# AGENDA # <u>2</u>

#### City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> June 18, 2008		
TITLE:	U	<b>REFERRED:</b>		
	Construction for a Commercial Building in Urban Design District No. 1. 16th Ald.	REREFERRED:		
	Dist.	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: June 18, 2008		ID NUMBER:		

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Bonnie Cosgrove, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Jay Ferm, Richard Slayton and Marsha Rummel.

### **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of June 18, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration for new construction located at 3001 South Stoughton Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jerry Bourquin, architect. The modified plans as presented emphasized the following:

- Deletion of the southerly drive aisle adjacent to the south elevation, allowing for enlargement of the green buffer and plantings adjacent to wetlands within this area.
- The landscape plan features an additional bioretention area at the rear of the building and replacement of flowering crab for Kentucky Coffee Tree as requested.
- Relative to building architecture:
  - Brought up awning, simplified materials on building.
  - Widen out cornice with a heavier canopy.
  - Heavier corner vertical piers, along with the adjustment of window groupings.

Following a review of building material and color samples the Commission noted the following:

- Like to see framing out windows above awnings, should be symmetrical.
- The curved bottom of upper level awnings not necessary.
- Not quite comfortable with relationship of windows on second story with curved awnings.
- Do not encourage the use of pastels, need a stronger color palette.
- The color palette as presented is OK, but not accurately detailed on the renderings.
- Encourage changing three trees adjacent to the southerly end elevation and using more Swamp White Oak to provide for more cohesive landscaping.
- Project is premature in light of the Stoughton Road Revitalization Plan. It doesn't live up to potential, site may be underutilized in 10-years.
- Architecture improved but building doesn't live up to its potential; need to see how signage is integrated; issue as to how it works with building.

• Don't think building is far enough along, no details on windows, awnings and brackets, lighting plan, absent of details on planting in triangle on plan, need to see how building resolves itself architecturally in terms of signs.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the project due to the above stated concerns, more specifically address of signage and landscaping per comments. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion emphasized the need to provide details on signage as it relates to architecture, brackets, resolve of the lack of fenestration at the middle section of the building, including problem with relationship of flat bottom sill above canopy. The motion stated that Urban Design Districts require a higher standard and included a recommendation for the removal of the outboard awnings altogether. A previous motion by Slayton, seconded by Cosgrove to grant final approval with address of the above stated comments relative to architecture and landscaping failed on a vote of (3-6) with Rummel, Slayton and Cosgrove voting yes, and Wagner, Barnett, Woods, Ferm, Harrington and Host-Jablonski 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 3, 4.5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, and 6.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	4	-	-	5	5	5
	3	5	_	_	-	3	2	3
	_	4	_	_	-	-	5	4.5
	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	5.5
	5	5	6	5	-	5	4	5
	5	5	6	-	_	6	5	5
	_	-	_	_	-	-	-	5
	6	6	6	_	-	6	-	6
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5

### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3001 South Stoughton Road

General Comments:

- Improved, but still isolated from the Stoughton Road context.
- Project fails to meet goals of Stoughton Road Redevelopment Plan. This gateway to Madison needs more than a nice strip mall. Development of this site is premature since this area of Stoughton Road will be radically changed with rebuilding of Beltline/Broadway interchange.
- Barely less banal architecture than last time. And why not 2-story? This project is not ready.
- General direction OK. Resolve architecture issues. Appreciate work with Fire Department to eliminate paved surfaces but Urban Design District and new attention to Stoughton Road requires more.
- Architecture is going in the right direction but still not there. Site much improved.
- Nice improvements, especially removal of the wrap-around driveway.