

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 22, 2006
TITLE: 1713/1717 Eagan Road – Planned Commercial Site (Retail Development). 17 th Ald. Dist. (02901)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 22, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Robert March.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 22, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a Planned Commercial Site (retail development) located at 1713/1717 Eagan Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was John Bieno. Bieno provided a review of revised site and elevation plan in address to the Commission's previous comments, in addition to providing details on the palette of materials and colors to be used on the various components of the retail center. Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Concern with single plain look of façade without depth (western storefront), specifically the east elevation.
- East elevation architectural elements need to pull brick up to resolve blank façade and eliminate potential as a big billboard or sign.
- Provide alternative access through the adjacent Quick Lube site; investigate this alternative.
- Use of spandrel versus vision glass on east elevation issue.
- The upper elevation above the Animart tenant space entry presents an issue with signage; need to reduce potential for a large scale signage.
- Need more landscaping and trees around detention area to include more canopy trees along the street side (Lien Road).

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2-0) with Barnett and Host-Jablonski voting no. The motion required that the plan be modified to provide more definition of the architecture of the façade as stated in the above comments and resolve site landscaping issues.

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 ratings for this project are 5, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6 and 6.