

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 15, 2009

TITLE: 66 West Towne Mall – New Construction in a Planned Commercial Site Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet of Retail Space for a Multi-Tenant Retail Building. 9th Ald. Dist. (15087)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: July 15, 2009 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Dawn Weber, Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Ron Luskin and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 15, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new construction located at 66 West Towne Mall. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christine Meske and Paul Matyas, both representing CBL & Associates. The revised plans featured the following:

- Move the building closer or forward to Gammon Road with more landscaping and more walkways, at the same time maintaining the parking level with circulation around the building provided.
- Pedestrian access provided in conjunction with the adjacent Longhorn Steak House development.
- The building has been redesigned due to the loss of the “Stanton Optical” tenant space with the “SmashBurger” tenant space remaining, along with 4,000 square feet of flex space for other possible tenancies.
- The building features a reduction in the amount of EIFS, with other changes in building materials and color palette including the use of more vision glass and detailing of the building façade at the pedestrian level.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The SmashBurger façade doesn’t tie back or relate enough to the remainder of the building; look at materials that relate including the corner street meant to provide some continuity.
- Look at extending SmashBurger design features to the remainder of the building; reduce the amount of EIFS even more.
- Need to keep and expand architecturally; more of a modernist approach.
- Pick up materiality of the SmashBurger façade on the remainder of the building, for example, brick, color and metal elements to create a tie with the use of a different metal top or hat treatment; something cleaner or simpler, choose to either extend materials for form across the building’s façade.
- The planting plan needs more attention around the patio area; people sitting too close to a parking area; widen beyond 5-feet, incorporate Skyline Locust, look at the use of grasses and incorporate vertical elements to separate patio from parking.

- Provide 2-3 additional bike stalls beyond the minimum level required by code; suggest the use of a hitch post or u-rack type to be provided at entries to the building.
- Square off corner of the building pad site and realign wheelchair access in combination of realigning crosswalks better with curb.
- Align walking path off of Gammon Road with the entry on the southeast.
- Coordinate bike parking, handicapped access, pedestrian access at the front of the building to work better altogether.
- Use smaller corner radii around pad site.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Weber, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Luskin voting no. Luskin noted his inability to vote in favor of the referral when architecture not technically deficient, combined with issues with the economy. The motion noted favorability with the scale and form of the building, as well as the Commission's desire not to limit the extent of the architecture. The motion further required that the applicant bring back a larger site and building plan details and materials with further consideration of the project, including hitch or u-rack cut sheets, along with address of the above stated concerns.

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, 6, 6, 6, 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 66 West Towne Mall

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	4.5	-	-	5	5	5
	6	5	-	5	-	7	6	6
	6	5	-	6	-	6	6	6
	6.5	6	6	-	-	6	6.5	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	6	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	6	7	-	6	-	6	6	7
	-	5	-	-	-	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Corner needs a strong visual; this is not.
- Good pedestrian improvements. Need to tighten turning radii to safeguard peds.
- Study materials/cornice detail without losing individual identity of SmashBurger. Good modern concept. Push further.
- Choose to unify architecture with materials or forms. SmashBurger is highly successful. Reworked site plan is a big improvement. Bike parking to help define edge.