



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 1 North Pinckney Street
Application Type: New Mixed-use development in a Downtown Core (DC) District and UDD 4 Pre-Design Conference for PD
Legistar File ID # [60545](#)
Prepared By: Janine Glaeser, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Mark Binkowski, Urban Land Interests

Project Description: The applicant is requesting an Informational Review for a new commercial development in the Downtown Core District and UDD 4. The development proposal includes a 9-story building that contains a total of a 22,000 s.f. of first level retail space and 300,000 s.f. of office space on upper levels. The proposal also includes 6 levels of underground parking.

Project Schedule:

- Landmarks Commission approved the Variance from the Historic Preservation Ordinance to allow the demolition of a Designated Madison Landmark on May 4, 2020 (Landmarks Report Attached)
- The development team is anticipating submitting formal approval applications later this year.

Approval Standards:

The UDC is an **approving body** on this request. The site is located in Urban Design District 4 (“UDD 4”). This requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project using the design standards and guidelines for that district in MGO Section 33.24(11).

At this time, the zoning district that this project will be proposed under is not known. The project site is currently within the Downtown Core (DC) District. However, UDC review will be required regardless of the underlying district. In DC zoning, UDC comment is required as part of the conditional use for new buildings greater than twenty thousand (20,000) or four-plus stories in height. In that case, the Urban Design Commission would review a development for conformity to the design standards in [Sec. 28.071\(3\)](#) and the [Downtown Urban Design Guidelines](#) and report its findings to the Plan Commission. Staff understands that there is also the possibility that the development proceeds as a **Planned Development**. Under that zoning, the Urban Design Commission would be required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval.

Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Staff recommends that the UDC review and comment based on the specific Guidelines and Standards of [UDD 4](#), DC Zoning Requirements-[Sec. 28.071\(3\)](#), [Madison’s Downtown Plan](#), and [Downtown Urban Design Guidelines](#) and PD Standards. Note that the Landmarks Commission has received a presentation on current plans and as noted above.

Planning staff would like to emphasize the importance of the proposed building relationships to and activation of the public street facing areas on Webster Street, Pinckney Street and East Washington Avenue. Staff further requests that the UDC provide feedback on the development’s relationship to the adjacent downtown context and the architectural detailing the existing vs proposed buildings.

UDC Informational Review Comments

<p>Site Plan</p>	<p>7 - Would benefit from mid-block relief south of 21 N. Pinkney – similar to the space between the glass bank building and the Tenney Building on the south side of the block.</p> <p>Ambitious plan that seems well-suited to develop wasted prime real estate currently used largely for surface parking. Wouldn't support if it didn't preserve the AEBank. Pinckney St retail level will be huge improvement over existing.</p> <p>Creating substantial underground parking is this location should be a major boon to higher and better use of this valuable real estate and continued revitalization of the Square. Adding a substantial entrance at E. Wash & Blair nicely activates a now-dead corner. All auto and service entrances off of Blair is appropriate</p>
<p>Architecture</p>	<p>7 – Tower seems to loom over American Exchange Bldg. It would benefit by moving upper tower portion north toward middle of block.</p> <p>Pinkney St. façade too disjointed. It's a new building, so make it look like one. Webster street more unified & successful. See site plan comments above.</p> <p>The aesthetic along E. Washington and Webster at pedestrian level is not human scale, which is not in keeping with the surrounding fabric. This is one of the more enjoyable areas to be a pedestrian in Madison, but the way the new building meets the street does not support that. The glass boxes do not seem to relate to the base structures. The smoothness of the glazing detail is not harmonious with the timeless character of the American Exchange Bank - why add more anonymous glazing to the Capital area? The Webster facade is particularly lacking in scale for pedestrians. The idea of the project is sound, but the detailing and architecture is not there yet.</p> <p>I'm having trouble getting excited over the, admittedly, preliminary versions of The large glass central portion. If this is to be the last project of this size on the Capital Square, I expect to be wowed. Not happening. I can see what you are trying to do with the glass "hat" but it's surprisingly clunky. Perhaps somehow acknowledging the forms or proportions or rhythms of the first floor elements somehow would tie it in better Highly recommend using special glazing to prevent bird strikes. The stone patterns created at the E. Wash entry don't enhance the appearance and actually detract from the over-all geometry of that corner element.</p> <p>Perhaps the rough cut stone could mimic the cubic forms above?</p> <p>Really like the varied volumes of the 'glass box' – early newspaper renderings did not make the variability apparent. Like the classical rhythm of the Blair St. façade with glazing down to eye level. Question whether maintaining the rhythm of multiple small store fronts on Pinckney is worth it. The US Bank building presents one long glazed façade on Pinckney that seems 'active' enough. Maybe a simpler approach. Also not clear on material/color choice for dark red façade on E. Wash. Seems incongruous.</p>
<p>Landscape Plan</p>	<p>Appreciate the various outdoor terraces on different levels. Nice - the more the better.</p> <p>Roof-top outdoor terraces are excellent additions.</p>
<p>Site Amenities/Lighting</p>	
<p>Signs– if shown, do they complement the architecture?</p>	<p>Organization of Pinckney storefront signage will be important design element. Multiple different facades may create more interesting signage or unnecessary complexity. TBD.</p>

<i>(sign approvals will be a separate application.)</i>	
Pedestrian/Vehicle Circulation	<p>7</p> <p>While the maintaining of the sidewalks and planters is appreciated, the architecture is not at the same scale. The corner of Webster and E. Washington, per the rendering, looks barren and uninviting to pedestrians.</p> <p>Hopefully more landscape details will clarify quality of pedestrian experience.</p>
Urban Context	<p>7 – Faux storefront attempt along Pinkney needs to be toned down – try 2 or 3 distinct looks instead of 7.</p> <p>The heights of the proposal is not an issue - the streetscape and how the building meets the street is unfriendly and out of scale. The effort to maintain character along Pinckney is appreciated, but don't ignore Webster and E. Wash.</p> <p>Again - support the development of this massively underutilized space, but really want to see something more special across from the state capitol.</p> <p>Excellent revitalization of under-used downtown site.</p>
Overall Rating (1-10)	7, 4, 6 & 8

*Individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10. The scale is: 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding.