AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** April 10, 2019	
TITLE: 929 E. Washington Avenue – New Development of a Commercial/Office Mixed-Use Building Located in UDD No. 8. 6th Ald. Dist. (54198)	**REFERRED:**	
	REREFERRED:	
Referral from Plan Commission Regarding Glare Study	**REPORTED BACK:**	
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	**ADOPTED:**	**POF:**
DATED: April 10, 2019	**ID NUMBER:**	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Sheri Carter, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Shane Bernau, Craig Weisensel, Jessica Klehr and Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 10, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a glare study for a project at 929 E. Washington Avenue until further information is made available by the consultant. Registered in support of the project were Doug Hursh, Curt Brink, Matt Brink, Matt Browne and Andrew Laufenberg, all representing Archipelago Village; and Mitch Hawkins, representing Viracon.

Ald. Rummel spoke to the Commission regarding the retention of 924 E. Main Street as part of the fabric of the Capitol Gateway Plan. She thanked the development team for working with her and the City to save this façade. She asked the Commission to reconsider their motion regarding 924 E. Main Street in the broad context of this block being redeveloped. She also mentioned the neighborhood has concerns regarding birds and the glare of the proposed building at 929 E. Washington Avenue.

- (Braun-Oddo) I walked by this building after our last meeting, and I just didn't see the value in this façade. What is it about this façade that's telling you to save it?
    - (Ald. Rummel) My inspiration and education came from Jane Jacobs. I believe it adds to some of our history, it used to be the National Biscuit Company. We talk about creating an employment district there, to me it's a layering. But I did agree with their proposal to take down others on E. Main.
- I think they have to take it all apart in order to remediate. Would it be acceptable to use it in a more appropriate location?
    - I never thought about that, but I'm certainly willing to entertain the idea.
- Leaving it may limit a well thought out design behind it. If we give them some latitude with placement maybe that would help.

- (Ald. Rummel) I worry that because Phase 2 is uncertain, it might take years. Building commercial and office space is the recommended strategy; if it were housing you could build it in a second. I just want us to make sure we're protecting the assets we have.

Curt Brink discussed the UDC's decision to take 924 E. Main Street down versus the Plan Commission's motion to retain the façade. The team met with Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner to maintain the façade without the windows. Their thought is to deconstruct the façade, number the bricks and store it in a warehouse. Then they can incorporate it into the design as Phase 2 begins. While it's not a historic preservation project, it is a heritage project.

Doug Hursh spoke to saving the façade of 924 E. Main Street and the difficulty of integrating it into what it may look like in the future. There could be a plaque that discusses what happened in this building. The consultant they have engaged for the reflectivity study of 929 E. Washington Avenue has not yet completed the glare study in full but they do have preliminary thoughts to share with the Commission. The Commission briefly discussed what information they are looking for regarding reflectivity; the Chair expressed concern about procedure and deciding on something that isn't on the table. Brink noted they have been working with glass manufacturers, installers and the consultant to find these answers; the most reflectivity will be on the south side of the building facing the green roof, which is setback from other buildings in the neighborhood. The north side will receive some sun in the afternoon; preliminarily the consultant isn't too concerned but will run a model. The majority of the glass on the east and west sides are higher above grade on the building, so out of the cone of vision. They relooked at the Navitus building at West Place that uses a bit more reflective glass. The Chair again expressed concern that this was referred back to the Urban Design Commission by the Plan Commission to look at the glare study, but the study is not yet complete.

A motion was made by Carter to refer until the glare study is complete and presented to the Commission.

- Is it something we could defer to staff once the study is done? Do we need to see it?
- The Plan Commission asked us to evaluate the study. Carter confirmed that was the directive.
- We asked for information regarding reflectivity on the building. We didn't define that a consultant from Ontario had to do the study. The applicant came and provided information, they studied with other examples and kinds of glass and presented that information to us. We could say the study satisfies the Urban Design Commission.
- The Plan Commission asked for the Urban Design Commission to evaluate the study and I believe that's what the Plan Commission wants. We need to receive a study and not try to second guess whether the Plan Commission understood what they wanted. The summary from Urban Design Commission was very clear, the Plan Commission acted on that. We should receive that study as requested.
- I agree.
- The Plan Commission referred it back because they thought the opinions here would be able to evaluate the study. I appreciate all these thoughts and comments but they are not considered a "study" as was requested. We've seen a lot of shadow studies but we have not seen this kind of a study. The Plan Commission wants us to use our expertise to evaluate the study, it should be here for us to evaluate.
- I recall asking the question about glare. My intent for that, regardless of how the Plan Commission read it, was for the architect to do their due diligence to make sure they're not creating a problem. They're doing their study, I don't think the presentation of the study will allow us to offer any further findings on it. The objective was that the design team look at that; the design is approved as it is. I struggle with having the design team coming back to present it to us.
- It seems like if somebody's doing a study on this, certainly they're in a position to present us with something that is understandable to the general public, to summarize it. To go through the trouble and

expense of doing this study and then have us dismiss it when we asked for it…that seems strange to throw that away.

- Based on your study it's not going to give us a lot of reference. I think it would be very helpful to see some comparisons, samples in the area of reflectivity. That would help me; that would mean more to me than a data-filled study.
- The technical information, I don't know how I'll absorb that. I want to hear the final analysis. I'm counting on the people who run the study to come up with a recommendation that I can understand. The information isn't quite here yet.
- The motion didn't include the façade piece, or did it?
- The motion for referral is simply to refer the matter to a future agenda. The façade piece technically was never on our table since that's a demolition permit and we don't approve those. We had a comment we made to the Plan Commission based on our sense of design about the façade. The Plan Commission asked us to rethink our comment, we can do that if we want.
- Carter amended the motion to include just the reflective study.
- I would like to add to the motion that our recommendation for referral is strictly regarding the reflectivity and that there are no other design concerns other than the glare.

ACTION:

On a motion by Carter, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the glare study for 929 E. Washington Avenue. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Goodhart, Klehr, DeChant, Bernau, Harper and Carter voting yes; Weisensel and Braun-Oddo voting no.

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Weisensel, the Urban Design Commission **APPROVED** the plans for the design team to dismantle and store the building materials for 924 E. Main Street, and the Commission will review its reuse in the future. The motion passed on a vote of (8-0).

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** April 24, 2019
TITLE: 929 E. Washington Avenue – New Development of a Commercial/Office Mixed-Use Building Located in UDD No. 8. 6th Ald. Dist. (54198)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: April 24, 2019	**ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 24, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of new development of a commercial/office mixed-use building after reviewing a requested glare study.

Registered in support of the project were Curt Brink, Matt Brink, Doug Hursh, Ryan Danks and Andy Laufenberg, all representing Archipelago Village, LLC; and Mark Sheskey. Registered in opposition to the project was John Jacobs.

Danks gave a telephone presentation as the senior engineer and subject matter expert for the reflection related study. Any contemporary building will reflect light. They used a tool and a set of criteria developed internally with a survey that is very conservative. They have made two assumptions in this study: they've ignored the effect of cloud cover, and they've neglected the attenuation of light caused by the street trees, particularly along E. Washington Avenue and the areas to the north and south. They looked at several key areas in detail: E. Washington Avenue itself would experience glare 11-31 hours a year (0.7% of the daytime) that could impact drivers. Many of those are glancing reflections. Reflections on other buildings are assigned a lower risk. On the Lyric they see between 0.3-0.8% of the daytime reflection with high frequency occurring at the lowest level and decreasing as you go up the building. The street trees on Brearly Street will provide some attenuation and reduce that impact. They also looked at Breese Stevens field and found a small percent of the year where reflections would fall on the field (between 1-2.5%, mainly in summer evenings). The playing field itself is exposed less than 1% a year. The northwest façade as faceted in such a way that there is the potential for multiple reflections to converge; in this case while they did see multiple reflections converging, the times of day when that was possible is when the sun is starting to set making it less intense. The actual energy that the reflections contain at that time are well below the thresholds for risks related to heat gain and well below what Madison would naturally experience over the course of a day. Overall their conclusions are that they do not expect any thermal effects on people or property, and the visual impacts we are seeing are generally very brief, very infrequent and not atypical for any modern urban setting.

John Jacobs spoke in opposition to the project, noting concerns with low energy efficiency glass curtain walls. Madison requires a single-family residence to use R21 with up to 15% windows; this proposes R4 glass all around the building. Here we are with another glass box. You should be concerned with energy efficiency and the carbon footprint.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I commend you for having done the "test pilot" case on the glare study. I would feel comfortable with the conclusion that this is not above and beyond what other urban buildings do. This was a precedent-setting study for us. Can you address the energy efficiency of this building?
    - It's not really an all glass building. When you look at the front three façades of the large volume that sits on top, there's glass that runs from 30" above the floor to about 10-feet. The floor-to-floor heights are 13-foot and between that is a spandrel panel insulated like a typical wall using spandrel as the finishing material. In essence it's a ribbon window continuous around between floors 5-11 on three sides. The south side of the building has a lot more solid insulated panels and punched windows; the first 3 floors are not all glass, there's maybe less than 30% on those floors. It's an expensive glass with a low E.
- What is the percentage of glass versus solid of this particular building?
    - I don't know that number off the top of my head.
- Did you do an energy analysis, did you share those values with Plan Commission or UDC?
    - We have not shared those values. We've run a simple energy analysis and it does meet that. There's not energy model for this project.
    - We have to prove energy analysis is high enough or we won't get a permit. Each floor has its own separate HVAC unit. We meet the commercial code.
- Could you speak to the south side of the building in reference to the letter from a neighbor?
    - (Danks) We found that once you get south of the Capitol City Trail, the frequency of reflections drops to essentially none. The reason is that when the sun is in the southeast sky it's much higher up. That means the reflections from this building can't travel as far. Reflections on E. Washington Avenue travel much father because the sun is lower in the sky. We aren't concerned about any reflections south of the building, not the least of which because there's less glass on the southeast elevation, and is further back from the street because it's on top of the podium.
- Could you please also tell me what building codes did you use as a baseline? Did you go above and beyond those baselines for energy efficiency? Or did you only follow the baseline?
    - I don't think we're going above and beyond what's required by ASHRAE.
- I'm not disputing the observations and conclusions, but I don't think we should lightly gloss over some of these values they came up with, particularly on the street level on E. Washington Avenue. D1-D15 values are high. I'm not entirely comfortable that this is acceptable or normal.
- We should ask developers for an energy efficiency analysis.

ACTION:

On a motion by Weisensel, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** based on the thorough analysis presented by RWDI. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2).