

- John Sheean spoke in opposition, noting mass and scale of building issues, attention diverted from tower scale and mass with neighborhood with site features as depicted, issue with inconsistency with existing setbacks along Wisconsin Avenue.
- Rosemary Lee spoke in support of the project.
- Paul Schoeneman opposes the project; questions a lack of a 10-foot setback exceeding the 50-foot height limit being ignored. He further questioned UDC's role in not enforcing. He noted the lakeside elevation was overwrought, more fussy and wedding cake-like. He further noted that bay windows on the 70's building will further impinge on the lakefront space.
- Curt Brink spoke in favor noting the deficiency in like access that exists now in comparison to what would be provided with the project. He further noted that the project will bring people down to the water with the stair access and will bring in young professionals.
- Fred Mohs spoke in opposition noting issues with the DNR's approval of the pier platform as not permissible, the existing pier as non-conforming; needs to meet code, its use as boat dock only with the dining extension of pier extension not allowed.
- James Tye spoke in favor noting that the project would soften the environment of the upper Wisconsin Avenue due to the extent of open space in the open space corridor.
- Jason Tish, Executive Director for the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation, also the Executive Director for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, noted the precedent of not meeting the district's requirements in setback and scale; where the project should be designed to conform with historic district with its tower addition. When questioned as to an appropriate height it was noted that four stories above the Langdon Street elevation with the mass of the building spread out along the lakeshore may be appropriate.
- John Martens spoke in opposition referencing memo distributed to the Commission noting issues with mass, form and location, superficial façade tweaking not affecting the mass. He further noted the building needs to integrate with the site more significantly, aesthetically and practically. He remarked that the building would pinch the view corridor which should be more of a concern along with a connection to the lake. He further noted the project provides for no new amenities with no plan for bike racks, no report from Traffic with no information on the demolition aspects of the project or public use details for the lower plaza.
- Craig Argall spoke in support noting the need to update the hotel where the public space as proposed is welcoming an attractive, nice job, give due consideration.
- Adele Zeller spoke in opposition noting the charge of the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission relevant to the PUD ordinance and requirements relevant to the compliance to existing zoning. She felt that the project did not adhere to the basis of the clause in addition to referencing the Landmarks action for rejection of the project as well as the project's noncompliance with the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Madison which supports 2 to 8 stories development on State Street but not on this site which would be less to comply.
- Jim McFadden, Architect, noted that the public plaza not visible from the city street, not public as a continuation of public space, as designed additional light view is minimal to spite the benefit of the removing two stories from the 70s building as proposed along with the upper plaza's primary function as an auto court. He further noted that alternatives to relocate parking to below the new building could be utilized to bring in more open space.
- Kitty Rankin, former Preservation Planner for the City of Madison, spoke in opposition noting that the building is too large for site and too large for the neighborhood. She further noted that the site was purposely omitted from the adjacent Downtown Design Zone which supports of maximum of 5 stories due to the pre-existing restriction of 50 feet because of the site's location within a historic district. She further noted existing agreements relevant to the right-of-way require a 10-foot setback from the right-of-way which is now being eliminated with the new agreement associated with the project. She

remarked upon questioning that the Landmarks Commission failed that all requirements were met except for volume and that the building should be no taller than Kennedy Manor where the new building is a visual intrusion into the existing right-of-way.

- Ald Bridget Maniaci spoke in favor emphasizing recent plan improvements which include seating features along the lakefront in an attempt to provide an active plaza space for area residents with some lawn incorporated, additional green space within the grand stair, along with her appreciation for the architectural response to the Urban Design Commission's previous comments as detailed by David Manfredi. She further noted her appreciation for symmetry of the site and building along with the mass where the height is appropriate for a commercial project.

In response to issues relevant to a new ordinance regarding the lakefront setback, Ald. Clear and Assistant City Attorney Kitty Noonan spoke to the ordinance amendments that would exempt commercial properties from the current setback requirements where appropriate setbacks will be provided as approved by the Plan Commission as part of its approval for lakefront development as proposed as part of the PUD. As a default, the underlying zoning would provide for the required setback.

Discussion by the Commission following testimony was as follows:

- Two levels of plaza so desperate one an auto plaza, one with amenities, need to find another way to get cars underground to parking to diminish the presence of the upper auto plaza.
- Not satisfied with plans and views of easterly loading dock, the need to figure way to move building back 30 feet to meet policy goal and ordinance.
- Site design on Wisconsin Avenue can be asymmetrical but building should be moved back.
- Plaza has too many activities going on, too bisected, surrounded by hardscape, activities on the edges are limited by additional hardscape around it; wish green space was back.
- Like more green. Lower Plaza is affected by its design programming.
- Want to know more about the pier and DNR approval process. In response to Bob Dunn, it was noted that the existing pier configuration as is is currently appropriate with the DNR and will commence with the application process following the City's timely consideration of the project.
- Concern with setback to a lesser extent the height.
- Concern with radius of turning movement into the ramp entry as reflected by the amount of hard pavement.
- Question tree height on lower plaza, concern with low trees; can see under versus higher trees where lower trees will block views.
- Like to see options on different designs for lower plaza's activity areas.
- The terminus circle at the end of the tower plaza doesn't relate to the line of the edge of the wall; the cantilever is too small, oval-shaped might not relate to architecture.
- Don't understand ice skating on plaza, less expensive to use lake, lake more public than plaza.
- The programming of space on the lower plaza excludes public where public only allowed on the perimeter; programming of space will exclude public.
- Saddened that no additional storm water improvements proposed because it's a redevelopment, need to do things that improve the water quality, need to do more than what has to be done.
- The car drop-off area looks bleak. Pulling back the building would not have a great impact on the design as it relates to Wisconsin Avenue.
- This is a PUD where we are never-the-less directed to honor the spirit of the underlying zoning and planning (Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan); the lack of a 30-foot setback an extra three floors violates two fundamentals of the existing district; problematic, a big issue.

- The plaza preposition as a public space problematic, can't see from street, should be able to see but obscured by parking place, the view of the actual plaza should be part of the public sphere, still needs to be punched up design not there yet, need to see site line diagram from the sidewalk.
- Address concern with all views from Langdon and beyond (include north side of Langdon Street).
- Question the loss of green space to fire access to the plaza site elevation.
- On lakefront setback issue, not provided at meeting. Want to know if building is customarily in keeping with ordinance.

A discussion of lakefront setback issues with staff including the PUD standards was provided with discussion by the Commission continuing as follows:

- Want to see street side view of loading elevation.
- Overall like new architecture.
- Problems with volume of the base of the tower at plaza and northerly extension, looks heavy. Detracts from the slimness of the above tower stories. Also problem with projecting windows into the right-of-way on face of the plaza side elevation.
- Question if the tower is too big, in breaking down façade to small scale is there enough change in plane on the southerly (plaza side) façade.
- It may not be our role to dictate the number of stories but does it feel right?
- Suggest a three piece composition from the lakeside point of view in regard to the relationship between the tower, the 70's building, and the 40's building as previously noted. The base interrupts with connectivity on the lakefront façade to the lake. In regard to signage, want to see how it is handled and integrated on the plaza side elevation.
- Not sure brown banding on the lower façade of the 40's building; should be cream colored as the rest of the building. In addition, not sure if lakeside signage is necessary for the Rigadoon Room.
- Check metal works accuracy on the restoring of the 40s building; use existing building's color for banding of the Rigadoon Room.
- Encourage with the design of the plaza especially dropping down.
- Disappointed about the lack of setback information and the lack of DNR approval information. Due to this don't feel that this design is not set and fixed on the site. Main issue is the lakefront setback east, west, and south have reasons.
- Problem with not figuring out to start out where to build and not to build.
- Applaud efforts at redesign improved over pervious.
- Less concern about lakeside setback but frustrated about waiting for details since August. Liked numbers to be provided.
- Concern about the setback from Wisconsin Avenue as Kitty Rankin. Request a look at pulling building back 10 to 15 feet to now its site, open space along Wisconsin Avenue in combination with pulling in stair and pushing building back to reduce encroachment. Pulling building back 15 feet from the property line may limit window openings. Need to know effect.
- Return with a simple diagram to detail building if it is pulled back 10 to 15 feet.
- Like what has been done but want to see exaggerating curving at lakefront elevation and pulling down glass façade.
- The 70s building horizontal element ties back to the 40s and is now lost with bay windows, squared-off bays and squared-off bays and in addition considered different material.
- Want the Plan Commission to start discussion with a motion to Plan Commission to initiate discussions but would have to come back for initial approval.

A motion by Slayton to grant initial approval failed for a lack of a second period. Wagner, in an effort to provide for forwarding the project for Plan Commission approval noted a need to allow for the initiation of the applicant's discussion with the Plan Commission. Discussion on the potential for a referral motion questioned the applicant's understanding of basic architectural issues associated and suggested modifications as to what was to be addressed. Manfredi noted the following:

- From a broader point of view beyond overall architectural character the lake elevation must be modified to try to manipulate that mass in order to make new construction more slender by pushing back the base and allowing it to come down and sit on the 40's level.
- Look at base on the 70's building with lakefront façade for issue with the amount of open space and configuration horizontally versus vertically.
- Research 40's building materials especially metal mullions.
- Obligation to create perspective from Langdon Street elevation looking west and push architecture.
- Investigate moving building back off of the right-of-way recessing stairs, balconies, and entries to further reduce encroachments.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** and provided recommendations to the Plan Commission that would permit them to begin their discussion with the many issues reserved and still here; expected to come back (to the Urban Design Commission) for additional consideration. The motion noted that the Urban Design Commission recommend the Plan Commission take up the discussion of the project, that we recognize the project has benefits in rectifying the mistakes of the 1970's building in creating lake presentation views, public use and lake access by the removal of the two stories of the 1970's building, that the restoration of the 1940s' building is also generally appropriately done by design and will result in the activation of the lakeshore with possibilities of enhancing lakeshore path development as a city goal, that we recommend the PC carefully consider the zoning issues of precedent for such a project and the other factors that they will weigh as part of the PUD. Additionally, we are requesting further information on stormwater and how that would be managed and more ideas on that, that we recognize and strongly recommend that the management agreement which will have to be considered, presumably in this case by the Board of Estimates, I would assume, strike a balance between programming and public use of the open space and that additionally they return with perspectives of lake views from Langdon Street and that the condition is that the lake setback needs to be approved for the present proposed design footprint through the City approval process as a condition for this design and that we will continue to explore with the design professionals and proponent setback alternatives as to whether they would be desirable. The motion directed the applicant to speak to the above-stated concerns raised in discussion by the Commission as the basis for address of the items noted within the referral motion. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 5, 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 666 Wisconsin Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	5			5	6	6
	6	6	6			6	5	5
	5	5	5			7	7	6
								7

General Comments:

- Comments for discussion much too lengthy to list.
- Good progress; explore setback.
- Too tall, where is the architectural invention? Why not?
- Wow.