

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 7/9/18
TITLE: 118-126 State St - Development Adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark; 4th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: 7/11/18	ID NUMBER: 51562

Members present were: David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, and Lon Hill.
Members excused were: Stuart Levitan, Anna V. Andrzejewski, and Katie Kaliszewski.

SUMMARY:

Jeff Vercauteren, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Ken Gowland, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Eric Nordeen, registering in support and available to answer questions.
Matt Prescott, registering in support and available to answer questions.
Fred Mohs, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.
Sam Chehade, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Franny Ingebritson, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Staff provided a summary of the staff report and recommendations for the State Street and North Carroll Street elevations. Vercauteren summarized the feedback they received from the Commission at the May 14 meeting and how that is reflected in the updated designs.

Gowland thanked the Commission for the in-depth critique provided during their last review of the project, specifically related to the materials, massing, and bulk at the top of the structure. He noted that in the previous iteration, limestone extended all the way up the building, and the Commission felt it was very heavy and didn't reinforce the datum at the fourth floor. In response to those comments, they revised the proposed materials for the top floors to include glass with steel detailing and cornice work at the top, which Gowland noted is reminiscent of other historic structures downtown. He explained that they reserved the limestone for the base, which allowed them to break up the building design to create a more confined scale and remove the monolithic feeling. He stated that the proposed design changes better respect the rhythm along State Street and are simplified and streamlined, which provides more autonomy to the two flanking historic buildings on either side.

Arnesen noted that the new design is a drastic change from the previous iteration, and asked the applicant to explain how the addition of windows on the side elevations will work for the hotel. Gowland pointed out that there is metal paneling as well, so they are not all windows and some are reliefs. Arnesen clarified that the Carroll and State Street façades are glass above where it is stepped back, and Gowland confirmed. He stated that they felt this design provided a more meaningful separation between the lower and upper floors, but still allowed it to read as singular building.

11 e 12

Arnesen asked if the building was stepped back further after the fourth floor than in previous iterations. Gowland stated that it is not stepped back any further, as they decided to address the scale by changing the materials.

Arnesen asked if they removed a story from the building. Gowland stated they did not. Arnesen asked if he was missing where the stepped back top floor was, and Gowland explained that they did push the top floor in further toward the middle, away from the parapet, to try and bring the scale down.

Rummel asked if the new design is still exceeding the height of the Downtown Plan. Vercauteren stated that 88' is currently allowable under the Downtown Plan, and their design reaches 95' at the top of the parapet. He explained that from the pedestrian view, one cannot see the top of the roof, but it is currently at 107'. Nordeen pointed out that the new design is 11' shorter than what they had originally submitted last fall.

Mohs expressed his concern about the height mass. He noted that the Downtown Plan was adopted recently and should be followed. He stated that if we are going to allow new buildings that are taller than what is permitted, what does this mean to the rest of State Street? He pointed out that if this is approved, then it means the height requirement is no longer enforceable. He detailed the extensive time and effort the Downtown Plan took to create, and stated that now it will all be gone. He noted that if they say yes to this project, it will be difficult to say no to anyone else in the future. He pointed out that State Street is supposed to be a historic street, and asked if we still care about maintaining that. Rummel read the Commission's charge in terms of their advisory recommendation to PC and UDC, and asked Mohs if he felt it was still too large and visually intrusive based upon that. Mohs responded that it is.

Chehade, the owner of neighboring Michelangelo's Coffeehouse, stated that he supports the project and does not think the new design is intrusive. He stated that as it is now, this portion of State Street is not very appealing, and he believes the new design respects the architectural and historical integrity of the adjacent buildings, and will also be good for the community. He pointed out that that the new design complements and enhances the beauty of the landmark building.

Ingebritson stated that this development should focus on State Street all the way to Library Mall, but the developers are focusing on the square. She handed out images of State Street to show how tall the other buildings are. She noted that the staff recommendation was a surprise to her, and stated that it seems the Commission will not consider how this project does not complement or positively contribute to the setting of the Lamb Building. She expressed that it does not create a pleasing visual relationship with the landmark building.

Arnesen stated that the new design is a vast improvement to the existing buildings, and he does not find it to be too large or visually intrusive. Rummel pointed out that she thinks large and visually intrusive are two different questions, but in terms of being visually intrusive, she finds the new design to be dramatically improved and it is an attractive building that no longer overpowers the historic storefronts. Arnesen agreed that it is a big improvement on the State Street elevation. Hill stated that he likes the new materials, which give an appearance of being more compact compared to the previous designs. He noted that the goal was to get the landmark buildings to stand out, and he thinks they accomplished that.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Hill, to advise PC and UDC that the State Street and Carroll Street elevations are not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the façades of the adjoining landmark. The motion passed by voice vote.

11012

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

July 9, 2018

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



Project Name/Address: 118-126 State
Application Type: Alteration adjacent to landmark (Lamb Building)
Legistar File ID # 51562
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared: July 1, 2018

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Eric Nordeen
Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting development adjacent to a Designated Landmark.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located adjacent to a Designated Landmark at 114 State Street.

Relevant Zoning Code:

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 Landmark 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. Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission.

Analysis and Conclusion

The Applicant is proposing to develop four contiguous properties on State Street that also have frontages on West Dayton Street and North Carroll Street. One of those properties is adjacent to the Lamb Building, a designated landmark. The Lamb Building is a narrow building on an angled through lot with elevations on both State Street and North Carroll Street. Each elevation of the landmark building is viewed against the proposed development differently and will be described separately in this analysis.

A different version of this project was reviewed by the Landmarks Commission on October 2, 2017 (Legistar 49062). Since that review, the buildings at 124 and 126 State were acquired and those sites have been incorporated into the project thus resulting in a larger overall development and a significantly changed appearance. The larger project was reviewed on May 14, 2018 (Legistar 51562) and the item was referred to a future meeting for action.

The existing building at 118 State is adjacent to the Lamb Building along the Lamb Building's western property line that runs from State Street to North Carroll Street. The proposed development will maintain a portion of the buildings at 118 and 126 State while the entirety of the existing 6 story building at 122 State and the 2 story building at 124 State will be demolished.

11e12

The building at 118 was constructed in 1897 as the original location of the Mautz Brothers Paint Company. Mautz would later become one of Madison's largest industries. The Mautz Building was constructed before the adjacent landmark, Lamb Building. The Lamb Building is architecturally significant because it was designed by master architect, Louis Claude of the local architecture firm of Claude and Starck. The Lamb Building was constructed in 1905 in the Queen Anne style. The Lamb Building is also historically significant because the master architect had an office in the commercial building.

The Lamb Building was designed with the Mautz Building (118 State) and the Wisconsin Building (102 State) as its neighbors. The three buildings have held the top of State Street since 1905. The Lamb Building has been flanked by period buildings that provide it an appropriate immediate context and the proposed development will change that context.

State Street

On State Street, the front portion of the building at 118 will remain directly adjacent to the Landmark. The proposed new building has been articulated to create a rhythm that is similar to the storefront bay widths typically found on State Street. A four story mass has been pulled out to the sidewalk. The facades of 118 and 126 remain as bookends to the new construction at the street level. Additional stories have been added above 118 and 126, but are held back significantly. A deep step back occurs above the fourth story and the new development increases in height to 8 stories, then to 9 stories after an additional step back. The mass of this taller portion is pushed to the North Carroll and West Dayton corner.

The retention of the 118 façade allows the Lamb Building to have a buffer building of similar scale and material qualities at the street level. The retention of the 126 façade provides a bookend treatment and contains the new development between buildings of historic context.

The simple design of the 4 story base building with hints of traditional construction methods and detailing provide an appropriate vocabulary in the context of State Street. While the limestone material palette is uniform at this portion of the building, the abundant use of glass, set in traditional openings with window frames, offsets the visual heaviness that was felt with the previous version.

North Carroll Street

The same 4 story limestone base is carried over to the North Carroll Street elevation. The base relates to the height of the building at the corner of State and North Carroll. The base is capped by a strong cornice line and above the cornice, the architectural vocabulary changes to metal and glass. The 8 story portion of the development is located toward the West Dayton Street and North Carroll Street corner, and there is no step back at the property line adjacent to the landmark site.

The size, style and pattern of the windows break down the mass and scale of the large building and make it more compatible with the smaller adjacent buildings.

Recommendation

The recommendations relates to the two different street frontages.

Regarding the State Street frontage, staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission find that the new development is large, but not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the primary façade of the adjoining landmark.

Regarding the North Carroll frontage, staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission find that the new development is large, but is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the secondary façade of the adjoining landmark.

11e12