

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 15, 2010
TITLE: 2205 Rimrock Road – Demolition for New Hotel Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet. 14 th Ald. Dist. (19242)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 15, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner and Jay Handy.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 15, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a demolition for a new hotel to exceed 40,000 square feet located at 2205 Rimrock Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan, Sarah Pittz, Clay Carlson, Brad Carlson, representing Gateway Project, LLC; and Chuck Possehl, representing The Bruce Company. Possehl detailed modifications to the site/landscape plan as requested by the Commission noting the following:

- Additional landscaping comprised of canopy trees and other plantings have been provided along the eastside of the parking lot.
- A request to add additional canopy trees along and beyond the north property line has been provided in conjunction with the adjoining property owner.
- An enhancement and redesign of the center circular feature as well as additional perimeter landscaping.
- The driveway entry end island treatment has been slanted to reduce right turn movement to short cut to drop-off canopy.
- Replace Oak species.
- Use of steel or aluminum edging and replacement of wash stone for shredded bark.
- Landscaping around building reoriented to meet with building panels versus window openings.

Tan provided a summary of revised building elevations to emphasize the redesign of the canopy treatment at the main entry and drop-off area, the building’s tower element versus one story portion, cornice treatment, entry revisions and proportions of arch window openings including the addition of a green roof on the one-story portion of the hotel. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Base treatment at main entry eroded from previous versions; need to be studied.
- Need solution for drop-off area creating too many problems with site design and circulation (vehicular and pedestrian); should be flipped.
- The site design as proposed will require staff and signage to resolve issues but is not the worst.
- Appreciate landscape and architectural changes.

- We usually like to see more trees in the parking lot.
- I commend you on the green roof.
- Resolve issue with the relationship of the upper façade to lower at corner entry.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion passed with the option of the applicant to revisit the architectural and elevational details to come back to staff and that the Plan Commission shall formally study and consider traffic patterns, circulation (vehicular and pedestrian), parking and drop-off details, including the exact locations of vehicular traffic, bus movements and where cars will stop before approval. The motion also commended the applicant for a green roof on the one-story portion of the hotel with the understanding that it is part of the project as approved.

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, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2205 Rimrock Road

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

General Comments:

- Drop-off areas/vehicular circulation looks problematic.
- PC – please study traffic, drop-off/circulation. Handsome building. Like green roof.
- Simply odd. Light fixture selection has no relation to the architecture. Vehicular circulation will be a disaster.

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 1, 2010
TITLE: 2205 Rimrock Road – Demolition for New Hotel Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet. 14 th Ald. Dist. (19242)	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:
	POF:
DATED: December 1, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Handy and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 1, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the demolition for a new hotel located at 2205 Rimrock Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan and Travis Schreiber, representing Gateway Development, LLC; Chuck Possehl, representing The Bruce Company of Wisconsin, Inc., Brad Carlson, and Clay Carlson. Tan reviewed the Commission’s previous comments on the project and the changes that have been made. Surface material would be either pavers or colored concrete to differentiate them. Canopies will be used in both locations for grand entrances. Tree plantings and grasses were listed; evergreens, ginkos and perennials will be used. Retaining walls will be placed on either side of the underground parking entrance. Ornamental Junipers will be placed to screen the parking entrance. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Question the use of vinyl edging with the washed stone. A steel or aluminum edge might work better.
- Substitute shredded bark for stone and bring a stone sample when you come back.
- I’d like to see a little more beefing up of the landscape plan.
- We need to see more detail around the building; need enlargement of entry details and other elements.
- I’d like to see more trees in the parking lot.
- Lose one more parking stall and make each of the islands a little bit bigger.
- Very upscale for that location. Much nicer than what is there now.
- Still Richardsonian Romanesque, where everything else out there is not.
- Make the cornice heavier to be the same material as the arches, to make the arches more purposeful where the arch feels less purposeful.
- Proportions at entrances and all that weight coming down to that point needs to bring a sense of heaviness that goes with the architecture’s style and needs to have depth.
- The problem with the covered parking area lies in the plan, not the architecture. It seems like there’s a disconnect but it’s outer edge and wall of building.
- The covered parking area end entry canopies are not complimentary to the building’s architecture.
- I’m very pleased with the amount of work you’ve done since we last saw this.

- Taller element of building needs more depth to better relate to one story element; look at extending bays.
- Struggling with drop-off area and ceremonial front door, all weather going straight through front door with canopy too high to effect. Consider small canopy, cantilevered and look at proportions of support piers on both the drive-up and entry canopies; needs to be ratified.
- Drop-off canopy is crashing into building, beef up piers on building, incorporate Richardsonian arches and add cantilevered cover.
- Look at short-cut to drive-up canopy.
- Look at green roof or provide for structurally in the future.
- On landscaping put plantings with backdrop of building to make sure they work, small plantings may need to be bolder and look at trees and large shrubs on how they relate to the arches and show in elevation.

ACTION:

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

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 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2205 Rimrock Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	5	5	-	-	-	7	-
	5	6	5	-	-	4	5	5
	-	8	-	-	-	3	-	7
	5	5	-	-	-	4	6	6

General Comments:

- Wrap parking in vegetation. Go with steel not vinyl edging. Substitute shredded bark for stone.
- Carry historical style through the entire project – pieces and details.
- Needs real depth to the façade – rethink all of the entry and drop-off canopies – car and lot circulation is counter intuitive right now – not good.

AGENDA # 11

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 21, 2010

TITLE: 2205 Rimrock Road – Demolition for a
New Hotel Exceeding 40,000 Square Feet.
14th Ald. Dist. (19242)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 21, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a proposed new hotel located at 2205 Rimrock Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan, Clay Carlson and Sarah Pittz, all representing Gateway Project, LLC. Pittz distributed updated site plans for redevelopment of five different parcels. Several of the parcels are currently in the Town of Madison. Plans call for a 230-room hotel with a 13,000 square foot conference center. The developers have been working with the Alliant Energy Center. There would be one level of underground parking along with surface parking. Tan reviewed the exterior of the plans, including a 7-story tower, the entrances and parking plans. Precast panels and brick will be used in the building materials. Staff informed the Commission that there is a land issue because the parcel straddles the City of Madison and the Town of Madison. Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Separate covered drop-off and parking areas duplicitous.
- Overall repetition and fenestration needs attention.
- Tree islands every 10 or 12 stalls.
- Look at relocating main entry with option that reduces amount of onsite vehicular circulation.
- Not sold on entry sequence, this might be attracting more traffic than necessary, as well as pedestrian access.
- This looks like there isn’t enough outdoor greenspace, sitting areas, green roof on top of the flat roof.
- Strongly urge you to rethink where you have the entry; you’re going to be catching most of your fall and winter weather through that door.
- Rotating the building a little bit might pay off.
- I’m not sold on the front door location, how pedestrians might safely and adequately use your site.
- The building fits the site very well.
- Columnar elements odd and disconcerting with the rest of the architecture.
- This recalls a “Richardsonian” building or facsimile as applied is too thin; the style relies heavily on depth. Architecturally the building is designed to provide a better read in terms of volume with the façade articulation requiring further study.

- Look at termination of pedestrian path.
- Separate conference space and parking lot with a green buffer to block views of the Beltline.
- A green area would be very valuable between your conference center and the parking lot.
- This is a great fit for this site.
- My biggest concern is pedestrian access to the site.
- Find a safe place for your employees where their bikes aren't vulnerable.
- Applaud that you are completely hiding your mechanicals.
- Please include your signage as you go along so it's not an afterthought.
- Good start.
- Mechanical element should have its own architectural form.

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.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2205 Rimrock Road

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

General Comments: