

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: 216 S. Pinckney Street – New 9-Story Mixed-Use Development above the 5-Story Parking Structure Podium at Block 88-Judge Doyle Square. 4th Ald. Dist. (56760)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new mixed-use development located at 216 S. Pinckney Street. Registered in support of the project were Lee Christensen, Isaac Wallace, Jeremy Frommelt and James Worker, all representing Gebhardt/Iconica; and Michael Carter. Registered and speaking in opposition was John Jacobs.

The team presented plans for the top of the podium on Block 88 as part of Judge Doyle Square in response to an RFP. They are trying to meet sustainability features, maximize the tax base by maximizing the density of the building, provide workforce housing downtown and activate the space during the day as well as at night. Images show relation to the materials used on the Madison Municipal Building without repeating it. They have metal panel from the base to add to the upper levels, and added a curved element towards to the third level office space. The first floor space has two lobbies and two retail spaces still being coordinated. The fifth floor has 22,000 square feet of office space as well as common space to serve office people and residents. A typical floor plate has 25 units in a mix of studios, one-bedrooms, one-bedroom dens and two-bedrooms. The roof plan has some solar panels on the more south exposure and rain water collection to use at the bathrooms at the fifth floor office level. A solar study shows impacts on the surrounding buildings, most of the shadows fall on Pinckney Street. They are proposing Nichiha panel in a metallic look, an accent of Nichiha that looks like red cedar and faux grain for siding. They like the idea of a more organic color to add warmth to the downtown. Stone will be added to the base of the building. An updated view shows glass panels in lieu of masonry panels at the parking level. They hold the datum line with the feature walls in the center of their building as defined by the MMB.

Public Comment:

John Jacobs spoke to concerns regarding the height and the equipment that goes above the Capitol View Preservation Limits. It is an important aesthetic consideration. Those mechanicals are way too big. Block 89 is maxed out to the limit but they don't have mechanicals up there. The ordinance was passed in 1966, let's get back to letting everyone in Madison view that Capitol and follow the law.

(Commissioner Goodhart): In my experience the City vigorously enforces this. I agree with you, you're 100% right in your assessment of that in their violation of that. Only the elevator penthouse can go up. I don't see any reason to violate that, I don't know at this level if City staff is supporting that, I certainly won't be supporting that.

The Commission discussed the following:

- How much taller is this than the originally proposed building?
 - It's the same height. The building maxes out the Capitol View Preservation Limits.
- How does that relate to other large buildings around the immediate area.
 - It looks to be that the others are maximized as well.
- When you come back can you bring elevations to show how this relates to other buildings in the immediate area. There's not a lot of room for error. Is that a roof garden guardrail?
 - That's the original proposal. When we revised it we heard some comments about not having anything that exceeds that, so there are no railing that extend up above that whatsoever. The parapet actually screens the solar panels.
- But you still have guardrails on the far corner. The aesthetics of that are problematic.
- This is a huge contrast to what was there. This is simple and safe, which is not a bad thing. I feel like there are a couple of different versions here, you have some images that seem to be earlier versions. I like it a lot because it's modern, but simple. I don't know about the Capitol View thing, I'm sure you are aware of it.
 - My understanding is that we're complying with the ordinance.
 - We'll have to go through the same conditional use process but we've been told to stay within this box.
- I don't think we ever approved a building that exceeded those height limits.
- I wouldn't mind a bit less density.
- I'm concerned about the view overrun and that balcony sticking out, it looks odd and flimsy.
 - The intention was to relate to the rail on the MMB but we can look at bringing that in and make some adjustments.
- I think that's subjective too, there would be people that would love to sit in that spot.
- I think the top could use some finessing, it's got a lot of ins and outs. This warrants more special than that. Where I normally don't object to the wood look, this is very urban, in our core and you don't see those materials in these buildings. I don't mind the metallic and the stone, I'd like to see more of the stone or even fewer materials and more consistency with the definition of the balconies and the rhythm of the building as you go along. The ins and outs feel almost random. I would also pay attention to your mullion spacing. It's a nice size mass that almost has too much going on. There could be more of a consistent repetition to the façade. You could have something that is more refined and simpler.
- Part of it is the base is a smooth curve, then we've got rectangular cantilevered balconies and some angled balconies with pilasters. I know you inherited a lot of this and I'm sure it's a very difficult design problem, I really appreciate the order that you have brought to it. Maybe a little more sleekness.
- The prior building had elegance, this has no elegance to it. You're maximizing what you can put there but it's not doing that with any style. I also object to the use of fake wood material in the downtown area.
- I like that, once you start saying this building shouldn't have this material, it's what people like.
- You can get warmth without the fakeness.
- The scale of wood siding is not high rise apartment building.

- I kind of like the fake wood, but the appeal of it in a project this size is more the warmth and color. I'm not sure where anyone would be that they would pick up on it being fake wood other than the units right next to it. Other than that I don't have a problem with it, there's something to be said for the texture of it. On so many of these large projects, I drive across town and see all these high rises with balconies and there's never anybody on them, on the nicest most beautiful day, it doesn't seem to matter. I can't tell you how many times I don't see a single person up there, and yet these projects all emphasize the balconies. It's like a fireplace, everybody wants one but nobody actually builds a fire in them.
- I work downtown and have a view of balconies, I never even thought about it until you mentioned it, but I never see anyone on them either. You'll see abandoned furniture or bicycles.
- I'm always on my balcony.
- If Beitler is the developer of the rest of the project, is he going to come back with the same design for the other side?
- (Chair) That design was approved.
- Because there was a composition to Pinckney Street with that curve, and that's totally lost here. This doesn't address the curve other than extending it by one floor. I'm really concerned from a broader scale here, we're not going to get what we initially approved here. It doesn't read as elegantly as the original composition.
- Can you tell me about that walk/wash?
 - It's on the fifth floor, a fake turf area. It can be hosed out.
- To the balcony issue, the community room is the most used amenity. This rooftop garden space will be where everybody will enjoy the outdoors. In terms of the curve, how do you mimic that, it's a totally different developer. It was a composition but not anymore.
- A little more continuity. There are a lot of angles and sharp corners. I'll bet the building we previously approved never would have been built. To me the wood gets away from having that continuity. I don't understand the need to have that element, it's not an entrance to the apartment.
 - The intention of raising it in general is to respond to the datum lines. We're trying to do everything we can to take this base structure that's approved and make it work without seeming like we landed on top of it.
- I don't think your building relates to the MMB at all. It just strikes me as reminiscent of so many apartment buildings we see. I think the ones on E. Washington Avenue are better than this.
- Things are overworked a little bit. You could have a more minimal material change, just like the base has a rhythm it's very consistently around. You could really simplify it a lot but give it a rhythm that makes sense and then the materials make sense with that.

Is there a preference from changing the glass to stone where the parking garage entrance is located?

(Chair) The issue was trying to make that more pedestrian friendly, which we didn't get too far on. We pushed as far as we could, but they had designed the parking lot and poured the concrete before we even saw it.

ACTION:

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