



11333 N. Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53092
Phone: 262-236-2904
Fax: 262-242-9655
www.ci.mequon.wi.us

Department of Community Development

PLANNING COMMISSION
Ad Hoc Port Washington Road Design Standards Committee
Tuesday, January 18, 2022
1:30 PM
Virtual Meeting

Agenda

MEETING NOTICE: Pursuant to the current recommendation of the CDC limiting the size of public gatherings and the various federal and state orders implementing that recommendation, and to help protect our community from the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, this meeting will be held virtually through the GoToMeeting platform with each member accessing the meeting remotely. Citizens may join the meeting online or by phone. Please go to <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/885171437> to join the meeting online or call into the meeting by dialing [1 866 899 4679](tel:18668994679) and enter access code 885-171-437.

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS may be made in writing in advance of the meeting. Written comments should be directed to the Department of Community Development at least 2 hours prior to the meeting by email at DCD1@ci.mequon.wi.us addressed to the intended committee. Written public comment may also be deposited in the drop box at City Hall on 11333 N. Cedarburg Road, Mequon at least 2 hours prior to the meeting. Comments received timely will be forwarded to all members of the body for their consideration.

VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENTS will be accepted only from members of the public who register in advance. Registration shall be made by sending an email to at DCD1@ci.mequon.wi.us or by leaving a message at 262.236.2903 no later than 2 hours prior to the meeting.

- 1) Call to Order**
- 2) TID No. 4 & No. 5 Draft Statement of Qualifications to Design Streetscape Amenities.**
- 3) Architectural Design Standards Review**
- 4) Adjourn**

Dated: January 14, 2022

/s/ John Wirth

.....
Notice is hereby given that a quorum of other governmental bodies may be present at this meeting to present, discuss and/or gather information about a subject over which they have decision-making responsibility, although they will not take formal action thereto at this meeting.



11333 N. Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53092-1930
Phone: 262-242-3100
Fax: 262-242-9655

www.ci.mequon.wi.us

Office of Community Development

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Jac Zader, Assistant Director Community Development
DATE: January 18, 2022
SUBJECT: TID No. 4 & No. 5 Draft Statement of Qualifications to Design Streetscape Amenities

INTRODUCTION

At its December 7, 2021 meeting, the Ad Hoc Port Washington Road Design Commission recommended moving forward with selecting a design consultant for streetscaping improvements along south Port Washington Road. The attached draft Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) has been prepared by staff for review by the committee. The draft SOQ includes a timeline that would result in completion of the project by the end of 2022. This is fairly aggressive timeline, but staff would like to maintain momentum and gain consensus from the Common Council at its April meeting prior to the organizational meeting that occurs later that month. Staff is requesting feedback from the Ad Hoc Committee of the SOQ prior to submitting it to Common Council for approval. Since Port Washington Road is under Ozaukee County jurisdiction, they will need to sign off on the final design and associated improvements.

Attachments:

Request for SoQs updated (DOC)



**City of Mequon
TID #4 and #5 Public Improvements
Statement of Qualifications**

Prepared by:

Date: 01/10/21

1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Mequon is requesting Statements of Qualifications (SoQ) for firms to design streetscaping amenities for the Port Washington Road Corridor; from Mequon to County Line Road, including the intersection of Mequon and Port Washington Road and gateway area along Mequon Road, from I-43 exit ramp as shown on Exhibit A including:

- Street and pedestrian lighting
- Landscaping and other streetscape features
- Wayfinding and Signage
- Other potential roadway improvements (bump outs, intersections, etc.)

2 PURPOSE

The goal of these improvements are to help establish a strong identity and create an enduring sense of place which will incorporate expressions of Mequon's history and culture. Additionally, the improvements will serve as a catalyst to attract private investment and to help spur economic development.

3 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The major elements of work include the evaluation, analysis and design of the corridor and the creation of a final plan to be approved by the Common Council and final plan set for construction of the following:

1. Landscaping and Hardscape features.
2. Street and pedestrian scale lighting.
3. Wayfinding Elements and signage.
4. Any other Street Amenities including bike and pedestrian facilities.
5. Consideration of existing adopt a median plan.

4 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation of response to this request for SoQs will be based upon the following criteria:

- a. Qualified candidates shall include a registered landscape architect with extensive experience in projects resulting in landscape architecture and urban design principles that transform major thoroughfares into a vibrant walkable neighborhood with pedestrian-scaled features and public spaces which provide social interaction, natural security, build economic and cultural value and provoke unique, sophisticated character and architecture.
- b. Provide examples of your firm's projects/designs which are of relevant and similar scale to Mequon's unique character yet introduced walkability, connectivity and a strong sense of community as a priority.
- c. Demonstrate experience in successfully designing streetscapes utilizing sustainable design practices.
- d. Express ability to create low maintenance designs which address the issue of resources/costs.

Please provide qualifications of the key staff persons to be assigned to project, list their scope of work within the project, their experience and any special skills. Six copies of proposal should be submitted, bound in some fashion and clearly indexed.

Please address the availability of staff and your firm's ability to complete the design and development of contract documents and plans in a time frame to allow for the bidding prior to _____ and construction of the project prior to _____.

Responses are to be creative while being formatted in such a fashion as to make the evaluation as straight forward and efficient as possible. Failure to address any of the required evaluation criteria will result in the subject response being disqualified.

5. DESIRED DELIVERABLES

As a minimum the final project deliverables for this effort that will be required from the selected consultant team shall be: 1. A complete set of construction plans including plan, profile, and appropriate details. 2. A complete set of contract specifications to include all necessary bidding documents. 3. An accurate construction estimate. 4. Development of applications for all necessary permits. 5. Other discretionary deliverable as determined by the city, 6. Provision of all information to the city in both hard copy and in an acceptable electronic format.

6. SELECTION PROCESS

The Quality Based Selection process will be utilized for the selection of the consultant team for this project. The review / evaluation team will be comprised of Kim Tollefson, Director of Community Development, Jac Zader, Deputy Community Development Director, Kristen Lundeen P.E., City Engineer and Director of Public Works and the Port Washington Road Ad Hoc Design Committee. The individual criteria listed above will each be evaluated and scored independently by each team member as to how well the submitted statement of qualifications addressed those criteria. A total score is then established by summing the individual scores for each criteria. The team will then confer and decide upon the top firms to be asked in for an interview / presentation. Based upon the interview / presentation a top firm will be selected. A definitive project scope will then be jointly established by the city and the top selected firm. Once a definitive scope is agreed upon the selected firm will develop a fee proposal for performance of the project scope of services and tasks and submit the fee proposal to the City of Mequon for review. The City of Mequon and the selected firm will then meet to discuss, modify, and agree to the fee for performance of the project scope of services and tasks. Once a fee is agreed to a contract for the performance of the project scope of services and tasks will be jointly developed by the City of Mequon and the selected firm. Should the City of Mequon and the first selected firm fail to come to terms on a fee negotiations will be terminated and the City of Mequon will enter into negotiations with the next firm / team.

7. SCHEDULE

The desired overall schedule for this endeavor is as follows:

January 18	Ad Hoc Committee review of SOQ
January 20-25	Forward SOQ to Ozaukee County for review and input
February 8	Common Council approval SOQ
March 10	SOQs due to the City of Mequon
March 17-20	Selection of top firms / teams made
March 28-31	Interviews / Presentations
April 4-8	Project scope established
April 4-8	Negotiate fee
April 4-8	Develop contract
April 12	City approves contract
June 30	Construction contract documents completed
July 15	Advertise project
September 13	City approves construction contract
October 1-15	Contractor begins construction
November 30	Construction substantially completed

8. SUBMISSION of SoQ

Responses to this request for SoQs shall be provided to Kim Tollefson, Director of Community Development no later than _____. Questions pertaining to this request can be directed to either Kim Tollefson at 262-236-2903 or ktollefson@ci.mequon.wi.us or Kristen Lundeen, City Engineer at 262-236-2933 or klundeen@ci.mequon.wi.us.

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Kim Tollefson, Director of Community Development
DATE: January 18, 2022
SUBJECT: Architectural Design Standards Review

Background:

The Design Committee is considering architectural standards for the Port Washington Road corridor. In 2018, the Department created an architectural gallery in which 19 projects were showcased. As an initial understanding of architecture in the community, the committee requested to review the same 19 projects and review the summary information from the review completed in 2018. In December, the Committee received the same set of materials and evaluation form.

Analysis: In 2018, over 50 members of the City's boards and commission that directly weigh in and act on development project were invited to participate in the architectural gallery. Eight (14.5%) community members participated in the event. The following chart ranks the 19 projects by overall design score and identifies the average and mode as well as the highest and lowest score received in any category.

Summary comments received include the following pros and cons of various projects.

CONS:

- Structures are boxed shape and architecture of such is boring.
 - More articulation is needed.
 - Mix, Pattern and color of materials appear cheap, inconsistent or overdone.
 - Fenestration is too dark.
 - Certain interior features showcased to exterior are unnecessary.
 - Colors are too light.
- Generic aesthetics are unappealing.
- Colors are not neutral.
- Harsh modern angles are unattractive.
- Flat and mismatch rooflines do not reflect community character.
- Some overhangs are too large.
- Baseline should not be above or below street grade.

PROS:

- Glass adds contemporary feel
- High quality design and materials
- Residential scale and aesthetic meets community character
- Stone mix is nice feature
- Nice aesthetic for gas station, strip mall, retail or auto use
- Roofline nicely matches scale of building
- Consistency of colors, pattern and materials is simple and well done
- Building compliments surrounding area
- Modern, sleek design is good
- Traditional style is nice design

Recommendation: The sample of responses is small and limited, but this information should assist the committee in developing themes surrounding architecture and design standards with the context of the neighborhood and what the zoning allows, which is distinct for the areas north versus south of the Highland Road.

Attachments:

2018 Architectural Gallery Results (XLSX)

RANK

	Project	Assessment				Responses							
		AVG	MODE	HIGH	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Riverwalk												
	Color	4.375	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4
	Articulation	4.25	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	4
	Materials	4.5	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	4
	Glazing Ratio	3.625	3	5	3	3	3	4	3	4	5	4	3
	Overall Design	4.375	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4
2	Spectrum												
	Color	4.125	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	5
	Articulation	4.375	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	5	5	5
	Materials	4	4	5	2	4	4	2	4	3	5	5	5
	Glazing Ratio	4.5	5	5	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
	Overall Design	4.25	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	5
3	Richmond												
	Color	3.875	4	5	1	3	4	1	4	4	5	5	5
	Articulation	4.125	4	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	5	5	5
	Materials	4.375	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	5	5	5
	Glazing Ratio	4.5	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5
	Overall Design	4.125	4	5	2	4	4	2	4	4	5	5	5
4	Newport												
	Color	4.25	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	4	3	5	4
	Articulation	4	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	3	5	4	4
	Materials	4.375	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	4
	Glazing Ratio	4.375	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4
	Overall Design	4	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
4	Starbucks												
	Color	4.25	4	5	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	3
	Articulation	3.875	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	2
	Materials	4.125	4	5	2	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	2
	Glazing Ratio	3.75	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	3
	Overall Design	4	4	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	2
5	Spur 16												
	Color	3.625	3	5	1	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	1
	Articulation	4.25	5	5	2	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	2
	Materials	4	4	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	2
	Glazing Ratio	4	3	5	3	3	4	4	5	3	5	5	3
	Overall Design	3.938	5	5	2	3.5	4	3	5	4	5	5	2

Rating
1-unappealing
5-most appealing

RANK	Project	Assessment				Responses							
		AVG	MODE	HIGH	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6	The Reserve												
	Color	4.25	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4	5	5	4
	Articulation	3.75	5	5	2	3	4	2	5	4	5	5	2
	Materials	4.25	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	3
	Glazing Ratio	3.75	3	5	2	3	4	3	5	3	5	5	2
	Overall Design	3.75	4	5	2	3	4	3	5	4	5	4	2
7	Metro												
	Color	3.875	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	2
	Articulation	3.75	4	5	2	3	5	3	4	4	4	5	2
	Materials	4.125	4	5	2	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	2
	Glazing Ratio	4	4	5	3	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	4
	Overall Design	3.75	4	5	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	3
7	Taco Bell												
	Color	4.125	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	3	5	3
	Articulation	3.75	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	3
	Materials	4	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	3
	Glazing Ratio	3.625	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4
	Overall Design	3.75	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	3
8	Sommers												
	Color	3.5	3	5	2	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	5
	Articulation	3.625	3	5	2	2	5	3	3	3	4	4	5
	Materials	3.375	3	5	2	3	4	3	2	3	3	4	5
	Glazing Ratio	4.25	5	5	3	4	5	3	3	4	5	5	5
	Overall Design	3.625	3	5	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	5
8	MTC												
	Color	3.875	4	5	1	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	1
	Articulation	3.875	4	5	1	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	1
	Materials	4	4	5	1	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	1
	Glazing Ratio	3.875	4	5	1	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	1
	Overall Design	3.625	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1
9	Artesa/Dermond												
	Color	4	4	5	2	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	2
	Articulation	3.375	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	2
	Materials	4	4	5	2	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	2
	Glazing Ratio	3.625	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
	Overall Design	3.438	4	4	2	3.5	4	3	4	3	4	4	2

RANK	Project	Assessment				Responses							
		AVG	MODE	HIGH	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10	Childrens Hospital												
	Color	3.5	3	5	1	3	4	4	3	3	5	5	1
	Articulation	3.5	4	4	2	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	2
	Materials	3.75	4	5	1	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	1
	Glazing Ratio	3.375	3	5	2	4	3	3	3	3	5	4	2
	Overall Design	3.25	4	4	1	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	1
10	Mobil												
	Color	3.25	3	4	2	3	3	4	3	2	4	4	3
	Articulation	2.75	3	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	4	3	3
	Materials	3.25	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	2	4	4	3
	Glazing Ratio	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	5	4
	Overall Design	3.25	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3
11	Froedtert												
	Color	3.125	4	4	1	3	3	4	4	2	4	4	1
	Articulation	3	3	5	1	3	4	3	3	2	5	3	1
	Materials	3.25	4	5	1	3	4	5	3	2	4	4	1
	Glazing Ratio	4	4	5	2	4	5	5	4	2	5	4	3
	Overall Design	3.125	4	4	1	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	1
12	Lexington Square												
	Color	3.5	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	4	4	3	2
	Articulation	3.5	4	5	2	2	4	4	3	4	5	3	3
	Materials	2.438	1	5	1	2	5	2.5	1	3	4	1	1
	Glazing Ratio	2.75	3	4	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	2
	Overall Design	2.938	2	5	2	2	4	3	2	3.5	5	2	2
13	Wright												
	Color	3.25	4	4	1	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	1
	Articulation	3.125	2	5	1	2	3	2	5	4	5	3	1
	Materials	2.875	4	4	1	2	4	3	3	4	4	2	1
	Glazing Ratio	3	3	5	1	2	3	4	3	3	5	3	1
	Overall Design	2.875	3	4	1	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	1
14	River Centre												
	Color	3	2	5	2	2	3	4	3	3	5	2	2
	Articulation	2.75	3	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	4	4	3
	Materials	2.625	2	4	2	2	3	4	2	2	4	2	2
	Glazing Ratio	2.625	2	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	3

Overall Design	2.75	2	4	2	2	3	4	2	2	4	2	3
----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

RANK

	Project	Assessment				Responses							
		AVG	MODE	HIGH	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15	PNC												
	Color	2.75	4	4	1	4	3	4	3	2	4	1	1
	Articulation	3.125	4	5	1	4	5	3	4	1	5	2	1
	Materials	3.25	4	5	1	4	5	4	3	2	4	3	1
	Glazing Ratio	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	3
	Overall Design	2.5	4	4	1	4	4	1	3	2	4	1	1