# AGENDA # <u>1</u>

#### City of Madison, Wisconsin

| REPORT                            | OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | PRESENTED: May 21, 2008 |      |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|------|--|
|                                   | 702 North Midvale Boulevard – Amended<br>PUD(GDP-SIP), Hotel/Office/Retail<br>Buildings in UDD No. 6. 11 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. | REFERRED:               |      |  |
|                                   |   | REREFERRED:             |      |  |
|                                   | (04800)   | <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>   |      |  |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary |   | ADOPTED:                | POF: |  |
| DATED: May 21, 2008               |   | ID NUMBER:              |      |  |

Members present were: Bonnie Cosgrove, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Bruce Woods.

### **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of May 21, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Scott McLamore, Adam Fink, Scott Uhlarik and Paul Raisleger, all representing Joseph Freed & Associates; Ray White, representing Dimension IV-Madison; Mike Sturm, representing Ken Saiki Design; and Ald. Tim Gruber, representing Aldermanic District 11. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- The upper deck pergola/plaza area has been redesigned, in combination with the entry feature to the hotel to provide for more interaction and access.
- Lighting details for the metal scrim signage element were presented.
- Enhanced plaza details were presented at all levels including the upper plaza view of the hotel, along with enhancement of the parapet treatment.
- The crosswalk at the face of the parking ramp has been moved southerly away from the entrance to reduce conflicts.
- An extended canopy has been provided over the plaza/sidewalk area as requested.
- Colored stone pattern has been provided on the roof of the retail addition abutting the upper stories of the hotel with the roof featuring raised drains to store rain water to delay stormwater run-off. An additional door has been added to the retail storefront on the southerly building at the corner of Mall Drive and Frey Street.
- The request to add a clearstory treatment below the parapet of the retail component adjacent to the hotel was noted as a problem with future tenant build-outs.
- Further review of the scrim sign element and lighting details noted the use of an LED light source for glow, the use of recessed can lighting below the extended canopy and LED cove light at the front of the canopy's fascia.
- Details of a redesigned and enhanced hotel entry at the plaza level were further noted.
- The utilization of EIFS on all the proposed buildings has been minimized with its use limited as the backdrop for sign band for retail tenancies consistent with the Phase I approvals.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Question the location and type of roof mechanicals on buildings. The one-story retail addition adjacent to the hotel would have none, according to the applicant, where the southerly retail building would have rooftop mechanicals. It was noted by the Commission that all proposed mechanicals should be screened.
- Want to see stone pattern design on the other retail building's roof.
- Not thrilled about parapet just being a parapet without the introduction of clearstory windows.
- Provide latitude for use of different colored pavement within the various plaza areas.
- Issue with EIFS at base as shown on the view of the hotel's upper courtyard.
- Add glass to the blank stairs at the corner of the courtyard entry (left side).

Following the presentation Ald. Gruber spoke in support of the project noting his appreciation for the amount of glass on buildings, its appearance, as well as the amount of doorways added to buildings.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion for final approval required address of the following:

- The parapet for both retail buildings shall be detailed on the backsides the same as proposed with the front side elevations.
- Provide latitude for the differentiation of pavement, color palettes at the various plaza levels.
- Provide an option for a colored stone roof pattern for the southerly retail building with all rooftop mechanicals to be appropriately screened, along with the introduction of windows at the stair corners on the hotel's corner courtyard entry elevation.

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 6, 6, 7, 7.5, 8 and 8.

|                | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape<br>Plan | Site<br>Amenities,<br>Lighting,<br>Etc. | Signs | Circulation<br>(Pedestrian,<br>Vehicular) | Urban<br>Context | Overall<br>Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| Member Ratings | -         | -            | -                 | -                                       | -     | -   | -                | 8                 |
|                | 7         | 7            | 7                 | 7                                       | -     | 7   | 8                | 7                 |
|                | 8         | 7            | 8                 | 7                                       | -     | 7   | 8                | 7.5               |
|                | 8         | 7            | 7                 | 6                                       | -     | 8   | 8                | 8                 |
|                | 6         | 6            | 6                 | 6                                       | -     | 6   | 6                | 6                 |
|                | 6         | 5            | 5                 | -                                       | _     | 6   | 6                | 6                 |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |

#### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 702 North Midvale Boulevard

General Comments:

- Long haul good job and excited to see it move forward.
- Great project, nice changes.
- Nice job! Outdoor spaces well integrated and an asset.
- Building elevations appear less dramatic than previous submissions. Decorative stone roof is a missed opportunity...is a future deck possible?