

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 11, 2007

TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard – Hilldale
Redevelopment SIP #3– Amended
PUD(SIP) for a Hotel and Open Space
Areas in Urban Design District No. 6. 11th
Ald. Dist. (04090) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: July 11, 2007 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lou Host-Jablonski, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Joan Bachleitner, and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 11, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** consideration of a hotel and two open space areas located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mike Sturm, Adam Fink, Scott McLamore, Ray White and Jeff Held. The plans as presented featured the following:

- The hotel has been downsized and reconfigured in a curvilinear form that is not 8 stories in height.
- The façade features vertical brick piers with banners at the front of the hotel adjacent to its entry plaza and an array of various materials consisting of metal panel, metal corrugated panels, metal shingles, EIFS and brick applied to the façade.
- Issues relevant to how the building meets the ground, its previously lower level blank façade were noted to be addressed with this revised proposal by the applicants.
- Adjustments to the landscape treatment, as well as orientation of surface parking stalls abutting the main access drive at the face of the hotel and existing Macy's entrance were noted.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Preferred the previous design scheme of the hotel to address previous concerns.
- Perhaps the curve should be on the east elevation, the dominant long view.
- The main entry is too deep in the building, too removed from adjacent activity where the previous version ties back well to adjacent open space areas, parking and main drive access.
- Disagree with orientation of the current version of the hotel. Like new version but the old version had too many odd pieces and no cohesion.
- Usually stick up for metal buildings and colors but bothered by color of the EIFS, flatness and thinness of the metal and EIFS combined with the shape of the building.
- Vertical pilasters are not strong enough. Issue on how the building is detailed; thinness of sheet metal above brittle, flat, etc.
- Composition of new façade too light and thin.

- Corners, metal panels tacked on, too many materials, scale too coarse. The metal at the corner should be the same as at the center around windows, need more articulation of vertical columns.
- Issue with how the building is being clad with the range of materials is out there; need more details, doesn't feel that it can work.
- Issue with how materials are used on this form of building.
- Renderings are schematic in nature and relatively flat. Relevant to landscaping, identify planter types A and B, the planters next to the rolled curve appear damageable, consider alternatives.
- Like the use of black walnut, make sure other plants are protected from its toxicity.
- The use of hackberry on the east of the drive aisle with Kentucky coffee tree on the west should be modified to consider alterations should utilized alternatively on both sides of the terrace.
- The plaza performance space is a collection of different trees used in a formal way. Consider correction of same trees utilizing the magnolia to block views into the seating area, adding more ginkos along the drive along Sawyer Terrace and Frey Street.
- Like the pool location on the previous version of the hotel, like site, landscaping, lighting, concern with views into loading dock from rooms. Could support initial approval for site plan to get project moving.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2-1) with Host-Jablonski, Barnett, Rummel and Barrett voting in favor, Bachleitner and Slayton voting no, and Wagner abstaining. The motion required address of the above stated concerns, specifically those issues dealing with the revised hotel as proposed; therefore initial approval applied with this motion was for site plan only.

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, 6.5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 702 North Midvale Boulevard

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	5	5/6	5	-	6	6	5/6
	8	6	8	6	-	6	6	6
	-	5	7	-	-	-	-	6
	7	5	8	9	-	7	7	6.5
	7	6	7	6	-	7	7	6
	8	6	7	7	-	7	7	7
								4

General Comments:

- Rethink street tree species arrangement/pattern performance plaza planting has room for enhancement
- The site design is superb. The architecture has the potential for being cutting edge (at least for Madison), but the renderings were not high quality enough for us to judge one way or another.
- Many exciting elements in site plan but not sure architecture wows me. Address drop off site.
- “Green up” drop off round form. Drop-off looks truncated, unresolved. Is the elevation vertical or horizontal?
- Need to see more detailed drawings to get the feel of the textures of the proposed materials.
- These really needs to be a better visual presentation of what this building, with these challenging materials, will actually look like. They’ve swapped some architectural problems for others.