

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** January 10, 2007

TITLE: 479 Commerce Drive – PUD-SIP,  
Homewood Suites Hotel. 9<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(05331)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: January 10, 2007

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Lisa Geer, Ald. Noel Radomski, Bruce Woods and Robert March.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 10, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP for the Homewood Suites hotel located at 479 Commerce Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brink, Barry Perkel and Pat Saiki. The plans as presented by Brink reflected minor deviations to the enhanced level of details provided with consideration of the overall PUD-GDP for the development of this site as well as the adjacent site for Hampton Inn. Brink emphasized the detailing of the building “Homewood Suites”; featuring architectural split-faced block in combination with brick and precast concrete as well as hardy plank siding, trim and cornerboards. He noted the incorporation of all air units into window units. Pat Saiki spoke on the overall landscape scheme. Brink noted that individual patios with trellis covers were provided on units adjacent to private street at the first floor. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Between the fence and patio areas along the west elevation, there needs to be some shade trees as well as landscaping for sun and privacy.
- Don’t like the false dormers on the porte cochere elevation. The windows on the dormers should be real to provide light to the interior space.
- On south elevation, re-examine the use of four section windowlights below the palladian window, use three sections with the same amount of glass.
- Like bike path, siting of stalls, and connectivity. The corner crossing needs to be at right angles for handicap accessibility.
- Problem with the lack of shared parking with adjoining hotel.
- Consider adding ivy at the detention areas exposed boulder wall.

The motion required additional shade trees along the west elevation fence and patio areas. The addition of vining along the detention precast wall remove or make real false dormers along the east elevation.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Woods abstaining.

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 4, 5.5, 5.5, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 479 Commerce Drive**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | 7         | 7            | 7              | -                              | -     | 7                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       | 3         | 4            | 4              | 4                              | 4     | 3                                   | 3             | 4              |
|                       | 6         | 6            | 6              | 6                              | 6     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | 5         | 6            | 6              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 6             | 5.5            |
|                       | 4         | 6            | 7              | 7                              | -     | 6                                   | 6             | 5.5            |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | 7         | 6            | 7              | 7                              | -     | 7                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- This is one of the worst instances of “planning” in the City. The lack of synchronicity and spatial efficiency (i.e., lack of shared parking between uses with different peak times) has created a hideous ocean of parking.
- No false dormers.
- Franchise limits design freedom adversely.
- Use an odd number sections on windows at pool element; even number does not complement the Palladian window. No false dormers.
- Sprawl, reasonably well-designed.
- Possibly add a few ornamental trees within fenced west patio areas for shade and more privacy. Appreciate the walk connection between hotels.