

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: April 5, 2006 |
| TITLE: 8420 Mineral Point Road & 117 Junction Road – PUD(GDP-SIP)/Planned Commercial Site, Bank/Offices. 9 th Ald. Dist. (03104) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: April 5, 2006 | ID NUMBER: |

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 5, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP)/Planned Commercial Site for bank offices located at 8420 Mineral Point Road and 117 Junction Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Att. Ron Trachtenberg, Sarah Lerner, Steve Harvey and Matt Collins. In response to the Commission's previous concerns on the project, the plans as presented featured the following:

- Interior tree islands have been added along the northerly shared parking area and along the west side of the building, in addition to providing openings and curbs for drainage.
- The building elevations have been modified to provide for an array of materials, including precast two colors of stone in a random mix, dark bronze window trim with EIFS utilized on upper portions of the building's elevation and windows utilizing insulated and tinted glass.
- The monument sign is proposed utilizing the same materials on the building and will be internally lit.

Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- A previous request to eliminate a three-stall bay of surface parking including an accessible stall along the south elevation and its relocation to the west of the building to enhance additional green space at the entry on the south elevation was not addressed and requested to be provided.
- Staff requested that more detailed signage specifications and detailed labeling of building elevations as to its various building material components and colors be provided with further review of the project.
- Need grading and stormwater plan for final approval, including lighting, photometrics and cut sheets.
- Need to see the areas where prairie grass mix correspond with the grading plan.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-1) with Barrett voting no. The motion required address of the above stated concerns requested by staff, as well as the need to provide for a grading and stormwater plan,

lighting and photometrics and cutsheets in correlation between the prairie seed mix areas with features of the grading plan. It was also noted that the applicant was allowed discretion to pull up the building to the street or to remain as proposed. If the building was to remain as proposed in its current location, the accessible stall should be relocated to the westerly elevation with the surface parking area eliminated in favor of providing additional greenspace provided along the south elevation.

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 4, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, 6.5 and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8420 Mineral Point Road

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.5 |
| | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6.5 |
| | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 6.5 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - | 6 | - | 5 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Decent project in sprawl-land.
- Still don't like the building architecturally.
- Need grading and stormwater information, as well as lighting cutsheets. Attractive building and landscape.
- Not bad given the limitations of the site.
- Still wanting to see adjustments to front entry area so that there would be less pavement, more parking.