

## AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> March 8, 2006
TITLE: 4841 Annamark Drive - Planned Commercial Site, Restaurant, Texas Roadhouse. 17th Ald. Dist.	<b>REFERRED:</b>
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: March 8, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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 FINAL APPROVAL** of a Planned Commercial Site for a restaurant, "Texas Roadhouse," located at 4841 Annamark Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jennifer Mowen and David Behrens. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff apprised the Commission of an appeal by the applicant of a condition established with initial approval of the project at its meeting of February 8, 2006. A condition of initial approval required that windows on blank portions of the south and east façades within the office and men's room area be provided to address daylighting and eyes on the street concerns. At the Plan Commission meeting of February 20 the applicant requested and obtained relief from this condition with Plan Commission approval of the project. Plan Commission consideration of appeal of the condition was without prior notice to the Commission according to established protocol. Staff informed the Commission that the Plan Commission's action effectively eliminates this as a condition to be addressed with further consideration by the Urban Design Commission. Staff requested that the applicants address the remaining conditions attached with initial approval of the project and provide information on the rendered appeal. Jennifer Mowen, architect noted that the issue of the windows was a security concern for her clients. The modified plans as presented provided address for the incorporation of additional landscaping around a proposed ground sign, elimination of hot spots on the photometric plan, as well as the use of fully shielded fixtures, in addition to the incorporation of more trees in parking lot tree islands. Following the presentation, the Commission noted a problem with a 10-inch deep backlit box above the main entry door appearing clunky and the need to provide for a flatter sign with a reduced light level.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2) with Paul Wagner, Ald. Radomski, Lisa Geer, Robert March and Michael Barrett voting aye; and Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett voting no. The motion required the development of a flatter sign above the entry door, front lighted and more integrated within the architecture of the entry.

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, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4841 Annamark Drive**

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

General Comments:

- Poor gateway building.
- Window issue is very disappointing.
- Plan Commission made a mistake in ignoring UDC’s recommendation to add windows and avoiding an unattractive blank façade.
- Change sign over entrance so it’s not a “stuck-on” box.
- I would appreciate better communication from the Plan Commission. I am disappointed with their action.
- Unattractive even by chain restaurant standards.