

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 27, 2019
TITLE: 2301 E. Springs Drive – Planned Multi-Use Site for a New Home 2 Suites and Tru Dual Brand Hotel by Hilton. 17 th Ald. Dist. (54629)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 27, 2019	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad, and Craig Weisensel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 27, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a planned multi-use site for a new Home 2 Suites and Tru Dual Brand Hotel by Hilton located at 2301 East Springs Drive. Registered in Support were Kastytis Cechavicius, Angie Black, Nick Bower, and Jay Patel all representing Hawkeye Hotel.

Nick Bower, architect, reviewed the site location and context. Looking at site existing conditions there are topography issues. Also reviewed the architecture and building positioning. The drive connects to Home Depot to the north. The Hotel main lobby and entrance is the meeting point where it splits in two directions for Tru and Home 2. Each portion has its own lounge and planning area with a central facility for lobby/laundry/service. Our proposed site configuration has a drive around building with efficient parking and continuous fire access road around the site. Hilton has 1 parking spot per hotel room. Updated design approach wanted to take two brands, but one distinct building. New approach the main element is more vertical and the beacon is more prominent. Dark brown back siding and horizontal panels cement board. Roof element for Tru band has columns. EIFS only on top band, other areas were changed to cement board. Beacon at top will be lit up at night. Meeting requirements for openness.

- I don't like new elevations, like the previous ones better.
- Why did swimming area change shape?
 - Working with parking.
- Zoning Administrator-
 - There is a zoning variance at play. This is not an approvable plan. It doesn't comply with other parts of the code in terms of materials. It doesn't show topography. Trying to pull buildings toward the street, the building should be 75' closer to the street. Zoning Board understands there is a topographical hardship. Looking at it from what is intent of the setback, what prevents development. Was building designed knowing Zoning Code was there? Proposed is 144' back from street. Some parking is excessive. Pull building more forward – closer to the street.

- Speak to design, EIFS only allowed on top of building and as an accent material. Looks like you are addressing that in the new. Entrance orientation – fine. Glazing requirement on element facing the street – provide certain percentage – not sure it will meet it. Could meet by putting pool facing the road. This is a 5-story building among 1 story buildings.
- Does zoning have ratio rooms to parking?
- Zoning Administrator- argument was needed for parking. Concern that could put parking elsewhere. Zoning – building placement – specific language that 100’ setback allow double row of parking/access road. Some sites just don’t work. What is going to get building closer to the street? Likelihood of parking here. May need to lower grade.
- In terms of material choices, there tends to be more cool tones except for brick. Why red?
 - If everything is too cool, there is no balance. Brown/red warmer.
 - Our approach is work on building placement. As far as building design issues?
- We would like to see it a little more snazzy. We have an issue with cookie cutter buildings.
 - We are trying not to do that.
- Look at Freeway architecture - add color and shape. The first one had some color and excitement.
- We like the color. You are in a non-descript neighborhood. Draw some attention to yourself.
 - We can look at bringing it back.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.