AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** June 6, 2018
TITLE: Major Alteration of 200 South Pinckney Street (Block 88 & Block 105) – Judge Doyle. 4th Ald. Dist. (45612)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: June 6, 2018	**ID NUMBER:**

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Michael Rosenblum and Rafeeq Asad.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 6, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for major alterations to

Registered in support of the project were George Austin and Natalie Erdman, both representing the City of Madison; Patrick Barkle and Jim Destefano. Registered and speaking in opposition was Peter Ostlind. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was John Jacobs.

Natalie Erdman gave an introduction and review of the project's history. Block 88 and Block 105 are divided by Pinckney Street with Doty and Wilson Streets on either side. The Commission approved a GDP for Block 88 and two SIPs (as a package) including the City's public parking structure and bike center, and the two levels of parking and commercial space with apartments. There was also a GDP and two SIPs approved on Block 105 (not yet recorded); a hotel and a second apartment building. Tonight focuses on Block 88 alone. The City is exploring its options for a major alteration for two reasons: to modify the SIP which currently is the public parking structure from just below grade parking to the below grade parking plus the first two floors of parking above and a transfer slab (the podium), and to phase SIP approvals so that the apartments above (second SIP) would be separated in terms of any modifications or alterations in the future. As the owners of the property they are seeking to modify the SIP and exploring their options to take it from 600 below grade parking stalls to 600 below grade parking stalls, 8,000 square feet of commercial space at grade and two additional floors of parking (160 parking spaces). Nothing inside the building is changing, nor is the massing of the podium.

George Austin explained that on May 15, 2018 the Common Council adopted a resolution to consider the direction the City should take relative to moving forward with the podium. As their private development partner began pricing the private development, it became clear that the cost estimates were coming in significantly over budget. They engaged the contractor to reduce the costs and explored alternative uses for above the podium, however, concluding in April they were not in a position to proceed with the private development as outlined in the development agreement. They asked the City to decide how it wished to proceed, which led to a series of

analyses and the action of the Council to engage the architect (LVDA) and authorize them to begin work on designing the podium that could be put into a public bid package. They will be going back to the neighborhood development committee to get their feedback, with a goal of mid-July to be in a position to file an application for a major alteration to an approved SIP, with visits to the Plan Commission and Common Council in September.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- This is the City bringing this to us because of the cost factors that the City is now on the hook for?
    - (Erdman)The City is bringing this to you because in our current situation we believe it's in the best interest of the City to develop the podium versus just stopping here and figuring out a transition. The City is working towards making public parking above grade and how we do that in a cost effective manner.
- This might be part of Parking Utility?
    - Yes, depending on how all those other things work out, it is being contemplated Parking Utility would own and operate the parking and the City would control the commercial space on the first floor.
- And the podium is that 2-story portion going all the way across?
    - (Austin) The ground floor retail would become part of what the City would own and operate.
- I don't recall a year ago having us approve the podium and the tower above as two separate SIPs.
    - They came before you in one package, so the application was a GDP and two SIPs with no contemplation of phasing. Often your review a GDP and people come in later with multiple SIPs, that phasing needs to be contemplated in the application process.
- It sounds like you're asking us to review just the podium but not the design as we move up?
    - We're asking you to review the podium with the design above being a separate, second component.
- It might be a previously approved design, or it might be something entirely different. That hole is over there and something's going to be on top of it.
- To summarize, the money savings are going to come from more structural stuff, or more of the façades and materials there?
    - The glass façade has been capped on the Pinckney Street side with the other three sides looking at open air. The changes have to do with the façades, what's inside is not changing.
- Basically if you get one or the other of these, the budget will more or less work?
    - Yes. For this piece.

The architect then gave a presentation on the updates to the entry and façade, showing what was originally approved and what is proposed in three options now. Two entries are shown into the public parking area, with limestone and glass. The back wall along the MMB side was a limestone wall with glass above; they are now looking at an open air public garage. They tried to minimize the effects of the garage ventilation openings by a different coursing method between the vertical. This determined more precise openings and more of a rhythm in the façade. The narrow strips are a little offset to provide a texture and unify the building. The openings also have inset screens so the actual air is coming in from the side while blocking the visual aspect of seeing the cars and lights. Those screens and openings wrap the corner to maintain circulation and aesthetic. Doty Street is very similar, although they were limited with the location of the elevator shaft. On the back they were able to create a constant opening on the 3rd and 4th levels to hide ramps and other internal elements. Another option that is very similar accentuates the verticality of the opening, where instead of the limestone piece they would introduce some sort of slab cover that starts to incorporate the horizontal aspect of this building to mix with the verticality of the openings, that continues around to Pinckney and Doty Streets. The third and fourth options give more liberties with where the windows are able to go in order to meet the clear area that is required. This takes those

coursing elements and creates a vertical stripe that differentiates the entries and how to get into the garage. Their overall recommendation takes Option 3 with the screens and allows them to hide a lot of the interior of the building while still keeping a clear opening, a rough stone pattern in the lower entry areas, doing the same thing around Doty to the other side.

Peter Ostlind spoke in opposition and urged the Commission to reject them all as being inappropriate to this site. The options of open spaces without the screening is not the kind of parking we would allow anyone else to build downtown, especially on this prime site. The design standards for downtown should preempt that. We aren't looking to build the parking ramps of the 1960s. Screening is at least a step above that. This podium doesn't lend itself to expect anything as dramatic as what was seen in the first round and what was approved. If this is the basis that starts the design, we can and should do better than this. Figure out a reasonable option that works on this site and is suitable, and keeps that integrity. If we go with what's already approved on Block 105, how will that relate to this? This is not a good starting point.

John Jacobs spoke about the craziness of above ground parking on this site. The site is ringed by underground parking that the City has helped pay for, and yet the City's project is above ground, it makes no sense. The pictures are very helpful because you can see the beautiful MMB next to an above ground parking garage that looks like a jail. The Capitol View Preservation ordinance was dismissed by the Planning staff. They basically said that these 10th acre spaces on top of the building that are 15-feet high covered with aluminum, 2/3 of the way across the building, that seems excessive that we don't even try to get these excursions into the view space reduced. There will be more changes coming but this Commission should be asking what is going on here, this is obscene.

Further discussion by the Commission:

- From my understanding we are to comment on the podium and ignore the building when we already approved what sits on top of it. We approved the complete project, now we're breaking it down and approving a base without worrying what's on top? They have to complement each other. You can't approve the bottom of a building and not the top because they have to work together. To an architect that's virtually impossible. We have to look at the entire context.
- I understand that dilemma. The hole still sits there.
- If that's the task that we have to do, I would tend to agree with some of the citizens. The initial project as approved was enclosed, I just can't see going to something blatantly parking.
- I'm looking at what we somewhat reluctantly approved, but when I look at the composition, you had a light base, a curtain wall system covering the parking areas. Where is the option that still tries to do that, maybe not with an enclosed curtain wall but some other light screening material above your stone base that preserves that lightness? Maybe integrate some of the curtain wall from the front, wrap it around a bay and then frame a second story that might be a grid or some other kind of metal lattice. You're trying to make it look like a building with occupants but it's just cars. If it's not going to be occupied make it say it's something different and not pretend like it's windows that people might actually be behind. This is a very modern expression and to take this traditional form, I think you could probably celebrate the parking and as you're coming down the street you may not notice there are cars there until you look up. Kind of like University Square and how they screen their parking on the 2nd and 3rd floors.
- One of my concerns is how it relates to the MMB. It's a very heavy, substantial building and now we have this sort of other substantial building where it was lighter in the earlier design. I don't think the two of them are well related, and I assume the limestone is very expensive. Other materials could provide more innovation rather than carrying out that limestone effect. It's going to be a very heavy podium, I don't know if that's the right solution.
- Natalie and George, did the City give some kind of direction?

    - This is a good opportunity for us to hear what you're saying.
- You obviously need the first story just to have the underground function. If nothing is going to be built on top of it for awhile, then we need to see how it stands alone and how it stands next to MMB. I don't think this presentation quite did that. The City is doing above ground parking in the Capital East District. This doesn't seem sufficient.
- The one part that I felt did work was the view from MMB, the more whimsical patterns. That was more interesting but not as visible from most views. The rest seems so heavy and formal and I don't know how they will work together.
- The rendering showing the MMB and the ramp next to each other, there is a rhythm to the MMB but it's a very large rhythm. This much smaller rhythm doesn't relate to it in any sense. All of the vertical elements really read so much differently than the MMB which has those strong horizontal lines. If nothing is built on top of it I'm trying to think of how it relates to the structure next to it.
    - Economics are dictating the open garage. The cladding we can address fairly easily; we originally had limestone as the base. We can look at options.
- Before you didn't have the heavy limestone on top of a curtain wall, it was the other way around. If there was a grid or grading across there, you could bring some of this around. This is completely different than what you had worked out before, and it's just not working anymore. Do something playful with screening or grading or perforated metal and let the air go through, but not mimic windows and make it real heavy.
- Even though it's next to the MMB it should be more contemporary and modern, taking material from that feels dated.
    - I take it you're comfortable with the limestone there at the base?
- I'm not. If it's going to be a stand-alone building that sits there awhile, it may or may not have that modern glass tower on top of it. Think of it as its own structure. I don't know why you want that heavy piece of it like that. If the City Council isn't willing to fund enough to enclose it then it's an open air ramp.
    - In reality the piece in the center with the horizontal feature is the elevator.
- But if you want it clad in something other than limestone you can clad that area too. Your original design had some plusses and minuses, but if we're in a new situation then rather than take this piece and expand it up…
- This may be a podium that the City builds and then leases to another developer for what goes on top. But it needs to stand on its own; making it heavy limestone doesn't relate to the garage or help it stand on its own.
- Yes I would agree limestone is not the direction if you don't know the top.
    - The City has to make some decision about where it ends its construction. The Council has given direction that they think we should end construction at the top of the above ground parking. We'll have a pad that has value. The Chair is correct that we are looking at a spot that could stay for some period of time and whoever comes in will have to design something that goes with the podium.
- Nobody likes the situation that we're in here, but I agree with the comments heard. If you can't do the cladding in mostly glass to tie it in to the building behind it, where do you go from there? If your inclination is to make it look better with the MMB, it changes the whole look of what this original entrance was by keeping those materials. On the surface it seems like a good option but it seems out of scale.
- We know that certain openings are still going to be there in some fashion. How these rhythms relate to the MMB is still one of the issues that's present for whatever material is going to be used. I'm not sure any of the options got to the solution. Option 1 had large openings, it's totally different in terms of the

openings of MMB. All this very fussy rhythm doesn't tie in with the classical rhythm of the MMB. They don't play well together.

- It feels heavy. If we're going to do something to distinguish it and make it more modern, Exact Sciences just had an interesting garage before us with metal that was much lighter.
- If you wanted to make those large panels that rhythm I wouldn't have all the extra little rhythms going on as well. Those applied pieces, the big stone mullions.
- If you're not going to maintain the existing datums I would just forget it. From the ground up just modern, drop the limestone. All of these are trying to get there but not getting there, as a stand alone building. It looks like a prison.
- Look at this as a whole composition. How the bookends wrap around the corner. Screen the parking with something contemporary and it'll probably even save more money. I was pretty vocal on the Doty Street side about some of the rhythms and punched openings. Some of our comments were that the elevations of the bike centers should have more entrances, revise the design of the street level access to the public elevators. This sort of punched door opening effect for the bike center and the elevator lobby, with some adjustment of materials you can think about those comments too. No changes to the floor plans, just how some of the entrances work on that street.
    - We are limited to the widths inside.
- The two doors, you could make that one element rather than adding texture on a surface. Encourage you to think differently.
    - (Austin) This body approved the new Capital East above grade ramp that is pretty modern expression. If that approach were applied here what would the sense be of the contemporary…
- My memory isn't that good but I think what you're hearing is yes we have great concerns in thinking of that as a contemporary ramp. If it's going to be an above ground ramp make it like a ramp and make it contemporary. And not with a heavy base.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.