

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 9, 2008
TITLE: 3001 South Stoughton Road – New Construction for a Commercial Building in Urban Design District No. 1. 16 th Ald. Dist. (09860)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 9, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Richard Wagner, Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Slayton, John Harrington and Todd Barnett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new construction for a commercial building located at 3001 South Stoughton Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jerry Bourquin, architect. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Ald. Judy Compton. Bourquin began by presenting modified elevation details which emphasized proposed wall signage areas, the upper band of the building's façade, including window, bracket and awning details in response to the Commission's comments. The landscape plan has been adjusted to provide for additional Swamp White Oak adjacent to the south end elevation of the building. Following the presentation Ald. Judy Compton spoke in support of the project but raised issues with design and the materials of the building, especially the utilization of EIFS. Ald. Compton noted her concern with EIFS and use of corrugated steel as inconsistent with the objectives of the Stoughton Road Revitalization Plan, as well as other recent approvals involving development of a "Sleep Inn" hotel approved by the Commission but required to eliminate the use of EIFS at the Plan Commission approval level. Compton reiterated the need to reduce the amount of EIFS and industrial steel use, especially on the back of the building. Compton noted her support for the use of "hardi" type materials, as well as the need to provide for a material palette that would be "out of the box." Following Ald. Compton's comments, the Commission noted the following:

- Previously stated concerns on the quality of the architecture still a problem, especially those portions of the building with yellow EIFS.
- Improved but in terms of Urban Design District standards, still problematic.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion to refer at Ald. Compton's urging noted the need to address the Alder's comments relevant to the use of EIFS and corrugated steel, especially its vertical application around the rear of the building, in addition to the following:

- Provide a better rear elevation treatment with less use of corrugated metal, as well as EIFS on all elevations.
- Not enough landscaping along rear boundary to provide sufficient screening.
- Brick and metal could be used on front of part of an integrated design.
- On back of building the verticality of the metal siding an issue, rendering doesn't speak to quality, provide profiles of metal siding samples.
- The placement of dumpster outward of the building should be adjusted. Square up the building along with sufficient screening in conjunction with proposed plantings.

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 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3001 South Stoughton Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
	-	3.5	4	-	-	-	4.5	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	5	5	4	-	-	5	5	5
	4	4	4	-	-	4	4	4
	6	4	5	-	-	6	5	5
	6	5	5	-	-	6	-	5

General Comments:

- Appreciate improvements. Address materials and color...it just needs to be better.
- Architecture closer but not there yet.
- This building really needs to come up architecturally. I think this is the third time I've had to make this comment.