

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** May 27, 2020

**TITLE:** 1 N. Pinckney Street – Redevelopment of Block 101, American Exchange Bank for Retail and Office Space with Underground Parking Located in UDD No. 4. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (60545)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Janine Glaeser, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** May 27, 2020

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 27, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for redevelopment of the American Exchange Bank located on Block 101 at 1 N. Pinckney Street. Registered and speaking in support were Mark Binkowski and Brad Binkowski, representing ULI. Registered in support and available to answer questions were David Jennerjahn and Tom Daly, representing Valerio Dewalt Train Associates. Registered and speaking in opposition were Jose Granados and Sara Granados. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Juan Camilo Pavi Rivera, Mark Giese, Dana Thiel, Gordon Brown, Matthew Siegler and Jacky Tu. The goal of this redevelopment is to do underground parking, create life and vitality, while preserving the American Exchange Bank and reinforce it as a landmark. This will create office space to attract technology and create activity on the sidewalk, while also creating retail viability on every possible sidewalk frontage for a total of 22,000 square feet of new space. The team discussed the major two story-entry, their previous projects downtown and the building material palette.

Jose Granados, part owner of Eno Vino downtown, spoke in opposition. He is very worried about a building that is going to block the view they have created at the AC Hotel. Eno Vino downtown has become a destination point for celebrations of all kinds, with the Capitol Building prominently featured in their view. Sara Granados read a letter for the record.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I like the design but a glass building isn't sustainable or energy efficient. Pinckney Street is where I have concerns with heavy on glass. I do believe you can still balance it very nicely. I would appreciate you looking more on the front side how you can create that fine balance.
- The first thing that struck me was the huge glass structure, it's hard to picture how that was going to be. I know there have been tremendous advances but it still seems a stretch to think that would be an energy efficient design. The issues brought up by Ald. Rummel regarding 902-908 E. Main Street, about impacts with birds, we're starting to tiptoe around that issue but on both of the buildings in Archipelago

Village they have some bird friendly glass. As for Eno Vino's comments, I've been waiting for this sort of impact. We tend to focus on residents' views and sunlight being blocked, but we're at a point where a commercial business's livelihood is affected with something going up next to it. A big part of your business is based on a view that is suddenly taken away, that's a fairly serious issue although there's nothing in the ordinances that guarantees a view in perpetuity. It should be discussed and taken seriously.

- When you come back we would like to see the glazing.

**ACTION:**

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

## UDC Informational Review Comments

<p>Site Plan</p>	<p>7 - Would benefit from mid-block relief south of 21 N. Pinkney – similar to the space between the glass bank building and the Tenney Building on the south side of the block.</p> <p>Ambitious plan that seems well-suited to develop wasted prime real estate currently used largely for surface parking. Wouldn't support if it didn't preserve the AEBank. Pinckney St retail level will be huge improvement over existing.</p> <p>Creating substantial underground parking at this location should be a major boon to higher and better use of this valuable real estate and continued revitalization of the Square. Adding a substantial entrance at E. Wash &amp; Blair nicely activates a now-dead corner. All auto and service entrances off of Blair is appropriate</p>
<p>Architecture</p>	<p>7 – Tower seems to loom over American Exchange Bldg. It would benefit by moving upper tower portion north toward middle of block.</p> <p>Pinkney St. façade too disjointed. It's a new building, so make it look like one. Webster street more unified &amp; successful. See site plan comments above.</p> <p>The aesthetic along E. Washington and Webster at pedestrian level is not human scale, which is not in keeping with the surrounding fabric. This is one of the more enjoyable areas to be a pedestrian in Madison, but the way the new building meets the street does not support that. The glass boxes do not seem to relate to the base structures. The smoothness of the glazing detail is not harmonious with the timeless character of the American Exchange Bank - why add more anonymous glazing to the Capital area? The Webster facade is particularly lacking in scale for pedestrians. The idea of the project is sound, but the detailing and architecture is not there yet.</p> <p>I'm having trouble getting excited over the, admittedly, preliminary versions of The large glass central portion. If this is to be the last project of this size on the Capital Square, I expect to be wowed. Not happening. I can see what you are trying to do with the glass "hat" but it's surprisingly clunky. Perhaps somehow acknowledging the forms or proportions or rhythms of the first floor elements somehow would tie it in better. Highly recommend using special glazing to prevent bird strikes. The stone patterns created at the E. Wash entry don't enhance the appearance and actually detract from the over-all geometry of that corner element.</p> <p>Perhaps the rough cut stone could mimic the cubic forms above?</p> <p>Really like the varied volumes of the 'glass box' – early newspaper renderings did not make the variability apparent. Like the classical rhythm of the Blair St. façade with glazing down to eye level. Question whether maintaining the rhythm of multiple small store fronts on Pinckney is worth it. The US Bank building presents one long glazed façade on Pinckney that seems 'active' enough. Maybe a simpler approach. Also not clear on material/color choice for dark red façade on E. Wash. Seems incongruous.</p>
<p>Landscape Plan</p>	<p>Appreciate the various outdoor terraces on different levels. Nice - the more the better.</p> <p>Roof-top outdoor terraces are excellent additions.</p>
<p>Site Amenities/Lighting</p>	
<p>Signs– if shown, do they complement the architecture?</p>	<p>Organization of Pinckney storefront signage will be important design element. Multiple different facades may create more interesting signage or unnecessary complexity. TBD.</p>

<i>(sign approvals will be a separate application.)</i>	
Pedestrian/Vehicle Circulation	<p>7</p> <p>While the maintaining of the sidewalks and planters is appreciated, the architecture is not at the same scale. The corner of Webster and E. Washington, per the rendering, looks barren and uninviting to pedestrians.</p> <p>Hopefully more landscape details will clarify quality of pedestrian experience.</p>
Urban Context	<p>7 – Faux storefront attempt along Pinkney needs to be toned down – try 2 or 3 distinct looks instead of 7.</p> <p>The heights of the proposal is not an issue - the streetscape and how the building meets the street is unfriendly and out of scale. The effort to maintain character along Pinckney is appreciated, but don't ignore Webster and E. Wash.</p> <p>Again - support the development of this massively underutilized space, but really want to see something more special across from the state capitol.</p> <p>Excellent revitalization of under-used downtown site.</p>
<b>Overall Rating (1-10)</b>	7, 4, 6 & 8

\*Individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10. 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.