

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 2 October 2017

TITLE: 118-122 State - Advisory
Recommendation for development
adjacent to Landmark, 4th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5 October 2017

ID NUMBER: 49062

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

SUMMARY:

Jeff Vercauteren, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Matt Prescott, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Fred Mohs, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Prescott provided a brief introduction to and summary of the proposal. Staff explained that, based on the evidence provided, it seems restoration was not realistic for 122 State. The Applicant plans to retain the majority of the original building at 118 State.

Rummel asked about the Downtown Plan as it pertains to the project. Staff said that it's Zoning that requires the step back at four stories on State Street. Vercauteren asserted that the building complies with the Downtown Plan, which is difficult considering the proposal's site.

Levitan asked if Staff would address her conclusion that the State Street façade is in compliance with Zoning Code 28.144, but the Carroll Street façade is not. He asked if it's possible to alter the project in a way to make the latter less visually intrusive. Staff responded that the Carroll Street side doesn't have much of a buffer between a new building and the existing ones. Staff doesn't feel as though the Commission can/should solve this issue with design solutions, but suggested they discuss it.

Prescott indicated that the State Street side was the focus of the project, and that Carroll Street was more challenging. The window extrusion to create contemporary bays was an attempt to be visually compatible with 114 and 126 State Street, both of which have similar bay windows.

Rummel asked about changing the upper bays on the Carroll Street façade. Staff confirmed that it was an option and explained that the current iteration is the most compatible thus far. Rummel asked how deep the window bays were. The Applicant responded that they're not extreme – they're a "hint" of a bay.

Arnesen asked about the step back on the 6th floor on Carroll Street. The Applicant indicated that it's three feet. Levitan asked if the entrance canopy aligned with the bays on 114 State. The Applicant isn't certain, as the architect is not present.

Rummel asked about the bay on the Lamb House and how it relates to the proposal's façade. The façade of the Lamb House protrudes further than the proposal's.

Rummel asked where the drop off/porte cochere is. The Applicant confirmed that it would be on Carroll Street with a valet. Rummel asked whether the design of the front door is actually a front door. The Applicant responded that, in order to make sure Dayton Street isn't an afterthought, the Carroll Street entrance was not treated differently than the one on Dayton.

Arnesen commented that he finds this to be a tremendous improvement compared to previous designs, and is much better than the current building.

Mohs discussed the Downtown Plan and the four story height requirement on State Street. Mohs believes that, if this proposal is approved and built, it will set a precedent for buildings over four stories on State Street.

At the request of the Chair, Staff confirmed that the purview of the Landmarks Commission is strictly set within the parameters of Zoning Code 28.144, and that the Plan Commission has jurisdiction over the Downtown Plan. Staff explained that where plans are adopted by council they become official policy of the city. Arnesen also commented that the Landmarks Commission does not refer to the Downtown Plan when making decisions.

Verveer indicated that the Downtown Plan was adopted by the Common Council, where the issue of compatibility of the proposed project and the Downtown Plan will be discussed. He went on to comment on the timeline of the application. He suggested that the Landmarks Commission refer the proposal in order to accommodate the Neighborhood Association's desire to meet and weigh in on it.

Rummel asked about what material would be used on the Carroll Street façade. Per the Applicant, it would be cast stone. Rummel asked if the scale of that stone would make much difference in the façade's appearance. Staff indicated that it would probably not.

Rummel commented that the height is quite noticeable. Prescott replied that every effort was made to make the building smaller from a pedestrian's perspective. From the ground, the appearance is not nearly as looming as the aerial views imply.

Kaliszewski asked what would happen if this proposal is denied based on its size. The Applicant responded that if it is not approved, it cannot be scaled down in a financially viable way. Arnesen commented that removing a floor wouldn't have any effect on the visual intrusiveness. He went on to ask if there might be a way to step it back on Carroll Street. Levitan commented that to do that on Carroll Street would require a change on the Dayton side as well, which may require a significant redesign.

Rummel asked why they couldn't replicate the State Street façade on the other sides. The Applicant said that the masonry and the pop-out bays make for a more pleasant pedestrian experience on the non-State façades.

Levitan asked about the view on the Carroll Street side. He noted that the bays on 114 State protrude more than the façade of the hotel. The Applicant confirmed that that was correct. Levitan finds that the masonry and zinc breaks up the façade effectively.

The Commission feels that State Street façade is successful.

With regard to the Carroll Street façade, Arnesen opined that this elevation is less successful related to the adjacent landmark. He explained that the building is visually intrusive and that a 5 to 10-foot step back above the fourth floor on Carroll Street would make it less visually intrusive.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the proposed State Street façade is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made by Rummel and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the proposed Carroll Street façade is so large and visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote, with Kaliszewski, Rummel, and Hill in favor; Arnesen opposed.