

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 28, 2013

TITLE: 610 John Nolen Drive – Construction of a New Four-Story, 111-Room Holiday Inn Express in UDD No. 1 (Building Plans). 14th Ald. Dist. (30769)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 28, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Lauren Cnare, Melissa Huggins, Henry Lufler, Tom DeChant and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 28, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of construction of a new four-story hotel located at 610 John Nolen Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Josh Wilcox, Kevin Page and Karl Roth, all representing Nolen Hotel Investment, LLC. Registered in support and available to answer questions were John Kothe, Neil Densmore and Mark Landgraf. The Chair noted a communication from Ron Shutvet, with a more collaborative suggestion for a master plan for John Nolen Drive, which is more in the purview of the Plan Commission and Common Council. The Secretary further noted the staff report from Planner Heather Stouder and the project’s consistencies with UDD No. 1. Wilcox discussed changes to the proposed project which include:

- The trash enclosure has been relocated with more screening.
- Building footprints have been revised with architectural changes to the site.
- More larger trees will be maintained on the site. Two large Oak trees will come down as they are within the building footprint.
- The addition of interesting landscaping items and paving in the front area.
- Bicycle parking area has been added.
- In talking with MG&E they do intend to keep the power lines overhead. The associated costs, size and separation of the lines is prohibitive. As part of the easement it grants them the ability to go underground anytime they want. If they were to do underground it would come through their site as well as past the Sheraton.
- The entry has been moved over slightly.
- The signage remains the same size, as well as the porte cochere.
- EIFS from the front and sides of the building has been eliminated; the same brick will be used as on the adjacent office building, all the way up to the parapet.
- Because of the drive aisle the bicycle parking is in back.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- No connection to the park, bike parking removed from bikeway and front of hotel, connects seem removed. Acknowledgment that you're connected to one of the City's parks; the bikeway is a major facility and it's just forgotten in your plan; totally auto-dominated.
- Need more direct route to bike parking at the rear; even if it's the perception of the bicycles being a welcome mode of transportation, just think about the flow of it.
- Look at location of trash enclosure.
- Bicyclists would likely be employees, right? The assumption is they will walk to the Sheraton to pick up their B-Cycle, then walk back. Do they have adequate ability to walk back and forth?
 - There's a sidewalk that connects the properties all the way through.
- Why do you have lawn in those tree island areas which is going to be high maintenance?
 - We can do ground cover.
- I'm going to ask that we refer the landscape plan because I cannot read it.
- The one plants that I can read I don't think are good in that environment (Carpinus, but do well in that locale). I would encourage you to use larger trees. I'm not sure if these are City trees or not but those trees are important.
- In discussing the lighting plan, the Secretary reminded the applicant that ordinance considers for colored lighting of the building as an "attention getting device"; lighting should be used to enhance the site and the building's architecture.
- Need more landscaping in rear around activity area.
- If some of the horizontal metal banding was reduced, the massing of the different parts of the building would read better. I don't really understand why you need to add all this metal. Just by eliminating some of this and filling consistently you'd reduce the amount of metal and might even save some money.
- Eliminate metal caps for coping atop brick on upper elevations.
- Eliminate metal spandrel for brick.
- I don't know why this stairwell terminates with the little eyebrow on the time. You could save some money there too. Just don't install it.
- Metal might make sense at the curve on the pool wall.

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for review of the landscape plan by Harrington, Slayton and staff that addresses comments with the lighting plan approved consistent with applicable codes and ordinances; no colored or green lighting of the building façade with elimination of the blue lighting as proposed.

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 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 610 John Nolen Drive

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

General Comments:

- Staff concerns over amount of metal panel can be achieved by reducing horizontal banding.
- Better; still not great. Doesn't meet "exceptional" criteria in my mind.
- Landscape plan is too reduced to read.