We don't want a monolithic building. We could do minor changes to the reveals. The comment is well-taken.
- The other Tree Lane building has strong vertical elements. Do the same here but changing colors. Make the vertical elements more of the same color.
- Simplify the entrance from Tree Lane, there's too much asphalt.

- o (Applicant) We do have concerns about access and flow. We want the parking close to the entry and we are dealing with sewer easements along the street. We split the parking to address that and have a central greenspace. There will be on-site management to police the parking lot. We did have a meeting with the neighborhood and heard their concerns, we're trying to be mindful of those.
- The south perspective has a nice taught, well-designed look. Compare that to the north perspective the exit stair looks like an entrance when in fact the entrance is in the middle. Downplay the exit stair and look at recessing the entrance rather than bumping it out.
- Using colors and windows the building can distinguish itself without the hat.
- Walpaks on the exterior are not preferred.
- Try to integrate the middle two floors into the rhythm of the windows.
- The pedestrian movements are not clearly delineated on the site plan.
  - o Senior housing is not a car heavy use, it's more motorized carts versus bikes. We need more mobile cart storage.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed on a vote of (6-0).

Initial approval includes the building massing and site plan. The applicant must return to the Commission for Final Approval with more information addressing comments on building articulation and materials including, but not limited to the following:

- Detail on material colors/types/projection;
- Detail on walpaks;
- Detail on the exit stair; and
- Detail on roof elements.