

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 16, 2005	
TITLE: 8102 Watts Road – PUD-GDP, Two Hotel Developments	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: November 16, 2005	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amended PUD(GDP) for the development of two hotel and retail commercial sites on property located at 8102 Watts Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Gary Brink, project architect. In response to the Commission's previous review of the project, the plans as presented by Brink emphasized the relocated detention pond with enhanced features, combined with the two adjacent hotel sites located along the north side of a shared access drive through the site with the two retail commercial sites located south of the shared access road along the property's Watts Road frontage. The south shared access drive system which also includes a north/south axis in addition to an east/west axis has been redesigned to include double-loaded perpendicularly oriented surface parking which allows for a reduction of surface parking on the adjacent hotel sites and provides shared parking opportunities. The shared access drive also features at its center a pedestrian core as an anchor for the pedestrian walkways along the access drives and on individual sites. Following a review of the details for development of the individual hotel sites, including site plan, landscape plan and building mass details, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- The Commission understands the site's existing limits, including topographic issues; the building should respond more to the site and be provided with underground parking to increase greenspace and to reduce the amount and size of impervious area, as well as the detention area.
- Site design does not create a relationship between one building and another and is disjointed. A suburban design solution, not urban.
- Suggest looking at consulting with a different site engineer to create alternative site plans.
- Trying to force buildings that need certain dimensions on a difficult landscape in terms of topography.
- Examine adjacent buildings and development on projects approved to the west of Commerce Drive contain development that creates an enclosure space and a town square like feel.

Upon review of previous comments by the Commission on the project emphasized areas of concern appeared to be still at issue.

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the amended PUD(GDP) with the recommendation to restudy and provide for site plan alternatives. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Feland voting no. The motion required the following:

- Provide for the integration of buildings. Create a focus for pedestrian walkways. Look at creating outdoor spaces.
- Create a relationship between buildings and open spaces. Look at site design and respond to comments from the Commission's previous review.
- Suggest looking at consulting with a different site engineer or design professional to create alternative site plans for a different perspective on a complicated site.
- Look at alternatives relocating the hotels to face either Commerce or Watts Road.

A previous motion by Feland, seconded by March to grant initial approval as requested failed on a vote of (2-5) with Wagner, Host-Jablonski, Barrett, Barnett and Geer voting no.

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 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, and 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8102 Watts Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	-	-	-	-	6	5	5.5
	5	-	-	-	-	5	5	5
	3	-	-	-	-	3	4	4
	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
	5	-	6	-	-	5	4	5
	3	-	-	3	-	3	3	3

General Comments:

- Too suburban even for this location.
- Buildings and circulation fight the existing site conditions. No urban context apparent.
- Where is the site design? Please refer across the street to the Brennan’s development.
- No here here. Site design and building design totally disconnected.