AGENDA #1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** June 16, 2010

TITLE: 2825 University Avenue – Minor Exterior **REFERRED:**

Remodeling in UDD No. 6 for REREFERRED:

International House of Pancakes. 11th Ald.

Dist. (18488) **REPORTED BACK:**

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

DATED: June 16, 2010 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O'Kroley, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner, Mark Smith and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Rummel, consideration of Agenda Item No. 1 was tabled at the request of the applicant due to an unexpected departure for family purposes. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Ferm, this item was taken up following consideration of Agenda Item No. 7. The motion passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

At its meeting of June 16, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of minor exterior remodeling in UDD No. 6 located at 2825 University Avenue for an International House of Pancakes restaurant. Appearing on behalf of the project was Steve Shulfer, representing Findlay Plaza, LLC. Shulfer presented revised details on the canopy. The site plan layout remains the same with the existing conditions, with the addition of brick pavers at the front entry to the restaurant. No parking stalls have been removed. The existing sun shade awning will be removed. The revised canopy recesses the columns against the building and creates a 4-foot walkway around the fronts of the columns. It was stated that since there is not a change in use, the parking can remain the same and meet code. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Stalls will need wheel stops at front walkway.
- I think it's an improvement over what we saw before.
- You've done a good job of negotiating, but running this up as a false façade seems unfortunate. Makes me a little unhappy.
- Don't like the idea of you filling in the gaps and taking away from the integrity of the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Luskin and Ferm voting no. The motion provided for the following:

• The columns shall engage the underlying stone piers with the addition of brackets on each side below the gabled entry feature's posts with the southern fascia of the parapet to become a solid four-sided element that runs down from the peak of the existing roof to the bottom of the flat roof with parapet

allowed to extend from the existing roof to the bottom of the new peak, eliminating the two residual EIFS triangles on either side of the IHOP façade to go back to staff for final approval.

• Any lighting comes back to staff for approval.

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, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2825 University Avenue

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

General Comments:

- It is what it is...
- Take advantage of existing architectural elements.
- Too much mass for both site and context; building is not cohesive (façade).
- Good response to comments.