# AGENDA # <u>6</u>

### City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 10, 2007		
TITLE:	483 Commerce Drive – PUD-SIP, Hampton Inn & Suites Hotel. 9 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (05330)	REFERRED:		
		REREFERRED:		
		<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR	: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: J	anuary 10, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>		

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

# **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of January 10, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for a PUD-SIP for the Hampton Inn and Suites hotel located at 483 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brink, Barry Perkel and Pat Saiki. As with the previous presentation for the Homewood Suites the site development plans were generally consistent with the detailed plans approved with the overall PUD-GDP with the development of both sides. He emphasized the architectural features of the "Hampton Inn Building" features with split-faced block base in combination with brick above vine with EFIS on upper portions of the elevations. The windows are dark and anodized brown in color.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Issue that the low-mow fescue will be mowed as typical. Consider as an alternative ornamental prairie grass or shrub treatment.
- On west elevation the windows below main arch aren't symmetric as well as lower canopied entry; move lighter colored base treatment up center section to add punch to the space.

## ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** contingent on address of the above stated concerns. The motion passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Woods abstaining.

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, 7 and 7.

]				Site		-	
	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context

#### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 483 Commerce Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Plan	Lighting, Etc.	Signs	(Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Context	Rating
Member Ratings	7	7	7	-	-	7	7	7
	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	5	6	6	-	-	5	6	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	7	7	7	-	7	7	7

Overall

General Comments:

- Yet another PUD with poor planning, too much parking, too little sharing of parking to take advantage of different peak times for different uses.
- Franchise restricts design freedom adversely.
- Sprawl, reasonably well-designed.
- Consider either changing the low mow fescue to a more diverse woodland edge wildflower planting or a mixed shrub planting in the parking lot islands, it may not be maintained as a low mow grass as designed.