



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 920 East Main Street
Application Type: New Development in UDD 8, Initial/Final Approval is Requested
Legistar File ID # [61288](#)
Prepared By: Janine Glaeser, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Doug Hursh, Potter Lawson, Inc./Curt Brink, Archipelago Village, LLC

Project Description: The applicant is seeking initial/final approval on a new ten (10) story apartment building with 75 residential units above first floor commercial spaces. Note, the applicant requests approval of two bonus stories as allowed under section MGO 33.24 (15)(e)(12).

Project History/Schedule:

- The UDC received an informational presentation on July 29, 2020.
- The Plan Commission is scheduled to review this project on October 19, 2020.
- The Plan Commission is also scheduled to review an **East Washington Avenue Capital Gateway Corridor Plan** amendment that will allow for residential uses in this portion of E. Washington Ave.

Approval Standards:

The UDC is an **approving body** on this request. The development site is within Urban Design District 8 (UDD 8) - Block 13b, which requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project using the design requirements and guidelines of [Section 33.24\(15\)](#). In applying the standards, the code states that the Urban Design Commission shall apply the UDD 8 district requirements and guidelines as may be appropriate in order to implement the Core Development Principles of the [East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan](#). In order to approve, ordinance requires that the development is found to meet the requirements and conform as much as possible to the guidelines.

Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendation

Staff recommends that the UDC review the project against the requirements and guidelines of UDD 8 and the Core Development Principles of the [East Washington Avenue Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan](#). Staff notes the following considerations regarding consistency with these standards.

Setback – Building Location and Orientation MGO 33.24 (15)(e)(2)

The entry element with the reconstruction of the historic façade element is proposed to be setback 5' from the property line and the main structure is setback 10' from the property line. **Both meet the current UDD 8 required 5-20' E. Main Street setback.**

Height and Stepbacks MGO 33.24 (15)(e)(1).

The standards require that along Main Street (Block 13b), there is a street façade minimum three stories and maximum height of five stories and 63 feet. The stepback above the 3-5 story street facade must be 15 feet. There is an allowed maximum overall building height of eight stories and 92 feet, with two bonus stories possible per

33.24(15)(e)(12)(b)(i). This proposed E. Main façade is shown as four stories with an upper level stepback and then the overall building height is ten stories at 110'-9".

Bonus Story – Upper Level Development Standards MGO 33.24 (15)(e)(12).

Bonus stories may be granted for a development in UDD 8 block 13b if it is determined that the provisions of at least (1) element from i. or a combination of elements from ii. Provides sufficient public benefit to warrant the additional height. **Staff requests that the UDC state its findings related to these standards:**

Group “ i ”

- LEED Gold certification, or equivalent
- Inclusion of at least fifteen percent (15%) of dwelling units for families with incomes not greater than sixty (60%) Area Median Income (AMI) for rental units and/or an income not greater than eighty percent (80%) AMI for owner-occupied units. Area Median Income is the median annual income calculated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the metropolitan area that includes the City of Madison.
- Structured parking that includes space shared by multiple users from multiple lots and that accommodates a substantial space for public use by patrons of both on- and off-site uses.
- On-site, publicly accessible plazas and/or pocket parks that are visible from the street and provide seating, landscaping, public art and/or other public amenities. For each one (1) square foot of plaza or park that is provided, five (5) square feet of bonus area is available.

Group “ ii ”

- Mid-block and through-block public pedestrian, bike, and/or vehicular connections.
- Substantial amount of family-supporting housing, including at least ten percent (10%) of dwelling units with three (3) or more bedrooms, outdoor recreation spaces, and/or other family-related amenities.
- On sites with designated historic structures and/or structures eligible for designation, the incorporation, preservation, or rehabilitation of such structures in the development.
- Adequately sized community meeting rooms available free of charge for neighborhood, public, or other community meetings or on-site daycare facilities in conjunction with family-supportive housing or employment uses.
- Minimum of fifty percent (50%) vegetative roof cover.
- LEED Silver certification or equivalent.
- On-site, publicly accessible plazas and/or pocket parks that are visible from the street and provide seating, landscaping, public art and/or other public amenities. For each one (1) square foot of plaza or park that is provided, ten (10) square feet of bonus area is available.

Restoration/Preservation Activities MGO 33.24 (15)(e)(11)

The plans include the rebuilding of a previously demolished façade. While this section of UDD 8 pertains specifically to restoring an existing building, there are design guidelines that provide related regarding restoring the original character of the buildings. There are, however, no defined requirements in this section of UDD 8 that must be found met. Staff note the development should conform as much as possible the design guidelines guideline where found appropriate to implement the plan, as stated in the code. **Staff recommends that the UDC state their findings related to these guidelines of this sections.**

- i. The distinguishing features of the original building should be preserved. The removal or alteration of historic materials or distinctive architecture features should be avoided, whenever possible.*
- ii. Where practical, the original masonry should be restored and missing elements such as cornices, windows and storefronts that were part of the original building design should be reconstructed. If restoration is not*

920 E. Main Street
Legistar #61288
October 7, 2020

feasible, new elements should be designed to complement the character, materials and design of the original building.

iii. Any inappropriate elements, signs, canopies, etc., that cover details and features of the original building should be removed.

iv. Painting of natural brick or stone is strongly discouraged when those materials are in good condition.

Finally, Staff refers the Commission to their comments from the 7/29 informational presentation:

General Comments:

- 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.
- 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.
- The proportions of openings to solid, brick proportions, this is really pulling it off.
- 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 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.

Comments on 924 Façade:

- 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.
- 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.
- I agree, the design team did a phenomenal job doing something they were asked to do, but with what we're charged to do.
- This just takes away from it. Nobody will know what's going on here, it doesn't fit.
- I agree, I was nervous about maintaining that façade and how you were going to tie that into a building, it's very successful.