

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: May 11, 2011 |
| TITLE: 1518 North Stoughton Road – Building Addition to an Automobile Dealership in UDD No. 5 and Comprehensive Design Review Signage. 17 th Ald. Dist. (02514) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: May 11, 2011 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 11, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the building addition, and **REFERRED** consideration of a Comprehensive Design Review of Signage. Appearing on behalf of the project was Sam Tijan, representing Gries Architectural Group, Inc./Schoepp Motors. Tijan presented renderings of the proposed addition, noting the black EIFS will be lightened by painting the existing EIFS white, columns and accents will be painted a light grey. The addition will be split face with anodized black aluminum windows to match the existing frames. The split face CMU will be painted white to match the white EIFS on the building. Wal-paks will be added to the building for security issues. Barnett inquired about colored brick rather than painting the existing due to maintenance issues. Tijan responded that colors from the factory don’t always come uniform; they use a particular kind of paint that can be power washed and provides an easy maintenance for the building. The look is much more clean and even. Barnett suggested looking at a white roof for the addition. Barnett was happy with the windows, allowing people to see in, but he is concerned about the western sun and the lack of overhang, and the integration of the doors. Smith is unsatisfied with the materials in relation to the existing roof overhang; he’d like to see the column expressed outside and how these two elements interface. Slayton discussed the smaller planting bed to the left of the entry; he has concerns with the listed Crabapple and suggested an Amelanchier instead. He also suggested bark mulch rather than stone, and perennials or grasses instead of spirea. Further discussion centered on Smith’s concern of the addition connection and roof overhang, with Tijan giving a more detailed explanation of materials and plans. O’Kroley suggested raising the soffit.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the building addition and **REFERRED** consideration on the signage. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following conditions:

- Look at the solar gain for the windows.
- Remove the Crabapple tree from the landscape plan for an alternate planting.
- Use bark mulch instead of stone mulch.

- The doors on the southeast side shall come up to the head of the proposed windows, whether it's a transom or panel so there is an element that is vertical.
- Lower the parapet of the addition so it comes below the joint and doesn't intersect the existing soffit; or modify the soffit where it hits so the proposed parapet does not intersect the new soffit.
- The applicant shall look into a white roof to off-set the stormwater effects of the building. If a white roof is unattainable, return with another option.
- The signage component will come back to the Urban Design 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, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1518 North Stoughton Road

| | 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 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- I would like to see how new work meets existing building, especially at the captured column.