



Agenda Item #:	2
Project Title:	4716 Sheboygan Avenue - Major Amendment to an Existing Planned Development (PD) for a New Hotel in Madison Yards at Hill Farms in Urban Design District (UDD) 6. (District 11)
Legistar File ID #:	59852
Members Present:	Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Wendy Von Below, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad
Prepared By:	Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of October 18, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a major amendment to an existing Planned Development (PD) located at 4716 Sheboygan Avenue. Registered and speaking in support was Ethan Skeels. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Kyle Strigenz, and Kevin Yeska.

An overview shows the south and north entry points, with an entry off Sheboygan connecting to the north lobby along Hill Farms Place. The landscape plan has been further developed and an architectural element has been added between the parking area and Sheboygan frontage. The loading area berth has been reduced, and integral screening is planned for all the rooftop elements. There is more contrast between the fiber cement board and brick; the textural change to burnished block tonally complements the metal panel, and is used at the ground plane for durability; masonry material at the corners anchor the building, and an accent wood look is proposed for the aluminum louvers. The parapets are extended up through the dark building material to create a substantial amount of screening for the roof. The marquee element reaches out to the curb edge to greet hotel guests. Gardener Street is considered the secondary street with the BRT stop and will mirror the future residential building planned for across the street. The guest courtyard has lawn games, fire pits, etc. A screen wall is proposed to anchor the corner, and to create a lit backdrop for the robust landscape planned for the corner. In the service zone, by increasing the bay they established a more substantial landscape buffer between the loading bay and the building. The retaining wall creates an architectural edge to the corner and screens the employee parking, which has been reduced to 12 from the original 24; that is needed for the off-set daytime parking within the development. Guest parking is in the Block 1 parking structure to the east.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- Could you please speak to materials for the screen wall?
 - It will be built out of burnished block that matches the building, polished and filled, the base course will match for a nice contrast during the day, and potentially lit at night.
- Those two materials are the same as on the building itself?
 - Yes, that's correct.
- What is the wall height?
 - Six-feet at the top of the retainage. Six in the middle and 7 ½ at the corner. We would not want to go any taller than that, and would be open to taking it down further.
- Where does the screening wall datum align with a building datum?
 - It does not align with the roof, it's below the canopy at this intermediate mullion line.
- Could you speak to what caliper of trees you're intending to plant on some of those important edges – at the screening wall and between the loading area and the public lawn.

- Deciduous trees have a caliper of 2 ½ inch, some are 1 inch caliper. We are looking for immediate establishment that is also reflective of what has been planted at Madison Yards to this point.
- Could you please point out the locations of the wall packs?
 - They are a vertical individual unit within each room that gets its outside air and ventilation from louvers located on each side of the window. The actual vent for the mechanical unit will be behind the wall. It's meant to feel and look like part of the window system.
- The staff memo mentioned the wall packs. Wall packs are not allowed on street facing façades. Is there a way you can provide more clarity as to how those are integrated?
 - We have to recess it within the wall, waterproof it and put the window system in front. The mullion will frame the entire opening, infilled with glazing, light and the louver. It will be the same color aluminum louver as the window frame and mullion.
- Because this is in the TOD, even though you screened the parking, how does that fit into what is allowed?
 - One thing that would be allowed is, if we pulled the building back along Hill Farms Place, the parking where it is; we don't feel that is a good urban design for the development. We rotated the parking, cut it in half, and provided the architectural element between the street and the building as a way of providing that architectural façade. That's what we were able to do with that. If we were able to pull the building back we'd have to add two floors to the building, which would change the construction type and economics. We didn't feel the solution was appropriate for the rest of the site.
- (Secretary) The TOD overlay says vehicle use areas like parking lots and garages, driveways, and loading areas are not allowed to be located between the primary street and the building frontage. Because the building is setback and oriented towards Hill Farms Place, that creates the current situation. This is a major alteration to a PD; they can ask for a modification to that TOD Overlay requirement, provided the UDC and Plan Commission can find that the standards for the PD are met. Our purview is UDD 6, with guidelines that generally speak to the location of parking facilities, they want those located at the side or rear of buildings. All four sides of this are bound by some sort of right-of-way; for the design in front of us tonight, the question is can we find this consistent with our guidelines relative to location of parking, designing with sensitivity to context, and the Urban Design District guidelines. Requirements shall be met, and guidelines shall be adhered to as closely as possible.
- It looks like from the floor plan that the front door might be the other street. How did Sheboygan get determined as the primary entrance?
 - (Secretary) Sheboygan is a higher street classification. Gardner was secondary. Their desire is to orient towards the open space. There is a secondary entrance oriented toward Sheboygan is designed similarly to the main entry of the building and is accessed the same way. The Zoning Administrator has determined that this could also be considered a primary entrance as well.
- Keeping on the zoning classifications, is this the right size for the parking lot? Can you help me understand what the parking for this use, but the whole general parking in the new development area, how that works together?
 - It does work together. As part of the GDP there is a detailed parking study and shared use study for the entire site. There have been tweaks along the way. The adjacent structure is about 600 parking stalls, with 500 additional stalls for Whole Foods and Block 2 residential. There is a shared parking agreement for guests, which is primarily in the evening.
 - We need the surface parking for employees. They don't have any extra daytime parking because of the office and residential. There's no extra parking with the Whole Foods and residential portion of the development.
- The TOD came after the GDP?
 - Yes.
- We have to find appropriateness of the site plan with UDD 6, appropriateness of the screening and landscaping. The Plan Commission is looking for an advisory recommendation if an exception to the overlay should be granted specifically for this development. We also need to make appropriateness findings for building design, wall packs, the lighting, the landscaping/screening and the materials.
- Our concern with the fiber cement panel, so often we see that flush with windows. I don't see any detailed information on how that will be handled.

- We are wood framed above a concrete podium. This does result in a pretty flat exterior relief to the fiber cement. We haven't detailed the window jambs at this point. There are things we could do with how we attach it, I was thinking about the detailing of the joints within the field. We have a color match extrusion that captures all four sides. We would be looking at getting fasteners as well, that would create a higher look to those fiber cement panels.
- I would suggest incorporating the use of a wide trim piece around the window surrounds to break up that transition and give the illusion of depth and shadow line, if it doesn't exist in reality.
- On the presentation you had a material sheet that did not have the burnished block. This is brick #2 on the elevations, and that matches the screen wall?
 - Correct and it's meant to blend with the metal panel. We do use burnished block as a base material for more durability. Anywhere it goes vertical above that one-foot grade is only used at the dark panel. We do use some as the base course below materials on the street side, underneath the metal panel it is only a base course of 12-inches.
- What will the wall look like from the parking lot side?
 - It will be double sided burnished.
- On the west side of the building; in the black metal panel there is variation there, is something else is going on or is that the PDF?
 - There is not, that is a result of reducing the PDF.
- I think this is your toughest façade.

A motion was made by Von Below, seconded by Klehr, for Referral.

Discussion on the motion:

- We've seen this before, this isn't the first time. Why referral when it looks like, based on the list, a lot of the things have been addressed. It's difficult to have a backside of the building with parking, it's difficult to have a hotel when you can't have blank façades. It seems like an attempt was made. Is referral the answer or are some conditions appropriate?
- Maybe. I made a motion so we could have a conversation. I do find the west façade troubling, that is a lot of blank wall both in the dark metal panel, although texture could make it more promising. I also feel like the parking is better, I appreciate the screen wall. The design of the wall doesn't feel finalized yet, it is resulting from where your parking stalls lay out, it doesn't align with anything in plan of the building, and I'm not sure about the height. I'm okay with the wall packs after hearing the detailing of that. Lighting levels should be addressed. Overall it's a good mix of materials that read really gray.
- With regard to the west elevation, the Commission should know that the two planes of that west elevation are not aligned. This is what we're going to see versus a flat elevation with a lot of blank wall space on it. Referral without initial approval would preclude them from moving on to the Plan Commission. It usually means there are significant problems with the building massing, height, etc.
- The corner screen wall around the parking is too tall, it needs to be at least two-feet lower, or the material has to be different so that you can see through it.
- There's a handful of sun loving prairie type plants on the north side of the building that should be revisited.
- On the west elevation in the northwest corner against the darker burnished block there's a wider landscape space with sea green juniper, those don't get that large, you could pick something more vertical. Otherwise I commend you for taking advantage of the shared use parking agreement, that's great urban design. You're in a tricky spot trying to find some employee parking stalls.
- I am appreciating the comments about materials and the wall datum. The louvers were explained, I agree it's very gray. I feel pretty strongly that this project's front faces not the major street as determined by the Zoning Administrator, but this lovely greenspace. Sheboygan is in some ways arbitrary. When I look at the UDD guidelines, parking areas shall be located to the rear or the side rather than the front. This isn't the front of the

building. I think we need to acknowledge and make a finding that even though it is in the TOD, it's not the front of the building.

- To further your argument, I think the parking on Sheboygan is off to the side of it. There's a significant amount of greenspace where they could have tried to cram in more parking. To have 12 screened stalls incorporated into the loading area I think is a fairly responsible and restrained request for the site.

The motion failed on a roll call vote of (0-5-1-1) with Rummel, Asad, Harper, Bernau, and Klehr voting no; Von Below abstaining; and Goodhart non-voting.

A motion was made by Asad, seconded by Rummel, for Initial Approval with findings and conditions.

Discussion on the motion:

- Does the wording for approving and advisory need to be rolled into this?
- The Plan Commission is looking for a motion on the TOD overlay.
- We all understand the idea of not wanting parking lots to be between the building and major streets, but we can all see this is not that. It's more to the side, they've downsized it and screened it. Nobody has mentioned the large greenspace next to it; how often do you see sweeping lawn in front of a hotel? From an urban design aesthetic this is a nice outcome. There could be some tweaks but to me the parking lot is not on the street.
- Staff recommended we include lighting as part of the formal action.

Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** with the following conditions and finding:

- The request return to the UDC for Final Approval.
- The UDC finds that the VTAC units as described/designed are acceptable.
- The UDC finds that the proposed surface parking lot as designed and screened is appropriate.
- The screen wall shall be at lower in height and the materiality needs to be modified to be more open/permeable. The wall shall be designed with materials consistent with the building materials, including burnished block and faux wood fins. The wall location shall align with the building in plan view and datum.
- The sun-loving, prairie style plants on the north side of the building shall be replaced with a more shade tolerant selection.
- On the west elevation, northwest corner, the sea green juniper, should be replaced with something more vertical.
- Tree plantings located at the screen wall and between the loading area and the public lawn shall be at least a 2.5" caliper.
- Provide details on material transitions between the metal panel and fiber cement. Consideration should be given to incorporating treatments that provide more relief between the fiber cement and metal panel, including providing a wide trim piece around the window surround to break-up the transition.
- Lighting shall be revised to be consistent with MGO 29.36.
- Revise the west elevation to incorporate design details or material textures that break-up/minimize the blank expanses on the elevation.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING REPORT

October 18, 2023



Agenda Item #: 3

Project Title: Report of the Facade Grant Staff Team - 2190 Pennsylvania Avenue, Exterior Modifications to an Existing Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 4. (District 12)

Legistar File ID #: 80252

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Wendy Von Below, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of October 18, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a façade grant located at 2190 Pennsylvania Avenue in Urban Design District (UDD) 4. Registered and speaking in support was Troy Curtin.

Wisconsin Greenhouse is a national company that designs, assembles, and maintains greenhouses, with manufacturing done elsewhere. The site is located in a high traffic area on the way to the airport, with a lot of exposure; this grant would help revitalize the area. They are proposing steel siding in “coal,” and steel siding in aged walnut for a modern and naturalistic approach. An aluminum frame is proposed for a lean-to above the existing entry.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- The raised planting bed in front, is that existing or being replaced as part of the improvements?
 - We would like to replace it, it has come up in discussions before. We’re open to suggestions on materials and plants for that.
- (Secretary) As a façade grant, as a replacement it is not an option for funding. They can replace it but that is not included as part of the request.
- The timbers kind of bring the overall design down, I would recommend another material be used if you’re going to keep a raised planting bed along that edge. Something of steel that ties into the rest of the building, it would keep your refined, modern aesthetic.
- There doesn’t seem to be a lot of difference between the coal proposed and the roof now. Is it failing? How come you don’t just paint it?
 - We did look at painting it, but we’d have to then repaint it rather often. The color has faded there, the vertical slats are a big portion to it. We looked at a completely flat type of material as well, we’re pretty open to suggestions here. We did have a leak but I don’t believe it was related to that.
- I’m wondering about the value of all that new siding, it’s still a very roof dominated façade. You could consider breaking up that heavy dark coal with maybe a lighter color that is just above the wood look, frame that a little bit, so the big eyebrow isn’t as heavy as the building itself. It could be metal panel but a lighter color, or a wood look. You could do that above the canopy too, just to lighten it up.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Klehr, to grant Final Approval.

Discussion on the motion:

- Condition to not use the timber for your planting bed, if replaced.

- The roof is proud of the façade, is that being changed?
 - It is much more of a straight angle as opposed to straight vertical.
- You're reconstructing the roof, not just recladding it? A condition of approval should be that something happens to bring that roofline up. Right now that proportion is very heavy.

Action

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** with the following conditions:

- Reduce the "top" material. One consideration could be to bring the wood look up into the "roof" to lighten up the mass of the dark material.
- If the planting bed is removed and replaced, use an alternate material for the planting beds – a simple steel that ties into the rest of the building would keep the modern design aesthetic.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).



Agenda Item #: 4

Project Title: 307 E Wilson Street - Façade Alterations for Summit Credit Union in UMX
Zoning. (District 4)

Legistar File ID #: 76206

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Wendy Von Below, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of October 18, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** with conditions of façade alterations located at 307 E Wilson Street. Registered and speaking in support were Alec Hembree, and Austen Conrad.

In address of the Commission's previous comments, they have moved the bike rack to the west side of the plan, taking plantings and relocating them to create a more comprehensive landscape in that area. Revisions to the Wilson Street façade include adjustments to the proportions, expanded use of the orange metal panel, which improves the overall visual and pedestrian experience while in keeping with the proportions of the building and the John Nolen Drive side of the building. The number of gray colors on the backside of the building has been reduced, and they have eliminated part of the orange band.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- This is so much better, great, you've taken all of our comments, it's so much better than last time we saw this, great job.

A motion was made by Bernau, seconded by Asad, for Final Approval with conditions.

Discussion on the motion:

- This final version looks better all around, on both sides. Both sides have reason to be happy with this outcome.
- On the planting design, the bed to the left, the three evergreens in the back are specked on the plant schedule in a way that that particular plant (a yew), make sure it's an upright variety. That same genus and species comes in a low-grow, make sure it's an upright version. Other than that, thumbs-up all around.
- I can't wait to see this building, thank you. I second all the hoorays.
- There is a question in the staff memo about lighting, the bollards.
- (Secretary) Lighting on the rooftop is at five footcandles using bollards, which is the typical use for this type of light fixture. The question for the Commission is would a different fixture be more appropriate and provide a more appropriate light level for that type of use?
 - In some of our previous submittals we had a building section all the way to the lake. We have been very strategic about the use of bollards, they only cast light down and are not visible from John Nolen Drive. Both from a lighting level perspective, and what type of lighting we're using, the bollards are a good option.
- Maybe I can add, as a condition, even on grade the bollards can be too tall. If it could be 36" bollards or less.

- (Secretary) My concern wasn't the visibility of the fixture necessarily, but the light levels.
- I'm personally okay with the bollard style.
- As long as it doesn't have any impact on the urban environment and is not spilling light outside of the property.

Action

On a motion by Bernau, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** with the following conditions:

- The three evergreens on the right side of the parking areas shall be an upright variety of yew, not a low spreading one.
- The bollard light fixture shall be 36" or less.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).



Agenda Item #:	5
Project Title:	1814 and 1818 Parkside Drive - Imagination Center at Reindahl Park, City of Madison Public Library in Urban Design District (UDD) 5. (District 12)
Legistar File ID #:	79954
Members Present:	Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Wendy Von Below, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad*
Prepared By:	Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

*Asad was recused on this item.

Summary

At its meeting of October 18, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for the Imagination Center at Reindahl Park located at 1814-1818 Parkside Drive. Registered and speaking in support were Christopher Sina, Brent Pauba and Garett Tomesh. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Jennifer Camp, Greg Mickells, and CJ Ryan.

The existing parking lot will be upgraded and expanded, with expansion of the center island for stormwater capturing. The team went to great efforts to preserve the larger trees on the site and minimize the impacts of construction. The landscape plan uses native species, with taller species planted around the stormwater management areas. The vehicular drop-off allows users to enter the library or pavillion entry space. Playful patterning and natural colors make this building fit within the park setting. The main entries have solid green canopies, and glazing that will help identify entrances to the building. The backside is placed close to the splash pad, and is heavily glazed for views out to the park, while also showing the activation within the building. A few public art areas on the exterior are still being explored. The Trespa laminated panel is durable going around the entire building.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- The combination and usage of project is existing. The massing and scale, the way you're avoiding trees is working well, it has a nice human scale to it which is important in a park and a library. This isn't necessarily UDC, but the use of color, yeah; it works well for the setting. It has a strong character that this neighborhood can be proud of, that this belongs to them. The fact you enter and can see through to the park is a really thoughtful move. A lot of great things going for this right now.
- This is an exciting project, looks really fun. I echo the comments on color. The use of form and pattern is really interesting, I think it's more successful on what we're calling the backside (west). The backside embodies the color, patterns, but also feels timeless. The other side loses a bit of the timeless quality, I'm not exactly sure what it is. Maybe it's the different color green and gray, which I like, but maybe it's the scale because it's so dominant. There are a lot of different patterns that make room for some consistency. Where you have the vine structures is a very strong pattern, with a different playful pattern next to it. I'd like to see more consistency tying that all together.
- Kudos for working around the trees. Your site plan, splaying out the geometric patios are really successful and interesting, different than a very safe landscape and site design we often see. Overall I think it's a really fun, playful, awesome start. I look forward to seeing refinement of it.
- I too agree with a lot of the comments. I do like the color but I'm struggling a bit with the same area of green grey block on the front elevation. The other thing that needs some study are some of your window proportions.

Some of the brick areas have windows decreasing in height, curtain wall, punched openings in a random pattern, but I'm not sure if I'm really following that language in some of the other areas where you have brick. It needs study, I don't know what the answer is. I'm bothered mostly by the punched opening in the brick; how do those relate to the brick or trellises? There's a lot of typology that could be a little bit simplified.

- This is really exciting. I saw 60s patterning, which to me is not timeless. This one we're excited by color, but study that some more. The lower level of that pattern seems more okay, the scale isn't so overwhelming. I look forward to seeing what you come back with.
- One request is to address how you're going to deal with the western sun in those rooms. We'll want to understand how, this being a LEED Gold building, how you're going to address that. Otherwise it's a nice project.

Action

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



Agenda Item #: 6

Project Title: 33 W Johnson Street - Planned Development (PD), New Mixed-Use Development. (District 4)

Legistar File ID #: 80306

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Wendy Von Below, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of October 18, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a Planned Development (PD) located at 33 W Johnson Street. Registered and speaking in support were Andy Inman, and Rob Uhrin. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Blake Richter. Registered and speaking in opposition were Fred Mohs, and Gene Devitt.

Inman highlighted that they are proposing to rezone to Planned Development to get the density and get the 11th floor, which will be programmed as primarily public space with a restaurant. The overall height of the building is 125-feet, which is remaining lower than the height allowed under the Downtown Plan in terms of feet, as well as below the Capitol Preservation Height Limit. Changes since the July 12th Informational Presentation include moving the Residence Inn entry to the Wisconsin Avenue side, adjacent to the entrance for the Autograph Hotel. A portion of the drop-off will be in the terrace; they have done what they can to minimize the impact to the terrace on Wisconsin Avenue. To achieve a grand gesture to the Capitol, the building proportions have become more uniformed and integrated. The base has been brought down in scale for a more human scale element along Wisconsin Avenue. The architectural language of the building has now been brought all the way around.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- This is all over the place, but when you start to look at it, it has this abstract artistic, Frank Gehry thing to it, the architecture, I like that. I like that it's at the corner. Like the previous project, there are some things that don't play well together. If you are going to look at, there is a chaotic corner, Wisconsin and Dayton, which is not bad, but both sides should counter each other, complement each other, have the same window treatments, same glazing patterns, canopies, etc. Don't have three different things, have two and let your corner do all the work for you. You have this metallic beige extended mullion, and it stops, but the plane...keep the same treatment. Have that recessed piece be the same language, which is breaking up that corner from your punched opening side. It will start to bring attention to the corner piece, which is what you want people to focus on. There's still some greenspace there, within the property lines. I'm okay with it, it's different but I think it's time for some different stuff happening, everything is starting to look the same.
- I have to say I really like the changes you made. The merging of the two separate hotels works so much better. I thought that was a handsome building, but it looked like a completely different building and now they are working together a lot better. From a ground level this will be so much more pedestrian friendly. The changes you made with the traffic patterns are an improvement too. Addressing some of the comments from the neighborhood, how many units are in the combined hotels and how many parking spaces do you have on site?
 - Very close to 330 on both hotels, combined. Parking is about 140 on-site parking stalls.
- I am gathering the complaint is that you're looking at using the neighboring public ramp?

- We're working with the Parking Utility, they monitor the occupancy of all the structures. Revenues are very much down. We've got good history now with the AC Hotel. Even when we're fully occupied we have numbers of how many guests are driving, and that number in general is declining. More people are getting to hotels via rideshare or other means. We share the concern of making sure there is ample parking.
- It is a concern, as somebody who has been a victim to sold-out nights and Orpheum and Overture, and there is no hotel there now, I can appreciate what it will be like when there is a hotel there.
- I too have concerns about the front of the building and that iconic view of Wisconsin Avenue. I don't know where the City's at as far as trying to protect those Ash trees, everybody wants to write them all off but in reality you can protect and treat them. I can appreciate that two of those may have to go; whatever lengths you can go to so Wisconsin Avenue is a tree lined alley. That might involve getting trees bigger than 2.5 caliper.
- It looks like the design has improved. Using the City right-of-way is a no-go. You can't solve your drop off on City property, I personally won't support it even if you make other design improvements. It's a premier street which should not be used for the purpose you have here. There are some other things in the staff report I'm seeing but I don't have comments on them.
- That is going to be the big challenge for this Commission, to make a finding that this project is in conformity with the Downtown Design Guidelines that talk about this being a premier street, tree canopies, one curb cut, no drop-offs. Making an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission talks about compatibility with existing or planned character of the street, and the height as well. We mentioned that being a huge concern the last time you were here. It's not a whim of this Commission, it's a written plan that we have to make a finding of being in compliance with. Stretching things 180 degrees is really tough. I'm concerned about the Commission being able to make a finding that this is in conformity with those plans.
- Based on what you read, the language of the Wisconsin Avenue, it's not. And those are up there. I don't think that says no to the project, it tells the architect what you have to do before you come back. Bring your site into compliance so your project can be approved. The architecture can't solve all the site issues.
- It's a very difficult problem, we've seen two other projects here. We're also going to be asked to approve bonus stories, which says "this project is great," and what do we get? A project that ignores a stated plan on a premier street.
- I agree about the Wisconsin Avenue concerns. The building reads very dark in your renderings, what are those materials?
 - The palette is masonry, we're responding to the Madison College buildings, we want something that is rich so we have a dark base. We're still fine tuning the brick color. Masonry metal panel, a lot of glass, a darker metal mullion. We're still planning the final palette and would love to hear thoughts on that.
- (Referring to Slide 32) As we're seeing more buildings get taller downtown, color is becoming more important, and the issue of just dark versus light is becoming more important. I hope you might look at this tower, there are so many exciting things happening in there, curves, horizontal lines as opposed to the verticality we see downtown. As you move forward on that element maybe it deserves color to celebrate those curves. The way those horizontals are celebrated are unique and different, but you're going against it with so many vertical fins. Color is subjective but I would make an argument that dark colors downtown are hard, I hope you might revisit that and also celebrate your curves more.
- I would like to expound on what Jessica said there. This is generally Residence Inn, this is Autograph, then I come around and it almost looks like more of a Residence Inn. If Autograph is the trendy expression, why don't you continue this type of expression all the way around to and down Dayton and have two hotels that really are distinct from each other, and two buildings that look like two different hotels.
 - We wanted the palette throughout the building to stitch together but show uniqueness. We wanted to make sure we celebrated the corner, but soften the design as you move towards the historic building.
- Why not extend the corner a little further and have a more slender "quiet" zone? You could bring out that corner and make a statement that this is a different hotel than anything else we have in town.
 - There's a lot going on here, the historic, but bird glass is the other one. If we were to stretch more glazing we start to push up against the bird glass percentages.

- You've made improvements, the Johnson corner is much better. I like the comments about introducing color to this pretty dark palette. My first reaction was this is really heavy, really dark. There is still a synergy lacking between the different pieces, there's still some competition happening, I don't know if it's the cap, my eye wants to go up to those caps but it's also competing with the architectural focal point at the corner, which I think is awesome. It's hard to pinpoint, but to me it's still lacking some kind of cohesive synergy between those two sides.
- I will echo what Alder Rummel said that Wisconsin Avenue is a non-starter, to ignore or try to justify the departure from the Downtown Design Guidelines. I'm not so sure if it's the setback issue, I know it's very important as you look at the progression of setbacks all the way up Wisconsin Avenue, but the line in the sand is the right-of-way and the new driveways being introduced, unfortunately it's a non-starter. As far as the trees on Wisconsin Avenue, I know they are treating some of those Ash trees, but some more stately trees in the long run would be better so the loss of two isn't the worst thing in the world. I appreciate this is the second Informational Presentation, I know it's a challenging site.
- I also wanted to show appreciation for the silva cells and some more stately street trees, which will be necessary.
- The height is another issue. Personally I think there could be a path to allowing an 11th floor, being within the height of a permitted 10-story building, and I prefer it because lower floor to floor means less space between the sill and head of the window for a much lighter appearing building. Are there any adjacent landmarks?
- (Secretary) Bethel Lutheran Church, the Masonic Temple. Within the same block but not directly adjacent to the project site.
- The Johnson Street side of the building is vastly improved.
- I think the height is appropriate. Architecture is not supposed to be, this is a downtown area, it's asking for dynamic design. It has to conform with some of the ordinances, but I think there are fixes for the site without changing the building design. I think the building design works if the site issues are fixed. I don't mind the black architecture, and I don't mind pops of color in there, but it could be more dynamic with colors, some color in there to accent the curves.
- In a city of brown and beige you definitely stand out – to the bird glass point...
 - We are complying with that, yes.
- In thinking about dark colors versus light – the heat impact is something to think about. The roof is something to think about...white roofs?
 - We have the roof plan in the packet, much of it is occupied with terraces and outdoor spaces for the Residence Inn and rooftop restaurant. Plantings, pavement, furniture and mechanicals.
- Aren't there things like white roofs? Maybe that's a way to address heat index concerns.
 - We've done both in previous projects.
- I frequently concur that the dark masonry downtown is overwhelming. It doesn't matter what time of day or season, when you go around the corner at the James it feels like a canyon. I don't get that effect from this one, it will play a whole lot differently on this block. Masonry has to be some color, it would look cornier to tie it into the old MATC building, when you had a lighter tan color it looked like a different building. In this case I think it's an attractive use of it, there's a lot of other very light colored buildings around, there is something to be said for the dynamic black and white thing going on. Having said that I definitely agree that the darkness of not just the masonry but other materials are hiding the dynamism of those curves. Whatever you can do help those stand out, it's the architectural feature of certainly that corner and in large part this project, to have them disappear into darkness is a big mistake.
- When you were here before you shared context photos, the actual photos of realized projects brought a depth and shine to these materials, they weren't actually that dark in reality. If you could show us the reality of it, it would help us get past some of these less-finer renderings.
- Put the actual context in the renderings instead of the white boxes.

Action

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