

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 24, 2016

TITLE: 4824 Tradewinds Parkway – Expansion of the “Sleep Inn” to Include Extended Stay Hotel Rooms in UDD No. 1 (41843)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 24, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton, Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, John Harrington and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 24, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an expansion of the “Sleep Inn” located at 4824 Tradewinds Parkway. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, representing Beltline Hotel Partners II, LLC; and Ryan Quam, representing Quam Engineering, LLC.

A 72-room addition is proposed extending to the east, along with circulation changes necessary to get around the site. The amount of EIFS on the addition will be the same as the existing building, as well as the heating/ventilation through the wall (they do not project out).

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I’m curious about this vestige of the original parking lot. Is that employee only, or limited to minimize confusion?
 - It would be available for customers. There’s not a lot of other opportunities to get the parking that’s necessary.

It seems like a bit much for a hotel like this.

- This would benefit from review of the architecture and the site plan, which we would normally receive. Photometrics are not included so we cannot grant final approval.
- Your landscape plan could be stronger to relate better with the features of the building’s architecture and site.
- Staff did mention as one of the conditions some additional shrubs along the Beltline frontage. It’s not just the shrubs, it’s having more diversity. And back here I don’t think you need to add more plants. The stone mulch bed doesn’t really have a rhyme or reason to it. Nothing really relates to the architecture. The detention basin could be spruced up too.
- Are the parking lot island plantings just lawn?
- We do have the requirement of 75% vegetative cover.

- I would add some plant material to the islands.

Chris Wells spoke to the Planning Division staff report, with concerns raised about the arrangement of the parking in the back, and the UDD requirement to add shrubbery so the parking is shielded from the Beltline. The EIFS is now perpendicular to the highway and a few of the widths of the windows are wider than the walpaks.

- When you come into the parking lot, if you look at the elevations it's a door and a window. It's a lower element there and maybe it could be just a whole row of windows so it's more of a glassy length rather than bricks.
- Make a glass link as the connector rather than a brick wall when viewed from the parking lot.
- The outdoor seating looks out onto a parking lot. It should be facing the greenspace.
- Use larger shade trees along the Beltline frontage.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rosenblum, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for address of the above stated comments and a revised landscape plan that addresses concerns.

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 3 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4824 Tradewinds Parkway

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	2	-	-	5	-	3
	5	5	1	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Landscape fails completely.

Wells, Christopher

From: Brian Munson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2016 9:16 AM
To: Wells, Christopher
Cc: Kevin G Wilson [REDACTED]; Wendt, Jay; Firchow, Kevin; Halvorson, Eric
Subject: RE: Sleep Inn Submittal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Chris,

Good to see you at last night's UDC. We are working on incorporating the comments from the UDC and staff and will get a revision to you shortly. One item was raised in the Traffic Engineering comments that we would like to add to the conditional use request:

- #28. Required loading facilities shall comply with MGO Section 28.141(13). Provide two (10' x 50') loading areas with 14' vertical clearance to be shown on the plan. The loading areas shall be exclusive of drive isle and maneuvering space. The required number of loading spaces may be reduced through conditional use approval.

The current hotel does not have a loading space and the owners do not feel that there is a need for dedicated loading spaces for the addition. We would like to add a formal request to remove the requirement for any loading facilities for this project.

Thank you,

Brian Munson
Principal

VANDEWALLE & ASSOCIATES
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Firchow, Kevin [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 12:02 PM
To: Brian Munson [REDACTED]
Cc: Kevin G Wilson [REDACTED]; Wells, Christopher [REDACTED]; Wendt, Jay [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Sleep Inn Submittal

Brian - My colleague Chris Wells is taking the lead on this one. Typically the report should be available the Friday prior to UDC.

From: Brian Munson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Firchow, Kevin
Cc: Kevin G Wilson [REDACTED]
Subject: Sleep Inn Submittal

Kevin,