

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 22, 2006
TITLE: 72 West Towne Mall, Granite City Restaurant – Planned Commercial Site. 9 th Ald. Dist. (02989)	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, Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Robert March.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 22, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of a Planned Commercial Site for “Granite City Restaurant” located at 72 West Towne Mall. Appearing on behalf of the project were Carl Frey, Wade Behm and Steve Kalkman. The project provides for the development of a restaurant/brewery along the Gammon Road side of West Towne Mall within an area currently utilized as an enclosed receiving area for various mall tenancies adjacent to the Sears anchor. The new building features a high 1-story structure approximately 9,531 square feet in size and provides for the development of an outdoor eating/patio area. The interior capacity is intended to accommodate 240 persons with 126 persons in the outdoor eating area. The outdoor eating area is located off of the south elevation of the building adjacent to the common mall entrance to the Sears anchor. Building materials consist of cast stone utility brick and stucco, where a 6-foot high parapet screen is provided to obscure rooftop mechanicals. Following the presentation of the plans, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- The perspective renderings and building elevations are inconsistent and inaccurate. The building elevations incorrectly identify the building’s siting and are inconsistent with the building renderings; require correction.
- The building needs to be turned around and reoriented so that windows appear to face the street side of the mall. Need windows, seating and articulation on elevations facing the parking lot.
- The Commission felt that the lack of windows along the south and east elevations was inappropriate based on location of tanks within this area to facilitate the delivery pumping of brew wort. The Commission noted to the applicant that many breweries feature exposure of the tanks to the public view with windows for daylighting purposes as an attraction and amenity.
- A consensus of the Commission reiterated its concern for the lack of windows on the public sides of the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion required address of the

above stated concerns relative to discrepancies between the building elevations and perspective renderings, the reorientation of the building footprint to provide windows along the parking side elevations of the building facing the street, as well as the need to provide for windows and articulation on exterior building elevations not oriented to the service corridor. In addition, inconsistencies with the proposed signage package with the Street Graphics Control Ordinance were required to be addressed, as well as providing detailed information relevant to other improvements proposed within this area of the mall associated with the redevelopment of this site to be provided.

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, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 72 West Towne Mall

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	5	-	-	3	3	4
	5	6	6	6	6	6	3	5
	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
	7	6	-	-	7	-	8	7
	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	6	-	4	4	7	5
	3	5	4	-	-	-	-	4
	5	5	-	-	-	5	4	5
	5	6	6	-	-	6	5	5

General Comments:

- Public side of building needs windows. Looks like it is just plopped on the site with cookie cutter architecture.
- Switch building orientation.
- Gotta have windows facing the public realm. This is a pub, not a warehouse.
- Rather good for a chain restaurant.
- Building “front” needs to face out!
- Like the outdoor seating with trees facing south. More windows on the east facing the lot.
- Needs windows on parking lot side!
- Good intents to infill this spot – south patio is good. Don’t present blank façade to customer approach. Signs must comply with ordinance. Graphic submittals need to accurately portray intentions.