

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 25, 2011
TITLE: 434-454 West Johnson Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Ten-Story Hotel with First Floor Commercial Space and Elevated Parking. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (18499)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 25, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins and Jay Handy.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 25, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a hotel located at 434-454 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brink and Jeff Brenkus, representing Raymond Management; and Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Att. Bill White and Jeff Kraemer, representing Raymond Management; and Scott Kolar, representing CNI. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Wayne Dishaw and Kelly Witkins. Appearing in opposition and not wishing to speak was Pat Dishaw. Brenkus highlighted changes made since the Commission’s previous review of the project. The pedestrian entrance off of Bassett Street has been moved closer to the corner and created a bit more of an entrance canopy, which integrates the area more. All the parapets have been integrated with the roof edges. The bollards have become more round for consistency with the round columns supporting the transfer beams. They looked at the introduction of windows on the stair façade areas but still strongly felt that their bookends played well with the ends of the building; additional elements added into there don’t really add any value. They looked at some form of seating along the raised curb but came to the conclusion that they do not want to encourage that. Saiki spoke about the green roof above the one-story projection at Bassett Street, where they are suggesting a mix of sedum and a tray system pre-planted, live roof installation. The blond brick has been cut back so the transition from light to dark brick is reduced. They have introduced a few windows on the Bassett Street side.

Wayne Dishaw, who owns property adjoining this property spoke in opposition to the project. Major concerns include a drive aisle through his property. He is concerned with the additional amounts of traffic on this particular corner, where there is already a large amount. He has noticed that his tenants wear headphones most of the time and are very inattentive walking through his drive aisle. He is concerned about increased traffic that could lead to potential pedestrian/vehicle incidents. He would like them to find an alternative means of ingress and egress other than onto his property. Barnett asked about a cross-easement; Dishaw replied there is one in existence. Dishaw also offered to pay \$10,000 towards the changes required to eliminate the use of the cross-access across his property.

Barnett inquired about limited hours for vehicular traffic through the Dishaw’s property. Jeske included their estimated traffic patterns within the packet. He anticipates this would be an exit. Barnett suggested some type of

signage instructing vehicles where they can enter and exit. He also thanked them for a nice presentation packet and for addressing the Commission's concerns. Rummel told the Commission that as part of the Plan Commission motion on this project it is required that the applicant look at the sweeping curve on Bassett and study possible changes to it. Slayton inquired about the location of the short-term parking; Brenkus replied they don't want to cause a traffic problem with too many people coming in and out. O'Kroley suggested that maybe both properties could use the drive aisle in the same manner; maybe there's a way to share the garbage access with a one-way between the two properties. Huggins thanked the applicant for improving the pedestrian access. O'Kroley suggested putting the moped parking nearer to the drive access; if their concern is related to the building entry, study signage on the interior face. She also stated the addition of the green roof is a good gesture towards the neighbors as well as their own property. Silver metallic blade signs were presented with typical Hampton Inn & Suites lettering. An internally illuminated sign will be placed over the canopy to further enhance the pedestrian entry. Smith stated he liked Option A for the stairwell window to be long and wide. He liked the vertical lines that break up a large expanse. He thinks it looks fully resolved now. He wondered if the signage would be visible coming around the corner; maybe there is a better location for it.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion passed with the following conditions:

- Encourage the applicant and their neighbor to work together to resolve the traffic flow along the cross-easement. If allowed by the City they could install a right turn only at that location.
- Option for the blade sign to come back to staff if the applicant wants to change it.
- Add the control joints on the façade; vertical lines that break up the EFIS.

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 6, 6, 6.5, 7 and 7.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 434-454 West Johnson Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	7.5	6	6	7	5	8	7.5
	6	6	6	-	6	6	6	6
	6	7	6	-	6	6	9	7

General Comments:

- Solid. Bravo on the green roof.
- Traffic circulation at Gorham and Broom needs to be reviewed by the City.
- This project started out well and keeps getting better – well done.