

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 7/13/20

TITLE: A land combination of the parcels located
at 1 N Pinckney St, 5 N Pinckney
St, 7 N Pinckney St, 15 N Pinckney
St, 19 N Pinckney St, 120 E
Washington Ave, and 22 N Webster
St; 4th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 7/15/20

ID NUMBER: 61118

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

SUMMARY:

Brad Binkowski, registering in support and wishing to speak

Jose Granados, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Andrew Inman, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Jeff Lenz, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Kurt Stege, registering in support and wishing to speak

Joanna Rouse, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Mark Binkowski, registering in support and available to answer questions

David Jennerjahn, registering in support and available to answer questions

Tom Daly, registering in support and available to answer questions

Please see attached Public Comment Registration list for an additional 1 registrant in support, 31 registrants in opposition, and 1 registrant neither in support nor in opposition, none of whom wished to speak.

Andrzejewski opened the public hearing.

Bailey described the proposal for a combination of lots for the American Exchange development, with the boundary of the landmark designation for 1 N Pinckney Street to remain the same. She explained that any future alterations to that landmark building would require a Certificate of Appropriateness; however, any of the new development on the remaining parcel would not be under the purview of the Landmarks Commission. She discussed the standards, including whether the proposed lot sizes adversely impact the historic character or significant of a landmark, and said the applicants addressed that by leaving the boundary for the landmark designation the same, thus preserving the existing landmark building. She said that the other part of the standards, whether the proposed lot sizes are incompatible with adjacent lot sizes, was also addressed by maintaining what was the former lot for 1 N Pinckney Street. She said that it is not changing the lot configuration for the existing landmarks and pointed out that in the downtown area and particularly around the Capitol Square, there are many different types of lot sizes and configurations. She said that staff believes the standards are met and recommends approval of the land combination with the landmark designation boundary of 1 N Pinckney Street to remain unchanged.

Brad Binkowski said that since the Landmarks Commission has last seen their proposal, they have worked hard to address a number of issues that would be best addressed in the discussion of item 5, alterations adjacent to a landmark. He said that they plan to save and preserve the American Exchange building and understand that the Landmarks Commission will continue to have purview over any exterior changes. He said that they have spent a lot of energy trying to save and improve the building and will continue to do so in the future.

Jose Granados introduced himself and his wife, Sarah, as part owners of Eno Vino. He said the reason for their objection is the bulk and size of the proposed building, which will change the Capitol view from the restaurant. He said that it is a significant view for guests who have had special life events take place there. He said that he believes changes could be made to the proposed building that would allow for them to keep their Capitol view. He pointed out that Eno Vino is a public space where all can enjoy the view while the proposed building will be private offices, so they want to protect the view for the benefit of the public. Granados provided images of the Capitol view from Eno Vino. Andrzejewski told Granados that the Landmarks Commission's jurisdiction is related to historic landmarks and encouraged him to watch the project as it goes before other bodies and commissions.

Andrew Inman, Vice President of Development with the North Central Group that owns the AC Hotel, said that they did not receive their notice of the public hearing until July 7. He said this was relevant as they discuss the impact of this project and they need sufficient time to analyze it, particularly because of the recent design changes. He spoke to the standards and said that this proposal fails because the overall lot size is much greater than the adjacent lot sizes within this block. He said that the overall lot size fails to maintain the general lot size and pattern of the surrounding lots, and the massive scale of the project will adversely impact the historic character of the landmarks. He said that this also includes the State Capitol, which the application fails to address. He said that the public views that Granados identified are relevant in that the proposed development will impede the public's ability to enjoy the views of the landmark. He requested the commission refer or deny the proposal. Bailey clarified that the City of Madison's definition of adjacency is sharing a property line. Because the Capitol building is across the street and there is a public right-of-way between, that breaks the adjacency. She explained that this development only takes into consideration the landmark properties that are adjacent to the proposed development. She said that the last part of the applicable standards, whether it fails to maintain the general lot size pattern of the historic district, is not applicable because it is not within a historic district.

Jeff Lenz, one of the owners representing the AC Hotel, said they oppose the project due to the notice and impact of the project on public views to landmarks, namely the Capitol and Capitol grounds, which has not been addressed in the application. He said they did not receive notice regarding the submittal until July 7, and this project and the site are too significant to have the appearance of being rushed through the process without adequate notice to nearby property owners so they can properly evaluate and comment. He said that the views of the Capitol have been an integral component to the successful operation of the AC Hotel and Eno Vino, and the massive scale of the project will have a devastating impact on the public view of the landmark State Capitol building and grounds. He said they hired a third party to complete a visual impact study to assess the impact of the large project on this public viewshed; however, they do not have the results because they did not receive adequate notice. He requested the commission refer or deny the proposal.

Taylor asked Lenz if his opposition was only because the proposal would block the view from the 9th and 10th floors of the hotel. Lenz said that is a large component of it. He said that blocking what they consider a public view will impact the spaces Taylor mentioned. He said there is an economic component as well because the rooms facing N Webster Street will be impacted and the value of the property will be diminished.

Steger said that the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation supports this project.

Joanna Rouse said that she and her father own the Capitol's Edge Apartments next to the AC Hotel and they have concerns about the massiveness of the project. She said they have residents who get to enjoy the view of the Capitol and she is concerned this project will upset their residents and affect their ability to rent those units.

She said that as they were developing the apartments, they went through a long process and had to reduce their size because of the landmark Lamp House being nearby, and she wanted to make sure there was consistency in the City's treatment of different proposals being presented. She said that she would like to see shadow studies. She requested the commission refer the proposal in order for her to get more clarification on what this will look like and how it will affect her building and residents.

Bailey read the remaining list of registrants who did not wish to speak.

Taylor asked Lenz if any of the other registrants were shareholders or stakeholders in the AC Hotel or restaurant. Lenz said there were some familiar names involved with Eno Vino and Mr. Smith is an Eno Vino owner. Other than Inman, who spoke, he didn't believe any other registrants represented the AC Hotel.

Brad Binkowski said that the matter currently before the Landmarks Commission was succinctly addressed by staff. He said that the commission is aware of the step taken before they could begin the public approval process, related to the demolition and delisting of Centre 7, which had widespread notice. He said that the existing zoning allows the full height they are proposing, and they moved the building back 18' to preserve a full view of the Capitol dome from Eno Vino. He said that given the work they have put into maintaining the historic scale of N Pinckney Street, setting the new building further back from the American Exchange building, and building underground parking that would not be possible if they were to maintain existing lot sizes, he hoped the Landmarks Commission would find that the combination of lots meets the standards. He said that even a five-story building would block the Capitol views from Rouse's apartments, but the 55% of the site currently used for surface parking is something that is not in the interest of downtown to preserve and maintain. He said there will be ample opportunity before the Urban Design Commission and other bodies to weigh in on the architectural merits and hear the concerns expressed from registrants in opposition. Arnesen asked Binkowski if they will hold neighborhood meetings where these concerns could be addressed in a more open forum, and Binkowski said they will.

Andrzejewski closed the public hearing.

Kaliszewski said that a number of registrants mentioned they did not have a proper amount of time to review the materials and asked how the commission should deal with that. Bailey said that the method that we go about issuing the public notice is within the City's control, and the mailing went out on time and the public hearing notice in the newspaper went out on time. Andrzejewski requested clarification that it was based on the date of sending, not receiving. Bailey confirmed that the notice is required to be sent ten days in advance, not received ten days in advance.

Andrzejewski asked Bailey to speak to the specific issues before them related to the land combination. Bailey discussed the standards and pointed out that the adjacent landmark buildings are retaining their existing boundaries. She said that she recommends that the proposal meets the standards. Andrzejewski said that there is another item related to this project on tonight's agenda, and Bailey said that they will review the development adjacent to a landmark and provide an advisory recommendation to the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission. She said that after that, unless the applicants propose exterior alterations to 1 N Pinckney Street, the Landmarks Commission will not have involvement and it will be the purview of UDC and PC.

McLean said that initially he was confused as to how the development was not adversely impacting the character of the landmark and was compatible with adjacent lot sizes, but he understood Bailey's explanation that we are not talking about the landmark site being conjoined with the larger lot and are not in a historic district for the other standard to apply. Bailey said that it also relates to how buildings downtown develop; on this block, there are largely lot line developments so buildings are already taking up their entire lot and are separated by party walls, not by a separation between buildings, so this is a different situation.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by McLean, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the landmark designation boundary of 1 N Pinckney Street remain unchanged. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other.