

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 1, 2010
TITLE: 2205 Rimrock Road – Demolition for New Hotel Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet. 14 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (19242)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: December 1, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Handy and Henry Lufler, Jr.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 1, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the demolition for a new hotel located at 2205 Rimrock Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan and Travis Schreiber, representing Gateway Development, LLC; Chuck Possehl, representing The Bruce Company of Wisconsin, Inc., Brad Carlson, and Clay Carlson. Tan reviewed the Commission’s previous comments on the project and the changes that have been made. Surface material would be either pavers or colored concrete to differentiate them. Canopies will be used in both locations for grand entrances. Tree plantings and grasses were listed; evergreens, gingkos and perennials will be used. Retaining walls will be placed on either side of the underground parking entrance. Ornamental Junipers will be placed to screen the parking entrance. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Question the use of vinyl edging with the washed stone. A steel or aluminum edge might work better.
- Substitute shredded bark for stone and bring a stone sample when you come back.
- I’d like to see a little more beefing up of the landscape plan.
- We need to see more detail around the building; need enlargement of entry details and other elements.
- I’d like to see more trees in the parking lot.
- Lose one more parking stall and make each of the islands a little bit bigger.
- Very upscale for that location. Much nicer than what is there now.
- Still Richardsonian Romanesque, where everything else out there is not.
- Make the cornice heavier to be the same material as the arches, to make the arches more purposeful where the arch feels less purposeful.
- Proportions at entrances and all that weight coming down to that point needs to bring a sense of heaviness that goes with the architecture’s style and needs to have depth.
- The problem with the covered parking area lies in the plan, not the architecture. It seems like there’s a disconnect but it’s outer edge and wall of building.
- The covered parking area end entry canopies are not complimentary to the building’s architecture.
- I’m very pleased with the amount of work you’ve done since we last saw this.

- Taller element of building needs more depth to better relate to one story element; look at extending bays.
- Struggling with drop-off area and ceremonial front door, all weather going straight through front door with canopy too high to effect. Consider small canopy, cantilevered and look at proportions of support piers on both the drive-up and entry canopies; needs to be ratified.
- Drop-off canopy is crashing into building, beef up piers on building, incorporate Richardsonian arches and add cantilevered cover.
- Look at short-cut to drive-up canopy.
- Look at green roof or provide for structurally in the future.
- On landscaping put plantings with backdrop of building to make sure they work, small plantings may need to be bolder and look at trees and large shrubs on how they relate to the arches and show in elevation.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken.

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, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2205 Rimrock Road**

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

General Comments:

- Wrap parking in vegetation. Go with steel not vinyl edging. Substitute shredded bark for stone.
- Carry historical style through the entire project – pieces and details.
- Needs real depth to the façade – rethink all of the entry and drop-off canopies – car and lot circulation is counter intuitive right now – not good.