

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 29, 2020

TITLE: 920 E. Main Street – Archipelago
Apartments and Phasing Updates in UDD
No. 8. 6th Ald. Dist. (61288)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 29, 2020

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 29 2020, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on Archipelago apartments and phasing updates located at 920 E. Main Street in UDD No. 8. Registered and speaking in support were Doug Hursh, Curt Brink and Andrew Laufenberg, representing Archipelago Village; and Andrew Szatkowski. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Matt Brink, representing Archipelago Village. Brink introduced the next phase of Archipelago Village. Hursh reviewed the phasing plan, with the need for approval of the parking, the apartment in Phase 2, then the 929 building that was previously approved. There is no addition on top of the Telephone Building, eventually the parking ramp except for west façade facing the courtyard will be mostly covered and screened. The building creates street edge and has a terrace at 18” above the sidewalk with room for outdoor seating. The courtyard space between the apartment and telephone building has some landscaping and seating. The ramp is clad with three types of metal for variation with shadow play, and a public art mural at the bottom is proposed to activate the pedestrian experience.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I love this building, I’m a big fan of how you did the façade. I like the brick industrial, the activation at pedestrian level. I wish the crown of the building was one story instead of two, it adds to the verticalness of the project. I think I much rather prefer the balconies on the lower level than the top level, the more recessed work a lot better than the bigger ones on top.
- I agree, I was nervous about maintaining that façade and how you were going to tie that into a building, it’s very successful. Question about the telephone building – is there any space between that building and the parking garage?
 - There is not, originally we had that pulled back. It’s all based on fitting in as much parking from the East Washington setback all the way to Main Street and it times out at the telephone building’s rear façade.

- I really like it, I wonder what that feels like in that building. I don't know if Landmarks has weighed in on that at all, the way the roof comes down it seems like there would be some tense connections there.
 - Right now it's a garage. There's been interest as a wine tasting room.
- It's a really nice looking building and agree about the top cap, it's a little bit too tall.
- This is a really handsome building and nails that modern version of an older industrial building in a way that a lot of projects try to pull off. This is successful, but to me makes it all the more appalling that the 924 façade was slapped onto the front of it. This is exactly what I was afraid was going to happen when this got kind of forced on everybody. It's really just the front of a garage, why is that pretty significant looking telephone building next door not even considered landmark worthy but this was? I think it looks ridiculous. I feel bad for the developers being made to use this.
- It's there to please some people, it's not a landmark. It wouldn't be worse without it.
- The proportions of openings to solid, brick proportions, this is really pulling it off.
- I agree, the design team did a phenomenal job doing something they were asked to do, but with what we're charged to do, in the long-term future of what this neighborhood is, you skip one generation and everybody will come along and say what the hell did you do here? We need to push as a Committee, this just takes away from it. Nobody will know what's going on here, it doesn't fit.
- The street perspective really tells the story.
- Where is this effort coming from? What is pushing it?
 - We're in a catch-22. The Plan Commission said we had to keep it. UDC didn't like it. We embraced it, the neighborhood worked with us to try to embrace it. We had a lot of comments, comments from the Alder. It's deconstructed and stored now. As we develop, with the glass on the side tying into the courtyard, I think it'll be exciting when we're done with it.
- I applaud the language you have on this building and that you really stuck with it all around. I love when masonry comes all the way down to the ground and you don't have different fenestration at the base.
- I think that we all as a Commission were in agreement that we didn't need to have that saved. I do disagree, any kind of folly on a building, gives everybody a pause to say what is that and why did they do that. To be respectful of the neighbors who wanted to save that, they incorporated this successfully and in the long run, they won't see it as a wart but an interesting feature that they'll ask about.
- Secretary: we talked about the phasing of this project, do you want more feedback on that phasing? The 929 building, the garage, this development with the telephone building, there is specific phasing that will leave the garage exposed.
 - It will be difficult to fill the 929 building with tenants right now, with the virus and the economy. The WHEDA building and the hotel will need parking, we need to build the parking which then frees up the 929 site and the apartment building site for development. Ideally the apartment building would go at exactly the same time as the parking ramp. In the likelihood that we can't do that we've designed the ramp to be something interesting as a stand-alone element which could potentially be there for a little while until the other buildings take shape.
- I don't have any concerns about the phasing of this. The only issue you'll have is when the neighborhood gets used to a little dog run there It's attractive and I feel confident that it won't be left bare for very long.
- I really like the architectural design with the bricks, it's very attractive. With the parking ramp there's a lot of uncertainty but a need for parking. It's very well covered with the metal panels and the mural so I don't see any concern with that.
- Especially doing a multi-development parking solution, the investment will spur other developments.

Andrew Szatkowski spoke, noting this is phenomenal and exactly the type of development we need in this part of town. He liked the original plan above the telephone building but understood the opposition to it. He agreed

with comments about the façade, noting the developer did a good job at integrating it but it's a shame it had to be done.

ACTION:

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