

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 23, 2008

TITLE: 1 South Pinckney Street - Exterior **REFERRED:**
Remodeling in the C4 Central Commercial **REREFERRED:**
District, US Bank Plaza. 4th Ald. Dist. **REPORTED BACK:**
(11317)

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: July 23, 2008 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Lou Host-Jablonski.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 23, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of exterior remodeling located at 1 South Pinckney Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brad Binkowski, David Jennerjahn, representing Valerio Dewalt Train Associates, Inc.; Robert Holloway and Ledell Zellers. Appearing in opposition to the project was Kenton Peters. The U.S. Bank Plaza's facade is a glass curtain wall structure, developed in the early 1970s. The atria areas through the use of clear thermoplane glass that has no solar shading and little insulating value. Significant energy issues against the high cost of primarily cooling and issues relative to the heating were resolved in significant energy and climate control issues due to the use of clear glass according to Binkowski. It is proposed to modify the existing building atriums where the two-story volume on both the Pinckney Street atrium and main fourth floor atrium will be maintained, combined with the elimination of both sloped glass façades in favor of the development of landscaped roof terraces with insulated roofs and skylights, where usable roof terraces will be directly accessible from adjacent office space. In addition to the elimination of the sloped areas of the atrium façade, energy efficient glass will be installed on the south and west walls of the building with an emphasis that new glass will maintain the building's transparency and provide for acceptable solar shading. Also proposed is the elimination of the fourth floor atrium abutting the building's Webster Street frontage replaced with a 6-story addition. The addition will allow for a floor plan that can attract small and medium sized office tenants to fit into the existing building. The new façade will be designed to fully match the existing building's exterior and will feature the use of energy efficient glass. An additional alteration provides for the replacement of the building's cooling towers to add movers on the 9th floor on the south wall in order to increase the capacity of the towers with new cooling towers to be located in an exterior recess on the 9th floor, combined with the installation of energy efficient chillers off of the loading dock on the first floor of the building. Future phases of proposed improvements include the construction of a new entry to the building lobby, in addition to creating new sidewalk entrances into the ground floor retail shops and restaurants. Binkowski provided an overview of the proposed renovation, noting the following:

- Building does need attention to relieve heat sink issue without affecting drastically its architecture.

- Based on energy analysis to make building more efficient it is necessary to modify three atriums with a rebuilt flat roof and reglazed building to reduce solar gain and energy costs, in addition to providing usable roof underlying and outdoor terrace area.
- The addition will be approximately 15,000 square feet in size adjacent to the existing elevator core.

Following the presentation Kenton Peters spoke in opposition to the proposed renovation, referencing that the use of double or triple insulating glass could be used to resolve issues, in combination with the use of window blinds, heat exchangers and other alternative remedies. Peters further noted within a text provided for the record based on his statements issues with the need to preserve this building façade as an element of the architectural heritage of the City. He further noted the need to consider the preservation of modern architecture as conventionally provided with historic preservation efforts which should be applied to buildings of this type.

Following Peter's statement the Commission noted the following:

- The existing plate glass has no solar coefficient and no energy efficiency.
- The existing curtain wall system cannot support the weight of energy efficient glass.
- Need to weigh architecture issues against need for sustainability; if someone wants to landmark the building, then do so.
- The sloped atria marks the building, replace glass with energy efficient glazing; still an issue with the loss of clarity.
- Addition is handsome with entrances on the street desirable but concern with loss of sloped atria.
- If City deems building is historically appropriate, why not make gestures to landmark it? If building doesn't work, why not remedy?
- Building is to be maintained, needs to be dealt with and not become an energy hog.
- Beautiful building great with sensitive modifications presented, but not convinced.
- Need more info to have a public discussion especially if not going to the Plan Commission. Need better discussion if we alter something as iconic as this structure.
- Like proposal and change but like historic architecture.
- Prefer referring, too important of an issue, want to look at energy audit and economic feasibility.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- A referral to the Landmarks Commission or a report from Kitty Rankin, Preservation Planner for an opinion relevant to the prospective landmarking of the structure featuring modern architecture as detailed within statements submitted for the record by Kenton Peters.
- Provide for a publicly noticed hearing with further consideration of the project.

Following the motion the Commission noted the following:

- This solution accomplishes many tasks but not necessarily the best solution.
- Many buildings of this age are now undergoing change, need to think carefully.
- Appreciate Kenton Peter's comments but good architecture can evolve such as his own Union Transfer project. Agree to the need for more information but project as proposed may be a good option; need to give direction.

- Give the public a chance to know about the project, have a notification process.
- More of the neighborhood building where the Commission needs to be deliberative about changes to such an important structure.
- Upon further consideration of the project, provide more understandable material.
- Suggest having a meeting within the building as a public hearing with displays of relevant information on how it works now and ways proposed to make it better, as well as to experience the space.
- In lieu of a special meeting to view the building, it was noted that members could tour the building as individuals without making forming opinions prior to any further consideration of the project.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. 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. The overall ratings for this project are 5.5, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1 South Pinckney Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Compelling but more info/options/research.
- This is an interesting proposal – great energy improvements and nice architecture. That said, we would benefit from more public input and special data before accepting such a significant change to an iconic building.
- This needs some study. Even modern icons can be modified and improved. But we need to be convinced that the energy concerns warrant the removal of important architectural elements.
- Wow...Wish this had come as informational presentation and not final proposal. Glad that neighborhood supports but this icon belongs to entire City. Appreciate that ULI is determined to “fix” the building...