

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 7/29/19

TITLE: 210 S Pinckney St (Judge Doyle Square)
- Alteration to Planned
Development Zoning Adjacent to a
Designated Madison Landmark; 4th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 7/30/19

ID NUMBER: 56725

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

SUMMARY:

Lee Christensen, registering in support and available to answer questions

Mike Slavish, registering in support and available to answer questions

Jeremy Frommelt, registering in support and available to answer questions

Isaac Wallace, registering in support and available to answer questions

Fred Mohs, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Wallace presented on the applicants' proposal for Block 88. He explained that their initial proposal has design elements that relate in scale to the datum points of the adjacent Madison Municipal Building (MMB). He displayed an image showing that the datum line at the top of the MMB is held through to the top of the 5th floor of the proposed building. He said that they initially proposed to add masonry to the ends of the building and masonry piers on top of the building as a nod to the materials of the MMB; however, they have received comments from the Urban Design Commission that glass is preferred rather than masonry. He showed a rendering of the proposed glass façade with a cap on top that holds the datum line of the MMB. He provided a solar study, and said that there will be little shadow impact on the MMB because the new building is located to the northeast. In terms of materials, he said they intend to clad the majority of the building in Nichiha paneling with a glossy finish that is color-matched to the metal panels on the podium structure, and will accent with Nichiha panels with a wood look. He showed samples of the two types of paneling, as well as a sample of the masonry they had initially proposed to use to create a connection to the MMB.

Levitan asked how the mass of this proposed building compares to what had previously been approved by the Landmarks Commission. Bailey said that there is not a substantial difference in terms of mass. Andrzejewski asked if there are differences in height. Arnesen said that there are substantial differences in mass. For their formal application, Bailey suggested that the applicants include a comparison of what was previously approved and their current proposal.

Slavish said that the height is the same. Wallace explained that they are restricted on height, and they are currently matching the height of the penthouse and mechanical screening that was previously proposed. He said that in terms of massing, the entire front of the building was curved in the previous proposal and there were wings on the back closer to the MMB. He said that the previous proposal for the commercial level stopped around the third floor of the MMB, while their proposal continues up to the full height of the MMB.

Andrzejewski said that is a significant change in mass. She asked if the previous proposal had anything on the wings or if it was stepped up at all. Wallace said that the previous building was at the podium level and then was a straight wall up to full height. Arnesen asked about the curved wall, and Wallace said that the curved glass section faced S Pinckney Street and kept that footprint all the way up 13 stories. Wallace said that their proposal provides some relief to S Pinckney Street, but grabbed space closer to the MMB and articulated that for additional units and rooftop space. Arnesen said that it would be helpful to see a footprint overlay of the previous proposal and the new proposal.

Andrzejewski said that with the addition near the MMB in the new proposal, they are teetering on making the development too large and visually intrusive. She explained why she was asking whether the previous proposal was stepped, and said that it may not be feasible, but suggested the applicants look into that as an option to provide breathing space for the historic landmark. Kaliszewski agreed that it is a substantial change in massing and said that while she understands that it may be difficult because the applicants are discussing this project with a lot of people, there is a way they could move some of the massing to the front side along S Pinckney Street.

Slavish explained that the applicants' design is an attempt to address and meet the objectives laid out in the City's RFP for the project, which included density, the largest number of affordable units, who would pay the most for the podium and air rights above it, and which development was going to bring the most tax base.

Kaliszewski said that she likes the idea of extending the stone into the design, but understands that there has been a lot of discussion regarding the materials and that others may prefer the glass.

Mohs spoke about the Capitol View Preservation Ordinance, and said that he is concerned that the City lowers the standards for people who fight aggressively. He said that there are always people who try to modify the established standards for their own economic reasons, but it is not good planning to allow that. He said that part of the original intent of the ordinance was to create a certain look for the city that would keep the Capitol from being buried in a circle of tall buildings.

Levitan asked if there are concerns that this project violates the Capitol View Preservation Ordinance. Wallace said that it complies. Frommelt said that the applicants met with Kevin Firchow and Matt Tucker from the City Planning and Zoning Divisions, respectively. Frommelt said that the proposed project falls within the limits of the original proposal. He explained that the Capitol View Preservation Ordinance allows the elevator override to extend beyond that, which their proposal does with an area of mechanical screening. Arnesen said that his understanding was that the ordinance does not allow mechanical screening. Frommelt said that there was a Conditional Use for the original project, and they were told that as long as they stayed within those limits or shorter, it would be conditionally approved.

Levitan asked when the applicants intend to submit their full application. Frommelt said that as of now, they intend to submit on August 26 for the September 16 meeting. He explained that they are presenting at the Urban Design Commission on Wednesday of this week and have a neighborhood meeting to attend later this evening.

ACTION:

No action was taken.