

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 10/14/19

TITLE: 216 S Pinckney St (Judge Doyle Square)
- Alteration to Planned
Development Zoning Adjacent to a
Designated Madison Landmark
(Madison Municipal Building); 4th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 10/17/19

ID NUMBER: 57666

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, and David McLean. Excused were Betty Banks and Arvina Martin.

SUMMARY:

Helen Bradbury, registering in support and wishing to speak
Randy Bruce, registering in support and wishing to speak
Andy Laufenberg, registering in support and wishing to speak
Duane Johnson, registering in support and available to answer questions

Arnesen left the room during this item.

Bailey explained that the proposed project is an alteration to a previous approval for new construction adjacent to a landmark, the Madison Municipal Building (MMB). She discussed the renderings from the submittal, which show the perspective of the proposed development next to the landmark to give a feel for its relationship to it. She explained that modifications to the design include the substitution of some building elements to include more traditional building materials, but it will maintain the curved form that faces S Pinckney Street. She said that the vertical and horizontal plane facing the landmark replicates the feel of the buildings surrounding it to provide a more traditional context, and pointed out that the new structure will be stepped back from the MMB. McLean asked if the original proposal included all glass on the street elevations and pointed out that the new proposal appeared to include more masonry. Bailey confirmed that he was correct. Bailey explained that the Landmarks Commission will make an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission regarding whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark. She said that staff believes the current proposal meets the requirement due to the significant step back from the MMB and the modification of the façade to incorporate more traditional buildings materials, while also using the architectural vocabulary of the surrounding buildings within the viewshed of the MMB.

Bradbury introduced herself as the co-owner of Stone House Development, and said that they have been working with the City as well as Potter Lawson and Knothe Bruce to complete the interior and exterior of the Judge Doyle Square Block 88 development. Bruce explained that the first floor plan has not changed and is being built now, and the 5th floor will be the first addition to the podium structure. He said that they kept the same curved façade along S Pinckney Street, but squared off the east, west, and south façades to better relate to the surrounding buildings and street grid. He said that on the 5th floor, they also added an amenity space,

and pointed out that one can see in the exteriors that it is a very lightly framed structure with quite a bit of glass. He described floors 6-12, saying that they added about 1,500 square feet to each floor, mostly in the east and west direction; between the stair towers, they added 5-6 feet that projects toward the MMB. He said that the footprint of the upper penthouse level is smaller than what was previously approved because it is tapered back along S Pinckney Street. On the roof level, he explained that the mechanical area is about 20-25% smaller than was previously approved and was made thinner so that it is less obtrusive and relates well to the architecture.

Laufenberg showed images of what was previously approved, and pointed out that the podium design has changed as well, and is being constructed of glass and aluminum rather than stone or brick. He said that the previous design did not have a lot of architectural fenestration that related to the surrounding buildings. He explained that the massing has not changed much, and because of structural reasons with the podium design, they found ways to work with the existing footprint. He said that the building will be stepped back and they kept the façade facing the MMB square and in line with the street grid, while extending the east and west façades to come flush with the street façade. Regarding massing, he said that instead of a glass box, they began looking at the characteristics of the MMB and other nearby historic buildings, which have a base, middle, and top condition. He explained that at the rooftop terrace, they set the floorplate to define the base condition, the upper floors act as the middle, and the top floor defines the top condition. He said that they switched from all glass to materials used more regularly in the area. He explained that there is a lot of metal panel in the design and where they could, they used brick to anchor the building back down to the ground and provide a break from the metal panels. He pointed out that the façade facing the MMB matches the symmetrical nature of the landmark. He said that they are using a lot of punched openings, which also relate back to the historic buildings. He described the shadow studies, and explained that the building does not cast the MMB into shadow.

Andrzejewski asked commissioners to discuss the advisory recommendation as it relates to size and how they define visually intrusive. McLean said that it seems like it has a lot of distance from the MMB, which keeps it airy and not overshadowing. He said that he is relieved that the material has changed because he was concerned about full glass facing the sun. Regarding the size, he said that it seems similar to what had previously been approved. Andrzejewski said that being squared up makes a big difference and even if it is closer, without the curve it seems to make it breathe more. Bailey said that it helps that it is more in keeping with the surrounding context. McLean said that overall, they are nice changes and it seems appropriate. Kaliszewski said that it is fine, and while they are not commenting on materials, she is on the fence about the metal siding. McLean pointed out that the metal siding is already present on the base of the podium. McLean asked if the brick is only on the ends of the building, and Laufenberg said that it is on the ends and stair and elevator towers. He explained that the structure of the podium was designed to support an all-glass façade, so they were limited in the materials they were able to use. Andrzejewski said that she appreciated the shadow studies, which were really useful.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by McLean, to advise the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark. The motion passed by voice vote/other. Arnesen recused himself, so the Chair, Andrzejewski, voted.