AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** 7/9/18
TITLE: 210 S Pinckney St (Judge Doyle Square) - Alteration to Planned Development Zoning Adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark; 4th Ald. Dist.	**REFERRED:** **REREFERRED:** **REPORTED BACK:**
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: 7/11/18	**ID NUMBER:** 52225

Members present were: David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, and Lon Hill. Excused were: Stuart Levitan, Anna V. Andrzejewski, and Katie Kaliszewski.

SUMMARY:

Natalie Erdman, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Patrick Burkle, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Erdman provided background information on the project, noting that in May 2017 the Common Council approved a GDP/SIP for the development at 210 S Pinckney Street, which is adjacent to the Madison Municipal Building. The Landmarks Commission had recommended to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the development was not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character of the Madison Municipal Building. The development that was approved included a 560 stall underground public parking structure as well as three levels of parking above grade with retail space, a bike center, and 148 apartments above. The agreement with the developer was that the City would build the below grade parking and the developer would build the above grade parking as private parking to support the apartments. Earlier this year, the developer advised the City that they were unable to make the economics work for the above grade parking and apartments, and asked the City to provide them with parking in the public ramp below grade or to construct a podium, which is the commercial space and two levels of parking. The City and the developer were unable to come to an agreement, and the City will now need to cap the below grade parking structure. The Common Council authorized funding and recommended that the City move forward with building the above grade parking and retail space that would be under the City's ownership and control. The current plan is that the City build the below grade parking, two levels of above grade parking, and cap it with a transfer slab that would make the development of something above it feasible in the future. The GDP/SIP that had been approved needed to be altered in order to stage the construction above grade. Erdman briefly described the new design for the parking structure, noting that the materials have changed, but the footprint, massing, ingress, and egress have remained the same.

Arnesen asked what is happening across the street from this project. Erdman stated that Block 105 is still under contract with the developer to construct a hotel.

Erdman described the new design for the parking structure, noting that the original design had a limestone base and glass façade above, but the Urban Design Commission thought the limestone was too heavy and recommended they create a more modern design that would better screen the parking. In response to UDC's feedback, the architects have created two new designs.

Arnesen clarified that the above grade parking is being built for an unknown future development, and Erdman confirmed. Arnesen asked how many stalls are being constructed above grade. Erdman responded that there are 150 stalls, which will be run by the Parking Utility. Arnesen asked if the 560 stalls below grade could be enough to support an apartment project. Erdman pointed out that Government East is the City's most-used parking garage, which also has 560 stalls; because they are not gaining any additional stalls, Parking Utility does not feel that they can lease any below grade stalls while still maintaining sufficient public parking.

Hill asked what the Urban Design Commission meant when they described the limestone base as being heavy, whether it was in appearance or structurally. Erdman pointed out that the original design was limestone and glass, which didn't hang together, so UDC had recommended they move to more modern design. Burkle noted that their comments were likely based on the fact that it is now a standalone four story building; the limestone was heavy and no longer had a tower above to complement or contrast that design feature.

Burkle described the specific features of the new design, stating that it will include architectural battens in order to minimize the view into the garage while still allowing for ventilation. Option A includes horizontal battens with two different profiles to give depth to the façade, and the base is pre-cast concrete with reveals that is similar to the limestone of the Madison Municipal Building. The center vertical area will be white spandrel glass to provide a contrast to the horizontal battens and call attention to the garage entrances. Option B differs in that the horizontal battens continue all the way to the ground in place of the pre-cast concerete.

McLean asked about the batten material, and Burkle stated that they are aluminum battens that are available in various profiles.

Arnesen asked several questions of Erdman regarding the future of the parking garage and how it will fit with any future development on the property. Staff pointed out that in the future, the City would likely be open to changes that would allow the base materials to be changed to complement any development that may occur.

Erdman noted that the plans include a transfer slab, which will allow most anything to be built above and also allows a full change of columns. Staff asked Burkle to describe the colors in the design. Burkle stated that they are looking to maintain a pristine aesthetic while keeping it low-maintenance, so they are planning to use dark grey for the battens and white for the spandrel glass and pre-cast concrete. Burkle mentioned that they plan to open the ground floor level on Pinckney where the retail will be located and set it behind the columns, which will allow them to use a broader span of glass that will provide a more modern feel. He noted that in Option B, they plan to use an aluminum plate system that would be slightly darker hue than shown in the plans.

Arnesen asked if they could use a different material such as spandrel glass that would provide a more permanent solution. Erdman stated that it was originally designed as an enclosed glass structure, but there was a value engineering done during the process that resulted in an open garage.

McLean asked if there was any known future for the building. Erdman stated there is no guarantee, but with the value of the added parking and the transfer slab paid for that she believes they will find someone to build there. She noted that their original intent was to maximize the amount of development that could happen on Blocks 88 and 105, so that was part of the direction that brought them to this point.

Arnesen asked about the future ownership of the parking and retail space once the City finds someone to build there. Erdman stated that she expects there would be a negotiation for the City to either lease or sell the structure, but there are a number of potential solutions.

McLean asked about creating greenspace on the site, stating that he knows there are already plans to create greenspace on part of the structure. Erdman stated that adding more greenspace was discussed, but there isn't an additional flat structure on which to place it.

Arnesen asked if the entrance to the above grade parking is the same as the below grade parking. Erdman stated that there are separate entrances.

Hill asked if the cap has parking on top of it, and Erdman responded that there is no rooftop parking.

Arnesen stated that he likes Option A better, and Hill mentioned that he likes Option B.

Rummel asked what the battens are made of, and Burkle stated that they are aluminum with a powder coated finish. Rummel asked if they would rust. Burkle responded that they would not rust, as the finish is very durable.

Rummel mentioned that she finds it visually intrusive, and asked the group to consider what they would be willing to live with if nothing ends up being built there. She stated that she thinks it should look more like an apartment building base, not a parking structure.

Hill asked if the exterior paneling could be swapped out if someone wanted to build an apartment building on top with different materials. Burkle stated that the batten system could be removed and replaced. He noted that they chose these materials because this garage requires a 60% clear opening, and there are very few visually enticing options that meet this requirement. He went on to say that the aluminum profiles provide them with a lot of flexibility and options to cultivate the appearance and make it more appealing.

Arnesen asked if the rain and snow would be kept out of the garage. Burkle noted that the battens will have a bevel that will shed water out, and also have a coating to prevent graffiti. McLean asked if the pre-cast concrete would also have a coating to prevent graffiti. Burkle stated that there are washes that can be used to remove graffiti from concrete.

McLean asked what will be placed on top of the transfer slab. Erdman responded that she believes it will be a membrane roof. McLean asked if the transfer slab is all flat, and Erdman confirmed that it is flat.

Arnesen asked several questions about the City's timeline and approach to this project. Erdman stated that once they get to grade with the current construction, they need to know what is going to happen next and finish the construction. She noted that they have carefully thought out where the best place to stop would be in order to maximize their ability to develop the site in the future.

Hill stated that he likes Option B. McLean stated that he likes Option B as well. Hill stated that Option B hides the garage and puts it more in the background. McLean noted that Option B does not relate the garage to the Municipal Building, which is a good thing. Arnesen questioned how the batten material would work going all the way down to the ground, and how well it would hold up over time. Burkle stated that they are putting a base material on the building at grade to account for snow and other factors.

McLean noted that the pre-cast concrete gives a slight nod to the Municipal Building, but then there wouldn't be any of that material within the rest of the tower. Arnesen stated that it would probably be easier to remove the aluminum battens than the concrete.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Hill, seconded by Arnesen, to advise PC and UDC that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character of the adjacent landmark. The motion passed by voice vote.