



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 6003, 6019, 6035, 6015 Gemini Drive
Application Type: New Mixed Use Development PD – Planned Development Pre-Design Conference / Informational Presentation
Legistar File ID #: 60544
Prepared By: Janine Glaeser, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Brian Munson, Vandewalle & Associates/Dan Brinkman, DSI Real Estate, Inc.

Project Description: The applicant is presenting an informational presentation for a Planned Development for a six-story mixed-use development with 153 residential units and approximately 5,800 s.f. of commercial space to complete unbuilt portion of the B Block in Grandview Commons.

Project Schedule:

- The applicant is planning to submit a land use application in the near future

Approval Standards:

The UDC is an advisory body on this request. As with any Planned Development, the Urban Design Commission is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval.

Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Planning staff requests that the UDC provide feedback on the exterior design, height, scale and appearance of the building and site layout, including pedestrian circulation, parking, and landscape concept, and comment based on the PD Standards.

The Comprehensive Plan (2018) recommends Neighborhood Mixed Use – NMU development. NMU areas are recommended as nodes or corridors containing housing, shopping, and services that generally serve the surrounding neighborhoods. The recommended height is 2-4 stories and density is up to 70 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Similarly, the Sprecher Neighborhood Development Plan recommends mixed-use development for the site. Staff notes that the proposal generally exceeds the recommended height in adopted plans and staff requests UDC feedback on the size and massing of the development along with its orientation and long views from surrounding streets.

UDC Informational Review Comments

Table with 2 columns: Comment Category (Site Plan) and Comment Text (Good layout of buildings and parking onto an odd shaped parcel. 5 – The plaza space on the west side of the site looks good in plan, but with the building overhead, that space is uninviting. Due to the long facade and bulk of this building, this site design does not seem particularly pedestrian friendly.)

	<p>This scale and height building has more of the urban feel expected of a 'Town Center'. Now, unfortunately, the two 1-story buildings on this block will look out of scale.</p>
Architecture	<p>Nice looking buildings - good rhythm and views from many angles. I like the color scheme - am I seeing 4 different main colors?</p> <p>5 – The wide band/ledge at mid-height is curious, seems forced and results in poor proportions. 1st floor apartments along Sharpsburg don't address street very well (at least from renderings). The design would benefit if the south wing of the apartment building was shorter as site plan implies.</p> <p>That is one long elevation - can this be broken into separate buildings? Not sure about the scale of the underpass - seems long and low. Would this space be used regularly? Will it be a wind tunnel?</p> <p>The quantity of different materials & colors might be one too many – would prefer simplification. Generally like the use of 'framing', but here it seems somewhat random – not clear how it elucidates the architecture. Might be used more effectively to break up the long Sharpsburg façade.</p>
Landscape Plan	<p>Don't skimp on the plantings in the various beds around this project - there's a lot of hard stone and masonry that warrants softening.</p> <p>The green scape provided is sloped for the most part - is there any way to break the long footprint and provide open flat space for kids along the west side instead of a covered walkway?</p> <p>Not much to react to yet.</p>
Site Amenities/Lighting	<p>Like the plaza/greenspace on the Cottage Grove side. Hope to see some nice utilitarian lighting as well as landscape/architectural detail lighting. This looks like a building that has the potential to be quite striking at night.</p> <p>5 – See site plan comments.</p> <p>Question the angled parking off of Sharpsburg if that street is two-way. Won't majority of traffic approach right off of North Star and want to head-in? Don't understand cant of angle.</p>
Signs– if shown, do they complement the architecture? <i>(sign approvals will be a separate application.)</i>	
Pedestrian/Vehicle Circulation	<p>Generally good. Question the diagonal parking on Sharpsburg. Know it seems like the way to go given the street configuration but we saw problems with this behind the Carben building. Do I pull in? Do I back in?</p> <p>5 – Two driveway entrances seems confusing and perhaps more impervious surface than necessary.</p> <p>ADA access to all commercial entrances from parking is a little unclear - looks like a long path to some of them?</p> <p>Question the angled parking off of Sharpsburg if that street is two-way. Won't majority of traffic approach right off of North Star and want to head-in? Don't understand cant of angle.</p>
Urban Context	<p>Seems like a good finishing project in this area. I've heard complaints about this type of new developments in Madison, usually non-specific but generally griping that it all looks "too-planned (!) but I think overall this neighborhood has progressed nicely and this is a nice addition to it.</p>

	6
Overall Rating (1-10)	8, 5, 5 & 6

*Individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10. 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.