

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** April 8, 2015

**TITLE:** 5110 High Crossing Boulevard – Planned Multi-Use Site for a Four-Story, 106-Unit “Holiday Inn Express Hotel” and a Two-Story, 44,000 Square Foot “Gold’s Gym” Health Club. 17<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (37163)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** April 8, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Melissa Huggins, Lauren Cnare, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley and Richard Slayton.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 8, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Planned Multi-Use site for a four-story, 106-unit “Holiday Inn Express Hotel” and a two-story, 44,000 square foot “Gold’s Gym” Health Club located at 5110 High Crossing Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Sohail Khan, representing Tim Nietzel; and Jerry Bourquin, representing Dimension IV-Madison. Bourquin addressed the Commission’s previous issues with the project, noting that the design of the intersection is set up to control traffic and if the drive is moved, the curb cut would have to be moved the same amount, which would change the entire situation. Stone material has been increased and brought up higher on the building and reduce the steel base; material samples were shown. Planning staff comments were mentioned regarding simplification of the material palette, and that the design was revised to deal with the Zoning Code requirements regarding EIFS, but there is still concern about the number of brick colors and the cultured stone not being simple enough. Bourquin responded that the cultured stone is being used to emphasize the front entrance and canopy of the building, and also the pool area.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The front entrance perspective, it looks well designed and it doesn’t look like it’s just a mish-mash of materials. We’ll see with the health club, how that main brick color ties in.
- The composition is nice, I just didn’t anticipate that being cultured stone; it kind of takes that vertical rise, I would anticipate that being metal and the cultured stone being somewhere else maybe, but the introduction of the cultured stone to the palette seems fine.

For the health club, they have introduced more glass and a sunscreen to the façade, and the roof edge has been moved to be more consistent while providing some shading. At 10-feet in height the material will be heavily sandblasted to provide more texture and context, while giving the base a more heavy, rustic feel. The main entrance is at the corner of the building and does not face High Crossing Boulevard, which was a staff concern. They felt by highlighting the corner, sandblasting and staining the building material it would be more

prominent, which has resulted in white sun shades in a translucent fabric. The Secretary noted that the Zoning Administrator has not made a decision about the entrance orientation and whether or not it meets Code, and there are issues with vertical building articulation that is required by the Code at a minimum level of 40-feet; Khan noted that the vertical columns and having the glass meet the requirements for that standard. The building is largely white concrete and changes in blasting texture and circular motifs don't provide for enough contrast to replace what would normally be a change in material or color, which staff is very concerned with because the building is very monolithic. The different elevations have different features but those features change as they go around the different elevations, therefore is there sufficient design cohesion from elevation to elevation as you go around the building? Staff believes that there should be more. Staff also still has issue with exclusive upper story glazing, and suggest consideration be given to providing more continuity of the building's base, especially along the rear façade which lacks detailing and reveals as on the other façades. The large ground floor parking lot facing the north elevation could be improved by breaking the feature down through different detailing. Staff questions the long-term durability of a prominent design element (sun shades) and suggest consideration given to a more durable, permanent and architecturally integrated material, such as metal panel. Khan responded that the fabric chosen for the sun shades is a very durable material that is meant to last; they haven't had any issues with it when they've used it on other projects. The metal panel does not offer the same transparency as the sun shades.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Do these projects have to be approved together?
  - They're on the same zoning lot, the integrated cross-access ties them together as a Planned Multi-Use Site.
- In terms of addressing the street, the strong gesture at the corner does seem to address High Crossing Boulevard, particularly from a vehicular entrance with a shared drive location, so that does seem very appropriate in the overall scale of things. The pedestrian entrance, the sidewalk that's to the south, some very small pedestrian-scale signage could be something that leads people to the main entrance from High Crossing. Very small.
- The comment on the monolithic composition actually brings success to this design due to the large gestures of glazed openings. So the monolithic material is necessary to outweigh that large glass and punched opening gesture, and it does seem to comply with the amount of vertical interest and being broken up along the façade.
- The material palette seems fantastic, including the fabric screens, and they serve a purpose.
- The north façade, I know there's less pedestrian activity on that façade, but again that large unbroken base supports the overall composition.
- This is a gem and to me it looks like a gem. It responds to its orientation and its site. I think the two buildings complement each other.
- I think it's a very interesting cube with lots of design elements in it, but doesn't try and mask with all these ins and outs like we sometimes see.
- The color makes it really exciting.
- Your experience with the fabric is positive?
  - I've driven by the one in the Town of Madison, if it's the same material it doesn't look like it's suffered. You could easily replace it if you have to after 15 years.
- There's a hedge outlining the edge of the pavement which really serves to say "here's where the pavement is." I prefer to see a mass of shrubs, pockets of shrubs that screen it. If there's a requirement that it's continuous, it shouldn't be a hedge, make it look like it's carved out of a natural area. This looks unnecessarily formal.

- I think the tree placement is fine but the whole shrub with ground layer placement needs to be revised. And you need more species. But I agree, you need to get rid of those linear lines and make them not look like they're hiding a parking lot.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for adjustment to the landscaping along the street frontage as noted.

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 rating for this project is 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5110 High Crossing Boulevard**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	6	3	-	-	5	7	-
	6	7/9 (hotel/gym)	6	-	7	-	8	8