



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 411-433 W Gilman Street
Application Type: New Mixed-Use Building in the Urban Mixed Used (UMX) Zoning District
UDC is an Advisory Body
Legistar File ID #: [89582](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Jason Doornbos, LCD Acquisitions, LLC | John Myefski, Myefski Architects

Project Description: The applicant is proposing the construction of a 16-story, mixed-used building with 259 residential units and ground floor commercial space. Residential amenities are proposed, including a clubhouse, fitness room, outdoor amenity deck and swimming pool. The project will be served by two levels of structured parking.

Staff note that both a zoning map amendment request to rezone the portion of the project site that is currently zoned Downtown Core (DC) to Urban Mixed Use (UMX) to match the remainder of the project site, and a Certified Survey Map (CSM) to combine parcels, are being pursued.

Project Schedule:

- UDC received an Informational Presentation on September 3, 2025.
- UDC referred action on this item on January 21, 2026, requesting more detailed information from the development team.

Approval Standards: The Urban Design Commission (“UDC”) is an **advisory body** to the Plan Commission on this development request. Pursuant to [Section 28.074\(4\)c](#):

All new buildings and additions greater than six (6) stories shall obtain conditional use approval. In addition, the Urban Design Commission shall review such projects for conformity to the design standards in the [Downtown Urban Design buildings](#) and shall report its findings to the Plan Commission.

As noted above, the UDC is an **advisory body** to the Plan Commission on this request. Staff recommend that as an advisory body, the UDC should structure a motion as a recommendation to the Plan Commission with or without specific findings and conditions. For example, such a motion may look like the following:

“The UDC finds that the development is consistent with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, with the following conditions being met...and recommends that the Plan Commission approve the proposed development subject to the following conditions...”

As noted above, at the January 21, 2026, meeting, the UDC referred action on this item requesting additional information and identifying design considerations. Generally, and in summary the Commission’s motion included:

- Design considerations related to the garage door locations and heights,
- The design and detailing of the four-story masses,

- Additional details related to the material transitions between the metal panel and glazing on the upper stories, and
- Incorporating landscape or other design elements in the hardscape areas along the street.

Landmarks Commission Comments: As a reference, the Landmarks Commission is advisory to the Plan Commission on the proposed demolition and any related demolition mitigation efforts. On January 12, 2026, the Landmarks Commission reviewed the proposed demolitions of existing structures on the subject site, finding that the buildings at 433, 415, and 411 West Gilman Street were historically significant for their architecture. The applicant asked for comment on their proposed mitigation to replace the building at 433 W Gilman with a new façade inspired by the historic building. Related to the design of the new building, the Landmarks Commission did not think that was appropriate mitigation as it was a different design, would likely not include architectural salvage, and would create a false sense of history with a fake historic building. Importantly, the demolition requests are NOT under the purview of the UDC. The role of the UDC is to make an advisory recommendation on the design of the proposed development.

Adopted Plans: The project site is in the [Downtown Plan](#) planning area, in the State Street Neighborhood. Generally, the recommendations included in the Downtown Plan speak to encouraging a diverse mix of uses, and creating a unique sense of place, an enhanced design at the pedestrian level and human-scale development.

Zoning Related Information: The project site will be zoned Urban Mixed Use (UMX). The Zoning Code outlines design standards that are applicable to all new buildings in the Downtown and Urban Zoning Districts ([MGO 28.071\(3\)](#)), including, but not limited to those related to parking, building entrance orientation, façade articulation, design of street-facing facades, door and window openings, and building materials. Staff notes that ultimately, the Zoning Administrator will determine compliance with Zoning Code requirements.

In addition, as noted in the Downtown Height Map, pursuant to MGO 28.071, the subject site crosses three different height zones, including six stories (88 feet) for the parcel closest to State Street (411 W Gilman Street), eight stories (116 feet) for the parcels located mid-block along W Gilman Street (415-421 W Gilman Street), and twelve stories (172 feet) for the remaining parcels along W Gilman Street (425-433 W Gilman Street). Additionally, along the W Gilman Street facade, there is also a requirement to step the building massing back 15 feet above the fourth story.

While the proposed building at its tallest is 16 stories (approx. 163 feet), which is in excess of the maximum height allowed in the Downtown Height Map in stories, staff note that additional stories may be requested as part of a voluntary land use restriction agreement to provide income restricted dwelling units provided the overall building height in feet (172 feet) is not exceeded. It is staff's understanding that the applicant is proposing to pursue the land use restriction agreement. With that, the applicant is encouraged to work with the Zoning Administrator to confirm that the proposed building will meet the height limitations in feet and that stories are being reported correctly.

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff request the UDC's continued review and evaluation of this proposal for consistency with the aforementioned standards, as it relates to the additional information submitted and design considerations noted in the Commission's motion for referral, including those related to:

- **Building Orientation.** The Downtown Urban Design Guidelines generally note that how a building addresses the street and defines the public/private spaces along the public way is the primary factor in creating an active urban environment. Consideration should be given to locating active uses at the street, incorporating a richer level of design detailing at the pedestrian level, minimizing the presence of service-

oriented uses (i.e., dumpster enclosure, utility rooms, garage doors, etc.), utilizing architectural elements to identify main building entrances, as well as incorporating landscape elements to add interest, texture, and color, etc.

Generally, and in summary, the Commission's previous comments focused on incorporating design elements and details that contribute to creating an active streetscape as well as reducing the presence of vehicular infrastructure. Specifically related to this item, the Commission requested that:

- The applicant shall relocate the garage door to a building recess area to create a full volume at the street,
 - If the refuse disposal will be handled completely inside the building, the height of the door is acceptable. If the door does remain at the proposed height, the applicant shall explore incorporating a color break to create a datum line at the first floor. If trash cannot be handled completely inside the building, the applicant shall revise the height of the door to come down to the first-floor.
- **Overall Building Design and Composition.** Staff requests the Commission's feedback and findings on the overall building design and composition, especially as it relates to those Downtown Urban Design Guidelines that speak to utilizing design details to break down building mass and scale, the design, detailing and proportions of building components and integrating visual interest, incorporating positive termination at the top of the building, integrating the rooftop equipment and stair/elevator overruns into the overall building design, etc.

Generally, and in summary, while the Commission's previous comments noted that the overall building mass and scale seemed contextually appropriate, the comments focused on the design and detailing of the four-story masses along W Gilman Street and material transitions on the upper stories. Specifically related to this item, the Commission requested that:

- The design/detailing of the four-story base masses be revised to bring some of the design/detailing of the recreated façade to the other masses. All four masses do not need to match exactly but there should be a continuity of design elements: the opening sizes, datum lines, materials, materials/colors, etc., and
- The applicant shall provide a detail where the material transitions from metal panels to glazing on the upper levels. Design of the upper levels shall incorporate changes in plane where the metal panels transition to the glazing,

Additionally, as noted in the January 21, 2026, staff report, staff had identified the following design considerations related to the overall building design and composition:

- The design, detailing at the pedestrian level, especially those elevations along the mid-block pedestrian pathway, all of which have blank walls and mechanical louvers, and
 - The screening/integration of rooftop mechanical equipment.
- **Landscaping.** The Downtown Urban Design Guidelines note that *"...how a site is landscaped can soften hard edges, make a site more inviting, and bring color and interest to a development."*

Specifically related to this item, the Commission requested that the Gilman Street frontage shall be redesigned to include landscape or other design elements to soften the hardscape and introduce color and texture into the streetscape.

Staff requests the UDC's continued review and evaluation of the proposed Landscape Plan, especially as it relates to softening hardscape areas, appropriateness of the plant selections, and providing year-round color and texture, especially at the pedestrian level.

- **Lighting.** The Downtown Urban Design Guidelines generally speak to lighting being adequate, but not excessive, limiting glare, utilizing fixtures that are appropriate for their function and well-integrated into the building design/detailing, as well as full cutoff fixtures, etc. While staff believe that the proposed lighting is primarily consistent with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, additional information, including mounting details will be required to confirm that the A series fixtures, and fixtures P1, L1, and ST1 and 2, meet cutoff requirements.

Staff note that the continued review of lighting can occur administratively, as part of the Site Plan Review process along with the review of the proposed lighting for compliance with [MGO 29.36](#). The applicant is encouraged to work with Building Inspection Division staff to confirm submittal requirements.

- **Signage.** Staff note and the applicant is advised that while signage is shown on the elevation drawings, signage is not a part of this review nor subsequent approvals. A separate review is required. The applicant is encouraged to work with Zoning staff to confirm whether the proposed signage complies with the [Sign Code](#).

Summary of UDC Referral Comments and Discussion

As a reference, a summary of the Commission's discussion and questions from the January 21, 2026, Referral are provided below.

The Commission asked about the status of the Landmarks Commission review of the proposed demolitions. The Landmarks Commission recommended a finding of historic value of 415 and 433 W Gilman Street.

The Commission inquired about the recreation of 433, the use of new materials versus reuse of the limestone arch and lintels. The applicant responded that the brick itself will be new, and that saving the entire building would prohibit this project. They do intend to do photographic documentation and measured drawings.

The Commission inquired about the changes to the four-story masses from a consistent height to being paired and stepping down. The stepping in the massing is due to the zoning story-height requirements.

The Commission inquired about the public comment related to the garage door, trash and the building recesses. The recesses are the places for the service elements, the main massing should be for the main entrances. The Commission inquired about why the trash entrance is so much taller than the others. The applicant noted that it was the requirement given by the local provider to accommodate truck movement within the building, and that it is set back.

The Commission inquired about the possibility of relocating the garage door to a building recess.

The Commission inquired about the condenser units on the roof, including screening and color. The applicant confirmed that mechanicals will be silver aluminum and vent out the top.

The Commission asked about the upper chamfer coming further out, following the units. The applicant replied it is the setback point for going from four stories up to the next height limit because that lines up with State Street, there are two bedrooms and a living room in that location. There is a specific distance

where the building has to be set back further. The Commission inquired about the glass wall following the corridor; the applicant responded it would be pushed so far back that they would lose two units on each floor.

The Commission talked about the previous presentation, the color of the taller building mass was more terra cotta, the architecture tied together better than it does currently. Using white on the upper floors now feels like a greater disconnect between that architecture and the four-story masses at the street. The applicant felt this was their best solution.

The Commission asked why the applicant did not use the historic reference to design the four-story elements. The applicant noted budget is an issue, and this provides more consistency between the base and the top. There's a missed opportunity to tie that entire base together while still making it new. The base could be more connected and cohesive in terms of some of the elements. Take some of the lintel colors, locations, bring some of those datums and highlight them. The white color does make it look like a currently built building.

The Commission talked about the staff memo bullets, including pedestrian pathways and blank walls. The elevations don't look human scale. The applicant noted the primary purpose is an exit way from the back of the building, and a fire lane.

The Commission appreciated that the team listened to their previous comments by shifting the retail closer to State Street.

The Commission noted that the streetscape realm is not very exciting, even knowing the trees are missing. There's no space for anything other than bikes and passing through. There are positive architectural elements with the canopies, the light and shadow play of the first-floor space, the recesses and voids, but envisioning the ideal space it would have space for café tables, furniture, activity, and plant material softening it. Not a line of shrubs, but areas that are carved out for green color and texture to break up the harder materials of the building and sidewalk.

The Commission talked about perspective and how these read as separate buildings. Should every building be expressed from ground to parapet, should they look like one massive development?

The Commission talked about the white material and how that might age and weather. Recreation of historical can be successful, but not always. It's an interesting design.

The Commission talked about how this fits in with the rest of the block and maintaining the pedestrian stretch, viewing the upper portion of the building as a pedestrian backdrop becomes more compelling. The lighter color helps it fade away. Some of the finer details do need attention to make it look less flat. It would be nice to see some definition between the metal panel and the glass. The garage takes away from the prominence; use one of the in-betweens for the door and keep the four-story volumes as four-story volumes. The Commission noted that the design needs more details.

The Commission commented that the doors gave some variety. The Commission further discussed how the white material will age; it can be durable and stand up to the elements, but it will hold atmospheric dirt and water, and drip down the face, it's a shortcoming of metal panel systems with horizontal joints.

Commission Action

On a motion by McLean, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item, with the following conditions needing to be met for the Commission to find that the development is generally consistent with the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines:

- The applicant shall relocate the garage door to a building recess area to create a full volume at the street,
- The applicant shall revise the design/detailing of the four-story base masses to bring some of the design/detailing of the recreated façade to the other masses. All four masses do not need to match exactly but there should be a continuity of design elements: the opening sizes, datum lines, materials, materials/colors, etc.,
- The applicant shall provide a detail where the material transitions from metal panels to glazing on the upper levels. Design of the upper levels shall incorporate changes in plane where the metal panels transition to the glazing,
- The Gilman Street frontage shall be redesigned to include landscape or other design elements to soften the hardscape and introduce color and texture into the streetscape,
- If the refuse disposal will be handled completely inside the building, the height of the door is acceptable. If the door does remain at the proposed height, the applicant shall explore incorporating a color break to create a datum line at the first floor. If trash cannot be handled completely inside the building, the applicant shall revise the height of the door to come down to the first-floor.