

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 7, 2020

TITLE: 929 E. Washington Street – Minor
Alteration to a Previously Approved
Planned Multi-Use Site in UDD No. 8. 6th
Ald. Dist. (62297)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 7, 2020

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 7, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a minor alteration to a previously approved Planned Multi-Use Site located at 929 E. Washington Avenue in UDD No. 8. Registered and speaking in support was Doug Hursh, representing Archipelago Village, LLC. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Rebecca De Boer, representing Archipelago Village, LLC.

Hursh described the nature of the alteration, including the addition of parking to accommodate one of the major tenants; they are confident this will happen across the board with tenants. One level of underground parking became very expensive for not enough stalls, and it went into the water table. This solution doesn't change the design of the building too much by adding three levels of parking that was previously two levels of office space. The glass now has a vinyl layer for a "frosted" and glowing look. You may see a shadow of something behind it but you won't see the details of the cars parking on those levels. There is still retail on first floor, still the same stone materials, but they have added more texture and levels to the building. The same glass would be on the upper part of the building but would have the frosted layer on the inside to look similar as before during the daytime hours. The progression of design of the parking structure noted precast panels and a green screen on the façade has been replaced with three types of perforated metal ranging from 1.5-4 inches deep in two colors. The floor line is accentuated with a bent steel plate to create a dance of light. The mural is temporary but on the E. Main Street side there is a mural activating the back courtyard in a permanent application.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Does raising the base of the building by one parking floor raise the overall height?
 - No because of the floor to ceiling heights, it does not.
- I understand this project has been before the Commission before. It reminds me of the 1980s all glass buildings. There's a growing trend around the country and around the world to recognize the environmental impact of glass on a building, and an aesthetic component to that. It's quite bothersome to

me that we would approve this in 2020. I would recommend an exploration of the daytime appearance, to articulate that. There is quite a bit of insulation in the wall.

- The glass, its reflectivity, its glare, the amount of spandrel to vision glass was discussed at great length.
- Does the frost character on the parking level glass reduce the bird strike issue at all? And will it be backlit or lit some other way during the daytime?
 - It will not be transparent anymore, so it does potentially improve the safety for birds. It's basically the same amount of glass but with that frosted coating it's not transparent anymore. That could potentially help with that. The interior of the ramp will have LED lights that will dim down based on occupancy. On this façade, with the amount of glass, it will also be tied to a photo cell and based on the amount of light coming in, the lights would probably be turned off during the day. We have been talking about how to light that corner at night.
- We don't want it to look dead or empty during the day.
 - We might be able to alternate where some of those different lights are so it looks to have a different rhythm to it.
 - I like the idea of uplighting during the day.
- The interface between the Telephone Building and the parking ramp – I thought that notch was already strangling the Telephone Building. It almost looks like the ramp is touching the Telephone Building. If you didn't own that building, there's no space around it, it seems like a self-inflicted design wound to run that right up to the edge of that Telephone Building.
 - We've been trying to be able to honor that building, it's a potential landmark, and open up the three sides to it. We're dealing with fire codes to make that building usable, meet our stormwater and parking requirements. Then the building can stand alone with its own sprinkler fire system.
- I know the City passed a bird friendly glass ordinance. Is this building grandfathered in since it was approved earlier?
- This is a minor alteration working under a previous approval.
 - Because this is a new application it would need to comply with the new ordinance standards that take effect in October but that needs to be verified with the Zoning Administrator, it applies to the lower 60-feet.
- The bird glass is not around the whole building?
 - I would want to verify the timing of when this minor alteration was submitted as far as what would be covered for that.
- If we approve this project, would staff then review this or does this need to come back to UDC?
 - If those zoning standards do apply it would not require another trip back to UDC. If it resulted in significant design changes that the Secretary thought was above the scope of an administrative approval, it would come back.

ACTION:

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Abbas, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0).