

## AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** July 10, 2013

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

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: July 10, 2013

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Tom DeChant, Henry Lufler, John Harrington, Richard Slayton and Cliff Goodhart.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 10, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on construction of a new four-story hotel located at 610 John Nolen Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Kothe and Neil Densmore, both representing Nolen Hotel, LLC; Josh Wilcox and Kevin Page, both representing Nolen Hotel Investments; Mark Landgraf and Kevin Page. Wilcox presented plans for a Holiday Inn Express located at this gateway location to the City. Entry will be from the frontage road, with a shared access drive with an existing building. They have received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a 10-foot landscaping area. 116 parking stalls will be provided, a detention pond is proposed with a wet basin and bicycle parking is provided. The landscape plan meets all the point requirements, with an additional 10-foot setback area that is heavily landscaped. They are looking to keep the brand footprint for the building and articulate that with a series of different masonry materials. Reveals and articulation will also be utilized, along with colored EIFS.

Staff noted that this is in Urban Design District No. 1 which details itself a gateway to the City of Madison and encourages buildings of high quality. It has less EIFS than it had originally but there is still an excess as a major element of the material palette; there isn't much architecture going on when there is a minimal amount of detailing and fenestration in EIFS. The district requirements for building relationships talk about structures being related to the site to enhance or maintain current contours. New development shall consider activities on adjacent properties with relation to access from abutting streets, parking areas, service areas, building setbacks, height of structures and color and materials of nearby adjacent buildings. The signage on the building itself will require exceptions from the district requirements in reference to height and perhaps square footage. The ground signage may comply but we may have a square footage issues. Signage may have to be dealt with as separate approvals outside of the project itself. The building criteria in the district talks about materials and colors shall be low maintenance and durable and harmonious with other buildings in the neighborhood; contemporary architecture shall be the goal of the district, buildings shall be designed to complement and enrich this character; the building as proposed has issues with this actually doing that. "The overall building design shall be of high quality considering the importance of the district as a principle gateway to the City and should relate in terms of

scale, material and color to other buildings. Structures should be designed to be compatible with the structures that are adjacent to them. Any building of exceptional height or prominence shall be integrated with the surrounding development.” This building has a lot of issues with all of these provisions.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Given the limited (low) density there, if you look at 660 that building is pretty successful. It has some restraint in the amount of materials being used, the roofline, etc. if you were to look at how that building takes its first three stories and a vertical expression with punched openings, versus what you’ve got here with different types of openings, it could be a little bit more restrained and certainly a lot less use of EIFS. The stair tower roof forms I could live without. This building has the opportunity to be successful like that.
- This is a prime piece of property, this is the gateway to Madison. There would have to be substantial improvement to make it worthy of this site.
- We’ve held some other developments to pretty high standards in this corridor too.
- The landscape plan could be better, something different and unique to help it stand out. Something other than the typical cookie cutter landscaping ideas. Use the plants as architectural elements.
- I don’t see a reason for the rhythm of the trees in back. There are some islands that don’t have trees. Put the sidewalk on one side of that and put a tree so it helps shade that area.
- Use a more natural form except where you’re trying to make a juxtaposition. Use the surrounding natural plantings as a cue for what you’re doing.
- In the drop-off curb across the canopy island to the other side, that should be 55 or 65-feet so cars can make that turn.
- Your species selection should be more...way too many Spirea.
- Maybe your bicycle parking area would be a great spot for a B-Cycle.
- There is no activity there. In terms of sense of space it’s dead other than the convention center. That’s a longer-term issue.

### **ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 7.

**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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7	5	6	6	6	6	7	7
	5	5	4	-	-	5	5	-
	5	4	4	-	-	6	5	5

General Comments:

- Undistinguished corporate architecture on one of the most visually arresting gateway sites. Needs much improvement.
- Less EIFS, take cues from your handsome neighbor.