

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION**PRESENTED:** May 11, 2015

TITLE: Consideration of a demolition permit and conditional use to demolish an existing mixed-use building and construct a new mixed-use building with 8,750 square feet of commercial space, 3,000 square feet of flex space, and 350 apartments at 510 University Avenue and 432 W Gilman Street. 4th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:**REREFERRED:****REPORTED BACK:****AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary**ADOPTED:****POF:****DATED:** May 11, 2015**ID NUMBER:** 37589

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

Brian Munson, representing Vandewalle and Associates and Core Campus LLC, registering in support and wishing to speak. Munson described the proposed project. Munson explained that the façade of the 1929 building (at 435 W Gilman) has been incorporated into the proposed development project and that the interior of the building maintained little integrity to the original use or design since it had been previously modified numerous times for various uses. He explained that the project team began by reviewing the adopted plans for the area. He explained that this site is in the State Street District in an area appropriate for higher density. Munson explained that there are step back requirements along both street frontages that are part of the design.

Jeff Zelisko (no green sheet)

Zelisko briefly described the proposed building plans and elevations. The project includes 150 parking spaces, retail spaces, a loading area, townhouses along Gilman, and residential units. Zelisko described the proposed step backs, the resulting massing, the integration of the 1929 façade, and the proposed materials. He explained that the design and massing directly adjacent to the 1929 façade relates to the façade in materials and stylistic design. He explained that the resulting massing establishes a collection of buildings that complement each other.

Levitan asked for clarification between the existing condition and what is allowed by zoning.

Rummel explained that she originally did not want to lose the building, but that the proposed solution integrates the facade in a way that is acceptable. Rummel explained that the architecture of the loading dock building may need some more refinement. She suggested that the loading dock door be more “glassy”.

Staff directed the Commission to review the staff memo in their packets. Munson discussed each item in the memo with the Commission. There was general discussion about the proposed step backs. The loading dock

integration is being studied. The Gilman street elevation has been modified to relate a portion of the building with the 1929 façade so that the parts are fully integrated. They continue to work with the Fire Code to have consistent materials, windows, and details on all elevations of the building.

Slattery explained that the recessed areas at the town homes negatively changes the character of the building and asked if the project team would consider retail uses in the space currently occupied by town homes so that the building is treated in a historically appropriate manner at the street level. Munson explained that the Zoning Code requires that residential entrances be inset, but that the project team is planning that the town homes area is flex space and may be used in a retail capacity so that a storefront is reintroduced.

Levitan asked the Commission to provide comments based on the direction provided by Alder Verveer's request to have the item referred to the Landmarks Commission.

Rummel explained that after seeing the impact that 12 stories has on the existing context, the 12 story maximum height in this area may need to be revisited and reduced in the Downtown Plan and the Height Map in the Zoning Code by the Plan Commission and the Common Council in the future. Zelisko explained that the rhythm of building heights and widths along the street relate to the existing context.

McLean explained that he is having a difficult time with the size of the building, but will focus his comments on the Gilman Street elevation. He explained that the loading dock element is successful in its contemporary expression and contrast in material and color, but that the chaotic windows are troubling and that it generally needs refinement. McLean asked if the brick size was a larger format. Zelisko explained that utility brick would be used in the building above the 1929 façade and that utility brick is 3 5/8 x 11 5/8 inches.

Levitan explained that the Landmarks Commission previously reviewed the historic value of the building related to the demolition of the building. The Landmarks Commission found that the building had historic value and recommended to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission opposes the demolition of the building. Levitan explained that while the building has historic value, the integration of the façade may warrant a different position on the opposition of the demolition.

Rummel explained that the existing building could be adaptively reused with numerous uses. Levitan asked if the building could be reused and if so, why is it being proposed for demolition. Zelisko explained that retaining the building is not possible with the proposed program desired for the site.

Slattery explained that while retaining the façade is appreciated, this is still a demolition. She explained that the previous finding could be softer, but that the building still has historic value whether the development is a good one or not. She explained that retail on the street would be better than residential because it would retain the character.

Levitan asked for clarification on how much of the façade would remain. Munson explained that the depth of the front wall would remain, but that the later infill of the masonry openings would be removed. Looking at a historic photo, McLean suggested that the team consider a low brick sill below the proposed gate to relate to the historic treatment.

Rummel explained that if these were separate parcels, one would just develop or reuse each site individually. Rummel also explained that the original action by the Landmarks Commission aided in the design of this interesting collection of styles on the Gilman Street side.

Levitan asked if the Commission was interested in lessening the previous action related to the demolition. McLean suggested that he would support lessening the previous action so that the message from the Landmarks Commission is to regret the demolition of 435 W Gilman Street, but welcoming the preservation of the façade in an historically relevant manner.

Slattery explained that leaving a façade is not acceptable in all cases and that it does not change the historic value of the property.

Rummel explained that the step backs provide differing heights and treatments and allow the streetscape to have character that is similar to the existing character.

Slattery explained that further consideration of increased step back depth is necessary to preserve the character of the street.

Rummel explained that the Plan Commission should reconsider the height map to reevaluate the appropriateness of the current maximum heights in the area. The proposed building will be a precedent and the scale does not relate to the context of Gilman Street and the State Street District.

Alder Verveer explained his interest in having the Landmarks Commission review the proposed project.

Brad Mullins, registering in support and wishing to speak.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rummel, that the Landmarks Commission regrets the demolition of 435 W Gilman Street, but welcomes the preservation of the façade in a historically relevant manner. The Commission also finds that the proposed step backs are appreciated and allow the continuation of a varied streetscape character, but that an increase in the step back depth should be encouraged to preserve the character of the street; that the low brick sill and storefront with a non-residential use would be most appropriate for the existing façade; that the new upper portion of the “Art Deco” building has materials that are deferential to the historic portion of the façade; that the loading dock building design should be revised to better integrate the loading dock/parking garage door so that it is more appropriate in the pedestrian experience; and that the Plan Commission should review the Height Map for this area to align it with the character of the Gilman Street and the State Street District. The motion passed by voice vote (Slattery, McLean, Rummel). Levitan does not vote.