



**Project Name/Address:** 115 South Hamilton Street

**Application Type:** Advisory recommendation of new development adjacent to a landmark building and the addition to a landmark on a landmark site

**Legistar File ID #** [34930](#)

**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

## Summary

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Mark Binkowski, Urban Land Interests

**Requested Action:** The submission materials show the proposed building adjacent to the Baskerville which would require an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission. It also proposes that a portion of the structure be built across the property line and connected to the landmark site of the Jackman Building which would be considered an addition and require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

The Landmarks Commission shall review the proposal as submitted. The applicant is requesting General Development Plan (GDP) review.

## Background Information

**Parcel Location:** The subject site is located in the first flat iron block off of the Capitol Square, which is bounded by South Hamilton, West Doty and South Carroll Streets. This development proposal is being constructed on the site of the Anchor Bank parking garage between two landmark buildings, the Jackman Building and the Baskerville.

### Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

**28.144 DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO A LANDMARK OR LANDMARK SITE.**

Any development on a zoning lot adjoining a landmark or landmark site for which Plan Commission or Urban Design Commission review is required shall be reviewed by the Landmarks Commission to determine whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark or landmark site. Landmarks Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission.

**33.19(5)(b)4 Regulation of Construction, Reconstruction and Exterior Alteration**

- a. Whether in the case of a designated landmark or landmark site, the proposed work would detrimentally change, destroy or adversely affect any exterior architectural feature of the improvement upon which said work is to be done; and
- b. Whether in the case of the construction of a new improvement upon a landmark site, the exterior of such improvement would adversely affect or not harmonize with the external appearance of other neighboring improvements on such site;

## Analysis and Conclusion

The property line of the Baskerville appears to run just at the face of the east facing wall of the Baskerville. The proposed building would physically touch the wall of the Baskerville with a newly constructed wing wall that appears to replicate the materials and details of the façade of the Baskerville. Staff noted that the elevations and plans differ in the way this connection is illustrated. Aside from the physical attachment, the construction of the new development would be on the adjacent property.

The submission materials show the existing property line of the Jackman Building and the proposed new building crossing the property line and attaching to the landmark building creating an addition to a landmark building. In response to 33.19(5)(b)4a, the proposed development would adversely affect the Jackman Building by concealing the windows of the southeast elevation. In response to 33.19(5)(b)4b the proposed development does not harmonize with the external appearance of the landmark Jackman Building. While the proposed building is well-suited to being a neighboring building to the landmark, the design and massing is not nuanced to the necessary level to be an appropriate addition to a landmark building.

The proposed development will return to the Landmarks Commission for Specific Implementation Plan (SIP) review after refining the project by working through technical land use and building code issues among other issues.

## Recommendation

Staff believes the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive and does not adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the Baskerville and recommends that the Landmarks Commission provide a similar recommendation to the Plan Commission.

Staff believes the proposed development, as an addition to a landmark site, will adversely affect the landmark Jackman Building and that the proposed development does not appropriately harmonize with the external appearance of the landmark Jackman Building; therefore, the standards are not met and staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission deny the COA for the development on a landmark site.

However, staff believes that with modifications to the proposal that would not cross the property line (thereby not crossing onto the landmark site), a finding could be made that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive and does not adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the Jackman Building and recommends that the Landmarks Commission provide a similar recommendation to the Plan Commission.