**AGENDA # 2**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | **PRESENTED:** September 26, 2018 |
| TITLE: Public Project and Major Alteration to PD Located at 200 South Pinckney Street (Block 88) – Judge Doyle. 4th Ald. Dist. (45612) | **REFERRED:** |
| | **REREFERRED:** |
| | **REPORTED BACK:** |
| AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary | **ADOPTED:** **POF:** |
| DATED: September 26, 2018 | **ID NUMBER:** |

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

*Braun-Oddo recused herself on this item.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 26, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a major alteration to a PD located at 200 South Pinckney Street (Block 88), Judge Doyle. Registered in support of the project were George Austin, representing Natalie Erdman, DPCED Director; Sabrina Tolley, representing City of Madison Parking Utility; Jim DeStefano, Patrick Burkle, Mary Ann Van Hook and Michelle Alletto, all representing the City of Madison.

The alterations are to the design of the podium piece, and to break the SIP into two phases: The construction of the garage, followed by the second phase apartment project, and to reduce the number of bicycle parking stalls within the garage. The objectives were to build something that would complement and not compete with the Madison Municipal Building, and to create something that would accommodate a building on top of it in the future. They have extended one elevator up on Doty Street from the parking garage below the surface to Levels 3 & 4. The window storefront wall along Doty and Wilson Streets has moved outboard to inboard of the structural columns. They have added planters along the MMB rear wall adjacent to Wilson and Doty Streets. Refinements have been made to some of the details based on the Commissions previous review of the project. They looked at using a batten system with a set of louvers ranging from 4 inches to 2 ½ inches to create a depth of façade. The structure will be painted with a high performance coating to match the battens so the systems flow into each other. At the corner details, instead of an open system the battens will be attached to aluminum cladding to match the coating with a reveal in the center to create the same horizontal pattern all the way to the ground. These will help create individual entries for the retail and bike center. The continuous parapet will be white precast concrete. A granite base steps down with the slope of Pinckney Street and sits at the base of all the storefronts and corners.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The Pinckney Street façade has retail space. If a "weight" goes on top of it, has the City considered how that will be done and is there flexibility in the façade for meeting the market? I'm wondering about things we're not seeing here like doors, signage, etc.
    - That element will be owned by the City and the parking facility and podium will be managed by Parking Utility, with the goal of leasing those spaces out. Once it's built we'll work with potential tenants on build-out.
- There's been a lot of improvement but what jumps out at me are the spandrel glass elements on Pinckney and Doty Streets. With those very small entrance doors it appears to me as though the vertical blank mass of that white spandrel glass might be improved if it were brought down a little bit and let the batten go around it. Everything else is really dynamic except for this really heavy piece.
    - The verticality is to bridge the gap between the two elements – the podium and the future tower above it.
- At this point we still don't know what's going on top. This design looks like the curve will still happen.
    - The contract between the developer and the City calls for them to develop the tower. There's an approved rezoning; we're not aware whether they'll come back with an amendment or not. They feel strongly about maintaining the approach that was taken. We're showing what's been approved and what we expect to be built based on our contract.
- The doors are so narrow compared to the volume that they're sitting in. Maybe make those entrances a little more pronounced and not just little slivers.
- Your original concept had a tautness and purity to it. With the narrowness of the doors to not emphasize that and actually have the battens form an archway over that mass might improve that and make it less stark.
    - The tall vertical was another attempt to emphasize the entrance. If we bring them down the entrance will look smaller and would not look as good.
- Given that we don't know what the top will look like, going to the roof with the material is going to flow better. It will look more like a base if we don't have something to pull up into it. I agree with the door comments.
- Structurally is there any reason why, if the design comes in for something taller, you can't rearrange how that looks now? Are you building something that couldn't be adjusted?
    - It's a façade, it's not the building.
- I don't mind the glass going up to the roof.
- The battens are raised up to make that opening look bigger than it is, same thing with the entrances on Doty Street, they've accentuated that by making the batten arch larger than the opening behind it. That's what I'm suggesting for the main public elevator entrances.
- The Pinckney Street entrance, what if that became one rather than two? Not combining the entrances but combining the materials. It adds another dynamic to the façade and would help your proportions.
- It's a public parking facility and 100s of people will be going in and out of there every day.
- Some of us are fine with it, some of us want to see other possibilities. If you could sketch some things that let us consider how this might look differently, we can decide to stick with this or choose something else. This allows the Plan Commission and Common Council to still review it.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed on a vote of (4-0).