

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 17, 2009

TITLE: 66 West Towne Mall – New Construction in a Planned Commercial Site Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet of Retail Space for a Multi-Tenant Retail Building. 9th Ald. Dist. (15087)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 17, 2009

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, Todd Barnett, Dawn Weber, Jay Ferm and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 17, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for new construction located at 66 West Towne Mall. Appearing on behalf of the project was Christine Meske, representing CBL Properties & Associates, Inc. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the project provides for the development of the southwesterly corner of the intersection of Gammon Road at Mineral Point Road with an existing surface parking area located between the recently approved “Longhorn Steak House” to the south and the existing “Olive Garden” restaurant to the west. Planning staff concerns were noted as follows:

- The development of a dual tenant building that includes the liberal use of EIFS as the main material including concerns with its use at ground level.
- The use of a corporate color for “Stanton Optical” is the main color element of the exterior façade which acts as an extension of the building as a “Street Graphic” inconsistent with ordinance provisions.
- The “Stanton Optical” portion of the building as designed prevents a significant opportunity for oversize signable areas and signage which offsets any architectural benefits of that portion of the building as designed.

Following staff comments Meske and Pratt provided a detailed overview of the project as proposed. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Like design, don’t mind color.
- Issue with corporate colors as a major element of the design.
- Like the boldness and freshness of the building architecture.
- The “Stanton Optical” signage is too much of a billboard.
- As with the “Longhorn Steak House” approval, still support moving building to avoid the island building approach. This approach is more of the same for typical mall-lands. Needs to be brought to a more urban approach.

- Like color, need to see sample but not excited about the extensive use of the EIFS system to ground; look at painted metal panels as an option.
- Like idea of building on corner as infill development, visually loud building on corner quite appropriate.
- Need site photograph and context information in order to understand. Programming issues with redevelopment of the site.
- Like simplicity of details but need to be careful in material selection in order to be quality; EIFS doesn't do it.
- Use of a single loaded bay versus a double loaded, as with the "Longhorn Steak House" approval could bring building closer to the street and provide more pedestrian space at the building.
- Elimination of bay of parking in front of Gammon elevation could be utilized to enhance the pedestrian area including walkway and landscaping around the building.
- Need to verify internal ceiling height versus building height.
- Examine providing a true two-story building or two-story volume with mezzanine.
- The "Smash Burger" building elevations need some work, EIFS appears cheap.
- The signing for Stanton Optical on three sides scary and overwhelming.
- Provide alternative for on-site infiltration.
- If LEED certified, energy usage would be an issue with the volume of the building as proposed.
- Put parking to the back, eliminate front loaded parking bays, look at providing two entries to the Stanton Optical portion of the building, and provide four-sided architecture.
- Deal with gray water issues.
- Provide more context as to what is west of the site including existing traffic patterns as well as context with the mall as a whole.
- Provide information on how parking needs of various business impact needs for redevelopment of the site.
- Look at moving building to street to eliminate parking and increase greenspace.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the 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, 6 and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 66 West Towne Mall

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	7	5	6	6	6	6	6.5
	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Pull building to east. Fresh architecture is good.
- Fresh modern architecture.
- EIFS not acceptable.
- Like bold color.
- Important to address corner.
- Look at parking configuration.
- (It's a smash!) Typical retail infill. It will be nice to have a building instead of an empty parking lot. Cannot be all dryvit!
- Maintain energy and well proportioned massing while studying comments. Bring material samples early.