

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 8, 2006
TITLE: 8102 Watts Road - PUD-GDP, Two Hotel Developments 9th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 8, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 8, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of two hotel developments located at 8102 Watts Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Att. Tripp Widder, Gary Brink and Ald. Paul Skidmore. Registered neither in support nor opposition was David Gerry. Staff noted to the Commission that the proposal under consideration was a reexamination of its previous initial approval of a site plan option granted at its meeting of December 21, 2005. Based on input from the owner of the adjacent developed property, "The Princeton Club," as well as the current owner of the property to be developed (The Archdiocese of Madison) the applicant was compelled to make additional alterations to the conceptual site plan as previously approved. At issue was the previously approved location of Hotel "A" immediately abutting the easterly property line of the Princeton Club and its potential to create negative impacts on an existing daycare operation and play area located on the adjoining westerly end elevation of the Princeton Club. In response, the modified site plan under consideration relocates Hotel "A" towards the center of the combined hotel sites, divides and separates a previously proposed large parking field at the center of the site in favor of creating a more substantial setback from the end elevation of the daycare operation at the Princeton Club, combined with the repositioning of surface parking to create a more substantive buffer between Hotel "A" and the daycare facility. It was noted by staff and the applicant that this arrangement would act to decrease potential negative impacts on the daycare operation, eliminate issues with "noise abatement" for outdoor use areas for the hotel, such as the pool, as well as maintain the required landscape setback from the adjacent U.S. Highway 12 and 18. Outside of the relocation of Hotel "A," the overall site plan for the remaining development proposed within the overall PUD-GDP remains as previously proposed, with the remaining hotel as well as other proposed commercial retail development relating to their perspective street frontages as previously approved. Although massing studies and preliminary elevations were presented, they were noted as an indicator of the direction the general architectural treatment of the buildings were evolving to with specific building design approval considerations yet to come.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the amended conceptual site plan. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2) with Barrett and Barnett voting no; and Ald. Radomski, Host-Jablonski, Wagner, Geer and March voting yes.

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 2, 5, 5, 5.5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8102 Watts Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	2	4	-	-	-	-	5	2
	5	-	-	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	6	4	-	-	-	5	6	6
	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	5

General Comments:

- Site plan very disappointing.
- Understandable compromise with adjacent building owner and potential for shared parking seen in new proposal.
- This site layout is slightly better. This is, however, still sprawl.
- Better site plan but still mediocre.