URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING REPORT

November 9, 2022

Agenda Item #: **5**

Project Title: 415 N. Lake Street - Planned Development (PD), New Lake Street Public Parking Ramp and Mixed-Use Building. 2nd Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 73342

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Russell Knudson, Jessica Klehr, Christian Harper, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold and Juliana Bennett

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of November 9, 2022, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new public parking ramp and mixed-use building located at 415 N. Lake Street. Registered and speaking in support were Nathan Gundrum, Michael Oates and John Chapman. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Claire Lommen, representing Mortenson; Katherine Hitch, Carter Lanser and Shane Grandbois. Registered in support but not wishing to speak were London Donohoe, Jill Drickell, Matt Maney, Dan Lessor, Tom Atchinson, Carson Bantle, Allison Petrick, Lauren McAndrews, Emily Habeck, Ellie Brockman, Lauren Summers, Ann Magne, Marissa Iacully, Mallory Kuppe, Martha Lucas, Julia Rosendahl, Joe Xiang, Meredith Buenz, Lauren Stenbeck, Blair Steele, Abigail Thornton, Jacqueline McLellan, Maggie King, Dylan Kiratli, Abigail Hinck and Taylor Duerr. Registered and speaking in opposition was Eli Tsarovsky, representing the Campus Area Neighborhood Association.

Matthew Mikolajweski, City of Madison Economic Development Director, gave a brief overview of the RFP process to partner with a private developer to redevelop new structured public parking, an inter-city bus terminal in a downtown location, and additional housing opportunities, all of which will activate Lake Street. They are making very good progress on coming to terms with a development agreement that will serve the needs of the City, Parking Utility, and Mortensen Development.

Nate Gundrum, Mortenson Development, gave a brief overview of the design revisions since the Informational Presentation in early September, including removal of balconies to clean up the façade, softening of the dark color to a medium gray for less stark contrast between the black and the white, and the addition of whimsical, accentuated pops of color added to the backside of building. Concerns at the Informational Presentation were expressed on the use of traditional EIFS, and using white EIFS adjacent to white metal panel, which has resulted in a refined and simplified enclosure palette. Traditional EIFS has been eliminated altogether and landscaping has been incorporated into roof areas and the green roof in the updated in design. The development team has been working with City Engineering, Streets, and Parking Utility on the design of Hawthorne Court.

John Chapman, EUA Architects, provided an overview of proposed development. The ground floor plan uses include the new bus terminal, housing component entry and amenity areas, and parking separated into two structures. The main public parking would enter and exit off Lake Street and ramp up in a circular fashion. The lower level parking would be accessed off of Hawthorne Court, privatized and segregated from the public parking and used for the housing component. Buses would enter off Hawthorne Court and exit out onto Lake Street. As you circulate up there are housing units along Lake Street (loft units), making the parking structure not visible from Lake Street. Four bridges in total connect the Frances Street project over Hawthorne Court. The top of the podium, which begins the housing component and tower form, includes an amenity space on the podium. At the top of the building there is a roof terrace that will

have expansive views to Lake Mendota and to campus to the west. Sections views illustrate the levels of parking, the levels of housing above and the connectivity to the Frances Street ramp. Also illustrated is the elevator overrun, which exceeds the Capitol View Preservation limit by eight-feet. Various exterior renderings from multiple viewpoints were presented. Building materials include masonry, concrete block for the parking elevations, a mix of metal panel and hardi-plank panel for the housing component, as well as some paver systems and glass.

Eli Tsarovsky spoke in opposition, representing the Campus Area Neighborhood Association, presenting some views from the steering committee with concerns to this project, relation to the business zero initiative, the bus terminal and the housing component. One of the concerns is its impact on local businesses and the way it interacts with University Avenue. There are multiple modes of traffic being pushed down Hawthorne Court, which presents risks to pedestrians and people who live on Hawthorne Court, as well as a major BRT line down University. Regarding the housing component, they are unsure if the swimming pool is a necessary component as housing is pinched in Madison. A few solutions that they wanted to offer for consideration included moving the entrances for the bus terminal and parking to Lake Street to reduce traffic to Hawthorne Court, which currently functions as an alleyway and has no controlled traffic signals; looking at considering all of the modes of traffic when designing Hawthorne Court, and also looking to activate Hawthorne Court as a pedestrian amenity and looking at a comprehensive traffic and environmental study. The committee knows that the development team and the City can give us a better vision.

- Can you expand upon the local business feedback you have received?
    - There are various emergency exits on Hawthorne Court, as well as people entering from the businesses and the apartment building. Currently when they are stepping onto Hawthorne Court they are stepping into cars, those will turn into Badger buses and present more risk to people. The businesses to the right of Hawthorne Court are closer to Frances Street and have delivery drivers picking up food; we are concerned with how will those businesses work? There is a lack of input taken from local businesses with this plan. Moving stuff from Hawthorne Court to Lake Street would be a better plan than what we are seeing now.
- You mentioned high pedestrian flow, do you have any numbers? Or an idea of what high pedestrian flow means to you?
    - Game days, there are a lot of bars with emergency exits onto Hawthorne Court, we are worried about those exits being impacted by the buses and what that may do to the businesses on that street. Not sure if those would be able to function as emergency exits and impacts to businesses related to occupancy.
- Has the steering committee worked with the developer or City staff about these issues?
    - We have had conversations with City staff and the development team, we presented solutions that are not seen in the current proposal.
- Can you inform us of feedback from residents?
    - Residents are excited about the housing opportunities. There is also concern about the environmental impact of cars on Hawthorne Court, including exhaust and air pollution from cars.
- How does your solution help bolster vision zero?
    - Moving vehicular traffic to Lake Street is a plus for this project. Lake Street has a controlled intersection with wide turn lanes. Hawthorne Court doesn't function like that right now, buses turning will have to cross a BRT lane and unprotected bike lane and pedestrian traffic, there are too many lanes of traffic to cross in an uncontrolled setting.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Programming for the outdoor space – what will be the programming in the courtyard?
    - At the high roof level outdoor space with landscaping and green roof, social area, grills, game areas, movable seating. The podium level, sits above the parking garage which is adjacent to an indoor fitness center that extends into the outdoor podium area for outdoor exercise. There is some space program for games and lounging adjacent to the pool, gill areas, private tenant patios, movable seating as well.

- I'm disappointed more hasn't been done to passively activate the large uninteresting east and north elevations, and how that might contribute to activing Hawthorne Court. Not in terms of lighting or improvements in Hawthorne Court itself, but in terms of the actual architecture and how it addresses activation along Hawthorne Court, there's not much going on there.
- On Sheet L1.0, there is a note that states there is six-inches of planting depth in the mulch is too much, it should be more like three-inches.
- Have silva cells been discussed for the street trees along Lake Street, giving them a more viable chance of living?
    - We can discuss that with our landscape architect.
- It may be out of their control if it is in the right-of-way.
- It would certainly be a conversation between the development team and Forestry. It can happen, the development team will have to design and pay for it, it would need approval in coordination with Forestry. It would be a good idea in this high trafficked area close to State Street.
- What is the finish of the columns along the Lake Street first floor façade?
    - We have talked about potentially a metal panel. We are showing them as exposed concrete. Immediately behind the columns is the glass and the metal that you can see into the habitable space/entry lobby for the housing component. Something we want to work through with the City and the development team.
- Has anything been explored for getting that elevator overrun out of the Capitol View Preservation Limit?
    - The alternative would be eliminating that amenity space on the high roof that is the only way to get rid of the eight-foot overrun. The overrun has been reduced in size to the bare minimum square footage and only encompasses the elevators necessary to get to that space, and are located in the center of the building footprint, so you don't see it from 3 of the 4 long views.
    - We do feel very confident that we can do it for less than eight-feet, probably be about a foot less than that.
- Is it within the scope of our role to make any recommendations based off of the traffic flow of Hawthorne Court?
- Yes, it is because this is integral with urban design, and there was a memo from Tom Lynch that showed a couple of alternatives and the rationale for going with this design. That could be part of our advisory recommendation.
- (Secretary) I would agree, it fits within the Planned Development standards. I would note that Sean Malloy from Traffic Engineering is here, and could speak to how they transitioned through the conceptual design to where we are today.
- The columns warrant something more than just a plain concrete, burnished or something that would elevate that a little bit.
- The traffic study seems to stop at the development. I'm not clear on what happens between the development and State Street on Hawthorne and how traffic flows if we make Hawthorne a one-way, how that affects the development or the existing apartments passed the development. How does circulation work for everyone further into Hawthorne Court?
    - As it exists it is two-way traffic. There's a very small sidewalk that's not very safe at 2-3 feet wide. The proposal is to turn Hawthorne Court from two-way into one-way traffic, allowing us to increase the pedestrian realm three times the width from two feet to a seven-foot sidewalk. Vehicle access is off University Avenue one-way to the north, exiting through a public easement westbound onto Lake Street. In addition, the City has made available loading zones which are not there today on University Avenue, and has also made loading zones available on Lake Street. There is twelve times the amount of pedestrian traffic on Lake Street compared to Hawthorne Court.
- As you go up there's two-way traffic in and out of the parking structure. If you come out of the parking structure, and take a left, then you're directed out past the buses?
    - Yes.
- What about the apartments just outside the greyed area towards State Street?
    - Traffic to the north of the development would travel south and exit out onto Lake Street.

- Coming south and going next to the buses again, it's two-way up until the buses?
    - Yes.
- As far as the general appearance of the building, the color is fine, it looks like you're trying to match the brick in the panel above. It would look nicer or lighter if you went to a lighter contrasting panel on the two towers, there needs to be more contrast between the brick and the panels, and it looks heavy.
- The details provided by City Transportation on why Hawthorne Court vs. Lake Street was a very helpful, thorough analysis. In that spirit, I appreciated the comments about enhancing the plantings more, little more mature or significant that could be a very nice feature in that goal of activing Lake Street even more.
- What is happening at Level P4, is it a two story atrium condition, better understand the open to below note?
    - There are two loft units in the four levels of the parking structure. The left is the first floor of the loft units and the right is the upper level of the loft units. It is a two story space in the residential portion of the building.
- The encroachment into the Capitol Preservation Limit is very unfortunate, if almost not passable, in my opinion. I do commend the team on fitting as many stories in as you did, we're all behind the idea of more housing. However that elevator overrun is really, really quite unfortunate in trying to get this building to work in this location. What studies have been done to increase housing density with less floors to bring this building down under that limit? Does removing the loft do anything in that direction? Also an open thought to the whole group about whether the podium might be allowed to be taller to get more units into the courtyard area to bring the height down.
    - From a tower footprint perspective this 'U' shape is ideal for maximizing the amount of daylight into the units from a health and wellness perspective. Other shapes were considered, but they, in our opinion did not have enough daylighting into the units. We could look at a different concept the loft units potentially.
- I wouldn't recommend a fully enclosed courtyard, maybe one or two stories more that encloses that 'U' shape, it would not be perceived by street level pedestrians. Curious if something like that would maintain housing units but keep the height down?
    - Are you suggesting adding a couple of floors above the lofts along Lake Street to make it an "o" for a couple levels and then 'U' shaped above that?
    - We had done some long range views that show the elevator overrun.
- Yes. The full plan set has some of the views you're talking about. I'm seeing view #2 on A 406 that appears to be from further down University Avenue, you can't see the Capitol from there anyway from a pedestrian level but you certainly see those elevator overruns. We may have the information you're talking about, just not in the presentation file.
- The data presented on the pedestrian flow between Lake Street and Hawthorne Court was misleading. The concern is not just pedestrian flow, but times of day that Hawthorne Court is being used currently and who is using it. Currently there are people lined up on the court, how do you expect to control for inebriated college kids in that generally use the court and where bars to do not have places right now to line-up these kids? The concern is a bunch of drunk college kids with big buses driving through a small court, through a small lane. How are we going to mitigate that issue?
    - We've had discussions with Tom Lynch, there is only one bus currently scheduled to use the terminal during bar time. In his memo, even during bar time between 11:00 p.m.-1:00 a.m. there are still three times the amount of pedestrians using Lake Street than Hawthorne Court. The current sidewalk width that is used by patrons of the bars is two feet, by switching it to one-way traffic we can give more of that overall width to pedestrians and widen that realm from two to seven feet. We can't control inebriated college students but we can give them a wider pedestrian zone.
- It is false comparing Hawthorne Court to Lake Street when the entrance is University Avenue. How does this pedestrian traffic compare when you add the data usage from University Avenue traffic which is the entrance to the court?
    - I don't have that data. But there is only one bus using the court at bar time.

- The Liquid, their emergency exit is on Hawthorne Court, that is their main exit and their capacity could go down from over 1,000 to just about 300 people. How will you account for the impacts of utilizing Hawthorne Court for local businesses that have emergency exits there and how those exits impact their capacity? There is limited parking on University Avenue for drivers to pick-up their food, where will they go?
    - We are aware that maintaining emergency exits is of concern, and have been in contact with business owners, we will maintain those and expand the sidewalk from two to seven feet to make that condition even safer. There were also concerns with regard to loading and unloading. The City is making accommodations for loading zones off University Avenue and Lake Street to serve that purpose.
- Also, what about delivery drivers to pick up food. Where will they go?
    - The city will introduce loading zones on Lake Street and University Avenue for the purpose of serving delivery drivers.
- What would it take for you to provide those numbers with regard to pedestrian traffic?
    - I'd need help from the City on that.
- (Mikolajewski): Traffic Engineering does not currently have pedestrian counts on that section of University Avenue. We as a City would need to get those counts.
- (Malloy): For a weekend count, we could probably do in the next two weeks or so. We do have quite a bit of cameras in the area, we could do a count with our cameras there. To clarify, is it a count of pedestrians on University as they cross Hawthorne Court?
- Pedestrians use the court when there's not enough space on University Avenue. It is equally important to study Lake Street and compare the pedestrian flow and impact of those numbers. It's not just the court, it's the pedestrian flow on University.
    - OK, the crosswalk of Hawthorne Court.
- For urban design purposes, we do need to take into consideration the alternative to the present plan as per the staff memo from Tom Lynch, almost doubling the driveway entrance on Lake Street or at least the percentage of the overall street length that the project would be dedicated toward driveways. We need to grapple with this so that the ground floor isn't just all driveway entrances and exits, to preserve the alleyway of Hawthorne Court.
- I agree with that comment. I appreciate the Traffic memo, it helps us understand, and I'm going to trust that Traffic staff knows way more than I do. The good part is that it's getting buses off the street for people waiting with their luggage; there are some positives in there.
- The overrun isn't as much about the views, it's about setting precedence. We either really protect this or we don't. I appreciate recognizing it may not be a big vision thing, this is precedent for future projects.
- I commend you on how you've set this up, it is smart to have residences facing Lake Street and not the parking, it's a huge improvement. Appreciate the colors you're working with.
- Is this allowable that somebody has no choice but to go under the canopy to get through the sidewalk? It concerns me that if it's crowded, the sense of who owns the sidewalk sense, it blocks others trying to get through.
- (Secretary) They are allowed and would need a right-of-way encroachment permit and would need to enter in to an agreement with the city.
- I'd like to see a night rendering, I'm curious how people will know buses are coming and going, what kind of lighting there will be, if it gets mixed up with the commercial lighting and spaces, it's a busy part of the city, especially with events going on downtown. How all the signage is going to work, night renderings might help understand that.
- Do you have demarcated seating areas at the pool to allow for privacy, or are there apartments next to the pool next to floor to ceiling windows of someone's apartment?
    - There are student housing units on the south and east sides of the pool. The north side is the athletic club and some green squares and rectangles on the east and south sides, those are to privatize the units from the public area.
- This is an improved project from what we first saw. The façade on Lake Street is much better without the balconies. Overall it presents well, pretty attractive building. Appreciate the color elements, but a, confused about the red color, appears more terracotta-ish, appreciate the effort put into the landscaping on the amenity

areas, nice to see the green sedum roofs and planters, nice selection of plants listed on there. The bench planters shown on the ground level along the front of the building are ridiculously small, will get vandalized and will never hold what you have listed; should be revisited with your landscape architect. There should be way more planters along the front of this building this size.

- Consider all those ugly concrete pillars, something should be done with those. You could improve and soften the entrance to the building with more planters (six or seven) and plantings.
- I'll reiterate the comment about going the extra mile for tree health in front of this building.
- Regarding the elevator overrun, from the development team's standpoint you probably feel it's ridiculous that this is important. But it is and that's why this height limit exists. It seems to be more and more of an issue with projects that push it right to the limit and want an exception for a mechanical unit on the roof. To comply you would remove an entire floor of housing, but we also respect this height limit, and if it means something it needs to be respected. I am especially troubled when developments are being built from scratch, you got good architects, I refuse to believe these buildings can't be tweaked in many different ways to not have these exceptions. We know from other projects that you can pick your long views from wherever and make it look how you want it to. We don't know what the views are from multiple other taller buildings in the neighborhood or on campus, or what's in the future.
- (Secretary) Generally, the projection is allowed with a conditional use, to include mechanical equipment, but it needs to be demonstrated that it is the minimum necessary to provide the required access per the building code.
- (Firchow) It is defined in state statute and city ordinance. The elevator overrun is approvable, but only by conditional use, which is the purview of the Plan Commission. It is the only body that can grant that approval. UDC can certainly provide advisory comments.
- It's not as earth shatteringly precedent setting because it is something by ordinance the Plan Commission can grant approval of as a conditional use. Church steeples and other things are allowed to be in that area, but they want it to be the absolute minimum necessary to get that equipment to work while keeping the datum of that main roof level where you want to limit protrusion into that protrusion view zone that is a mile around the Capitol.
- North and south ends of the building that are mostly parking garage, the material listed is decorative concrete block. You're playing fast and loose with what decorative means, it just looks like a plain dark grey block; there is nothing decorative to it at all. Look at articulating or using surface treating that visible to make it more aesthetically pleasing.
- I appreciated the report by Tom Lynch giving us the thought process for the Hawthorne Court bus terminal traffic. We desperately need a bus station like this, but I am disappointed this is the spot it ended up because it is problematic as everybody is noting. Given the concerns and reading the rationale behind how they needed up where they did, I begrudgingly have to agree that most of the decisions made on it seem to be the correct ones. How many buses a day would come in here?
    - In my discussion with Tom Lynch, the number was 20.
- (Mikolajewski): That's what I recall as well.
- That's a relatively modest number of times per day the buses will come through there. I don't think we should overstate that impact. The improvements in there, particularly that widened sidewalk is really important. Twenty buses a day are not going to blocking those emergency exits, I don't see that as an issue. While I kind of wish this was in a different place, given the constraints it seems like they have presented the best solution.
- Clarity on the shape of a motion.
- (Secretary) There are two parts to this: The UDC Approval is for the public building portion, just the building, which could take the form of Initial/Final with or without conditions. The UDC is Advisory on the Planned Development, making a recommendation with outlined considerations you are recommending the Plan Commission to adopt. Anything related to the PD include design elements on Hawthorne Court, elevator overrun, landscaping and open spaces, and excess height.
- (Firchow) Since this is one Legislative item, it would be best course to have one motion in multiple parts.

- There were some items outside the public building considerations such as silva cells, the development of Hawthorne Court, the affirmation of the building height and number of stories (has 16 floors but reads as 12). The Plan Commission would be granting a conditional use on that, the Plan Commission would appreciate our findings on the height. And with regard to the public building, it is all four elevations, materials, colors and lighting, garage wall exposure and materials, and colors. You could entertain a motion that states Initial, Final, or referred, with the following advisory recommendations to the Plan Commission.

A motion was made by Knudson for Initial Approval of the building and recommendations to the Plan Commission on the Planned Development. He noted his motion was for Initial because the elevator overruns are there to access the rooftop amenities, not to access the machinery for the floors below.

Discussion on the motion was as follows:

- The shaft overrun is the height listed at the top, you can see the Capitol View Limit on the right. It is just the overrun portion that's exceeding the height limit, not the lobby or other components that get you to the roof.
    - The elevator lobby is the roof height, which is labeled on the left, the elevator shaft, just the overrun of the elevator to the right. Just the overrun exceeding the height limit, not the elevator lobby.
- This is an elevator serving the roof top plaza. I don't think the rooftop plaza is a strong enough reason to do this. It's not a key feature of this important project. My Initial Approval is based on a building that avoids going above that cap limit with an elevator there to serve a rooftop plaza.
    - The elevator getting to the rooftop plaza is allowing people to get there, but also the availability to the mechanical equipment that is under the Capitol view limit that resides on the roof on the portion that is not habitable. Getting equipment up there, it does serve that function as well.
- My motion remains, and I would suggest that as a Commission we might entertain some studying of how we can get more units on lower levels to still keep the overall housing units comparable. That might include evaluating that "O" style courtyard for one or two floors, as well as a strong encouragement for more substantial plantings along Lake Street for a strong activation design element, night renderings, noting also avoidance of excessive pedestrian lighting (there's a note in memo about ordinance), and more articulation on the garage wall expanses.

The motion was seconded by Bennett.

- A friendly amendment to advise the Plan Commission to review the usage of Hawthorne Court. We need more numbers on pedestrian usage because University Avenue is connected to Hawthorne Court. There is not a solution for local businesses, a proposed solution but not a guarantee, that's important moving forward.
- We are advisory to the Plan Commission.
- (Secretary) It sounds like it is a recommendation to the Plan Commission to request pedestrian traffic counts on Hawthorne Court.
- Yes, to request pedestrian traffic counts and to a solution for local businesses for the usage of Hawthorne Court.
- I could see this amendment being expanded to include the overall design of Hawthorne Court, which is in the right-of-way and not a part of the developer's design; we can certainly make that recommendation. What we can request additional information or changes on is the building elevation facing Hawthorne Court.
- (Firchow) Just a quick clarification, this is a friendly amendment if all the commissioners agree. Otherwise we would need to vote on the amendment. Are there any objections to the amendment?
- It would be good to define it a little better for me. We've asked whether pedestrian traffic crossing at Hawthorne Court has been considered as part of this recommendation. If the motion articulates some specific questions like that, then the Plan Commission has something to do with it.
- For the purposes of this it would be good to keep it more open ended because there is such a broad range of concerns over utilizing Hawthorne Court. My goal is not to belabor the issue or delay approval, but they need

accurate information and to fully understand how this will impact those in this area. There's a broad range of concerns with regard to Hawthorne Court that cannot be condensed into one question.

- (Firchow) It's okay to have advisory comments regarding Hawthorne Court. The Plan Commission is reviewing the planned development standards and not the design of Hawthorne Court. The actual design of Hawthorne Court will be a separate City process. We have to know how these are intended to work together, because the design of the building relates to the design of Hawthorne Court, but the Plan Commission is in a similar boat that they are advisory on the zoning map amendment. As pointed out earlier, we can certainly provide advisory comments on things we want to look at but PC when they see this item, but they are also not an approving body on the details of Hawthorne Court at this time.
- Not necessarily about the design of Hawthorne Court, but the design of the building as it relates to Hawthorne Court.
- You mentioned eliminating the elevator overrun and studying some other considerations for other configurations of the podium. Typically Initial Approval signs off on the basic massing of the building; is the elimination of the overrun and potentially a floor and other configurations at the podium something that is much more comprehensive than an Initial Approval?
- (Secretary) With regard to the overrun, we need to be clear what the intent is because the building as it sits is compliant, it's the elevator overrun that is exceeding the Cap View Height limit. If the goal is to remove that overrun, there would be no rooftop plaza. That would be a recommendation to the Plan Commission because UDC is advisory on the overrun as part of the conditional use review.
- With an Initial Approval motion, I don't know that we can ask for other design studies that significantly change the massing.
- (Secretary) I would agree on that. Initial Approval says you're generally okay with the box, it's how we are refining the box to look like a building.
- I tried to suggest how that box or massing might change as a compromised way of keeping this going. That was the intent of suggesting the shape of the courtyard change.
- One of the issues I would like to see resolved is the Hawthorne Court elevated or rendered so we have a clear idea of the intent from a pedestrian level. I'm having issue with materiality because all the renderings are these long views and I'm not seeing what those columns look like, and really what the experience on Hawthorne Court would be. The designers should spend some time giving us more detail because it's an impactful building and I need to see what that pedestrian experience is going to be.
- I'm not sure where we landed on the amendment or what it's really saying. In my own opinion on of the Hawthorne Court subject, the development team presented an alternative circulation flow, what they're presenting is the preferred alternative. Asking for pedestrian counts is good but I don't know if I'll be any more qualified than a traffic engineer to do anything with those numbers. We may be adding busywork that doesn't actually help us make a more informed decision. Their preferred alternative is better than the second alternative. That's separate from what Russell did originally include, which was a building architectural treatment of the facades that activate and address Hawthorne. I'd like clarification on what the amendment is because the way it started we might need to vote on it.
- (Secretary) For the friendly amendment, a recommendation to Plan Commission to request pedestrian traffic counts on Hawthorne Court and address solutions for businesses utilizing Hawthorne Court with regard to the design of the court.
- The amendment can be generalized as the usage of Hawthorne Court as it relates to the pedestrian experience within the development.
- So then the amendment is more consistent with what the previous comment was saying related to the design of the building and how it relates to the pedestrian experience along both Lake and Hawthorne.
- Please clarify the motion, as amended.
- I wanted a few things regarding Hawthorne Court and about the development in general. Trying not to underestimate the issue with HC, it is a genuine valid concern with regard to usage. I know that right now that alley is unsafe. I understand that we are widening it and making trying to make solutions with the local businesses, however as it stands, I am not fully confident in the solutions we have right now. I understand that a

strong argument that the current version is better than an alternative. There could be other solutions that have not been explored yet. I think there needs to be further exploration. So, it is concerning how that flow will work; we need a strong understanding of how that works. Trying to get more information to see when it comes back; I encourage staff to work with the neighborhood association and businesses to come to an amicable solution. I do not think that what is currently proposed is acceptable.

- The effects the design of Hawthorne court that is well beyond the limits of this project. We could as an advisory recommendation to the PC that we request that the final designs of Hawthorne Court be brought to the UDC.
- We are not in a pool shortage. Consideration should be given to other programming.
- (Secretary) The motion is for Initial Approval for a building that avoids going into the Capitol View Preservation Limit, the applicant shall provide night renderings, the end walls north and south elevations shall be revised to show more articulation, especially the garage walls, and the applicant shall provide Hawthorne Court elevations and renderings with regard to the building.

  Further, a recommendation to the Plan Commission with the following recommendations: the UDC recommends that more substantial plantings be included along Lake Street, that the Plan Commission request pedestrian traffic counts for Hawthorne Court and to reexamine the design of Hawthorne Court with regard to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and to refer the design of Hawthorne Court back to the Urban Design Commission.
- (Secretary) To clarify, the UDC is advisory on the Capital View Height limit, ultimately the Plan Commission is approving. To be as clean as possible, this leaves that as a recommendation rather than being incorporated into the Initial Approval conditions. Also, what about the incorporation of the finish treatment of the columns along Lake Street, the mulch depth, silva cells, the brick and panel colors on the towers? Does the Commission want to entertain any of those items being worked into the Initial Approval?
- (Firchow) This is a complicated motion. Procedurally it is not the Plan Commission's purview to refer the design of Hawthorne Court back to UDC. Advising the Plan Commission wouldn't necessarily get the design of Hawthorne Court back to this body. Ultimately, this would not be a Plan Commission decision. Also, to be absolutely clear that the Secretary's read of the motion is the motion.
- It's an overrun above the Cap View Limit, but it's a design choice to bring the elevator to a certain floor.
- Is your motion would be for the Plan Commission to not approve the conditional use for the overrun exceeding the Capitol View limit?
- I thought this was more in our court to comment on the design of the building and the design choice to have a rooftop terrace and a design choice to bring an elevator to an occupied rooftop. I am trying to keep the action in our court versus Plan Commission.
- The Plan Commission has the approving authority. WE are not allowed to approve it or not, we are advising them on whether or not it should be approved.
- Do we not have the authority to grant initial approval given the design choice to have a rooftop terrace and an elevator?
- (Firchow) My question would be on the intent of the motion. If the PC does approve the conditional use, when we review this at a Final Approval level, is your intent then that even if the Plan Commission approves it, the UDC wouldn't support it?
- My intent is if this body agrees with me, the body would agree on the next round when we get to Final Approval whether we think this design choice of the elevator shaft height is appropriate. If the PC approves the elevator overrun, I am thinking that we have the duty to comment on whether we think that design choice is appropriate, the intent is to keep the overrun under the cap limit.
- The intent of the motion is to keep the elevator overrun under the Capitol view limit.
- (Firchow) There are concerns with the UDC's role, where it specifically notes PC has approval authority. We are getting into a tricky area based on that cap view projection.
- We have settled on keeping it as an absolute minimum and that only the minimum number of elevators that are needed to reach the rooftop or penthouse should be allowed to extend into the preservation view limit a little bit more focused.
- (Secretary) Before a vote, I wanted to confirm if the comments regarding the finishes on the columns and colors.

- I would welcome the amendment of columns and finishes.

Action

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by Bennett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL of the public building and made an ADVISORY RECOMMEDNATION to the Plan Commission on the Planned Development**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-0) with Knudson, Bennett, Bernau, Harper, Braun-Oddo and Klehr voting yes; Arnold voting no; and Goodhart non-voting.

Initial Approval with the following conditions:

- The building design be revised to eliminate the intrusion into the Capital View Height Limit.
- The applicant shall provide night renderings.
- The north/south end walls shall be refined to incorporate more articulation in the design/materials.
- The applicant shall refine the finish treatment of the concrete columns along Lake Street.
- The applicant shall revise the material colors to provide more contrast between the masonry and the panels on the tower elements.
- The applicant shall provide Hawthorne Court elevations and renderings of the building.

The UDC **Recommends** approval of the Planned Development to the Plan Commission the following conditions/comments:

- Not to approve the building with an elevator overrun exceeding the Capital View Height Limit.
- That more substantial plantings be incorporated along Lake Street.
- Request pedestrian traffic counts for Hawthorne Court and to re-examine the use and design of Hawthorne Court with regard to pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and to refer the design of Hawthorne Court back to UDC.