



Agenda Item #: 5

Project Title: 411-433 W Gilman Street - New Mixed-Use Building in Urban Mixed-Use (UMX) Zoning. (District 2)

Legistar File ID #: 89582

Members Present: Shane Bernau, Chair; Rafeeq Asad, Nicholas Hellrood, Davy Mayer, David McLean

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of January 21, 2026, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a new mixed-use building in UMX zoning located at 411-433 W Gilman Street. Registered and speaking in support were John Myefski, and Josh Dawson. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Angie Black. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Sarah Church. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Nicholas Davies. Registered and speaking in opposition was Cliff Goodhart.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission asked about the status of the Landmarks Commission review of the proposed demolitions. The Landmarks Commission recommended a finding of historic value of 415 and 433 W Gilman Street.

The Commission inquired about the recreation of 433, the use of new materials versus reuse of the limestone arch and lintels. The applicant responded that the brick itself will be new, and that saving the entire building would prohibit this project. They do intend to do photographic documentation and measured drawings.

The Commission inquired about the changes to the four-story masses from a consistent height to being paired and stepping down. The stepping in the massing is due to the zoning story-height requirements.

The Commission inquired about the public comment related to the garage door, trash and the building recesses. The recesses are the places for the service elements, the main massing should be for the main entrances. The Commission inquired about why the trash entrance is so much taller than the others. The applicant noted that it was the requirement given by the local provider to accommodate truck movement within the building, and that it is set back.

The Commission inquired about the possibility of relocating the garage door to a building recess.

The Commission inquired about the condenser units on the roof, including screening and color. The applicant confirmed that mechanicals will be silver aluminum and vent out the top.

The Commission asked about the upper chamfer coming further out, following the units. The applicant replied it is the setback point for going from four stories up to the next height limit because that lines up with State Street, there are two bedrooms and a living room in that location. There is a specific distance where the building has to be set back further. The Commission inquired about the glass wall following the corridor; the applicant responded it would be pushed so far back that they would lose two units on each floor.

The Commission talked about the previous presentation, the color of the taller building mass was more terra cotta, the architecture tied together better than it does currently. Using white on the upper floors now feels like a greater disconnect between that architecture and the four-story masses at the street. The applicant felt this was their best solution.

The Commission asked why the applicant did not use the historic reference to design the four-story elements. The applicant noted budget is an issue, and this provides more consistency between the base and the top. There's a missed opportunity to tie that entire base together while still making it new. The base could be more connected and cohesive in terms of some of the elements. Take some of the lintel colors, locations, bring some of those datums and highlight them. The white color does make it look like a currently built building.

The Commission talked about the staff memo bullets, including pedestrian pathways and blank walls. The elevations don't look human scale. The applicant noted the primary purpose is an exit way from the back of the building, and a fire lane.

The Commission appreciated that the team listened to their previous comments by shifting the retail closer to State Street.

The Commission noted that the streetscape realm is not very exciting, even knowing the trees are missing. There's no space for anything other than bikes and passing through. There are positive architectural elements with the canopies, the light and shadow play of the first-floor space, the recesses and voids, but envisioning the ideal space it would have space for café tables, furniture, activity, and plant material softening it. Not a line of shrubs, but areas that are carved out for green color and texture to break up the harder materials of the building and sidewalk.

The Commission talked about perspective and how these read as separate buildings. Should every building be expressed from ground to parapet, should they look like one massive development?

The Commission talked about the white material and how that might age and weather. Recreation of historical can be successful, but not always. It's an interesting design.

The Commission talked about how this fits in with the rest of the block and maintaining the pedestrian stretch, viewing the upper portion of the building as a pedestrian backdrop becomes more compelling. The lighter color helps it fade away. Some of the finer details do need attention to make it look less flat. It would be nice to see some definition between the metal panel and the glass. The garage takes away from the prominence; use one of the in-betweens for the door and keep the four-story volumes as four-story volumes. The Commission noted that the design needs more details.

The Commission commented that the doors gave some variety. The Commission further discussed how the white material will age; it can be durable and stand up to the elements, but it will hold atmospheric dirt and water, and drip down the face, it's a shortcoming of metal panel systems with horizontal joints.

Action

On a motion by McLean, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item, with the following conditions needing to be met for the Commission to find that the development is generally consistent with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines:

- The applicant shall relocate the garage door to a building recess area to create a full volume at the street,
- The applicant shall revise the design/detailing of the four-story base masses to bring some of the design/detailing of the recreated façade to the other masses. All four masses do not need to match exactly but there should be a continuity of design elements: the opening sizes, datum lines, materials, materials/colors, etc.,

- The applicant shall provide a detail where the material transitions from metal panels to glazing on the upper levels. Design of the upper levels shall incorporate changes in plane where the metal panels transition to the glazing,
- The Gilman Street frontage shall be redesigned to include landscape or other design elements to soften the hardscape and introduce color and texture into the streetscape,
- If the refuse disposal will be handled completely inside the building, the height of the door is acceptable. If the door does remain at the proposed height, the applicant shall explore incorporating a color break to create a datum line at the first floor. If trash cannot be handled completely inside the building, the applicant shall revise the height of the door to come down to the first-floor.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0).