



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**Project Address:** 223 S. Pinckney Street  
**Application Type:** Alteration to a Planned Development (PD-GDP-SIP) - "Block 105" Hotel  
Final Approval is Requested  
**Legistar File ID #** [62784](#)  
**Prepared By:** Kevin Firchow, Acting UDC Secretary

## Background Information

**Applicant | Contact:** Aaron Ebent, Kahler Slater, Inc., Milwaukee, WI

**Project Description:** The applicant is seeking final approval for proposed alterations for portions of the Judge Doyle Planned Development. These requests pertain only to the hotel development on 223 South Pinckney Street, which is one of two buildings approved for "Block 105" of this Planned Development. This item was conditionally approved by the Common Council, specifying certain details that are to receive final UDC approval prior to final sign-off and the issuance of permits.

### Project Schedule:

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on November 4, 2020.
- The UDC granted initial approval on January 27, 2021.
- The Plan Commission approved the Planned Development amendment on February 8, 2021 (Legistar #[63856](#)).
- The Common Council approved this proposal on February 23, 2021 (Legistar #[63856](#)). This item was conditionally approved,

### Project History:

In 2017, the Urban Design Commission, Plan Commission, and Common Council considered various requests related to the Judge Doyle development. This includes Downtown Blocks 88 and 105, centered on South Pinckney Street, between Doty and Wilson Streets. Three similarly designed glass-clad buildings were initially approved.

On Block 105, the subject block, two twelve-story buildings were approved including a 253-room hotel and a 204-unit residential building. Subsequent alterations were approved on this block. This included clarifying that the hotel and residential buildings could be phased separately, consistent with the details approved by the Common Council-approved development agreement with Beitler Real Estate Services. From a design standpoint, modifications to the hotel building's design were approved that removed a level of underground parking and associated garage door along with other minor façade modifications that were reviewed administratively by the UDC Secretary. No alterations are proposed to the adjacent residential building as part of this request.

On Block 88, the Urban Design Commission reviewed alterations to the upper nine stories in 2020. These plans were subsequently approved by the Plan Commission and Common Council are also available from the City's Legislative Home page under file [57762](#). No alterations are proposed to that site as part of this request.

### Approval Standards:

The UDC will be an **advisory body** on this request. This request will be submitted as an alteration to a development in the Planned Development (PD) Zoning District, subject to the approval standards of MGO §28.098. The UDC is required to review the General Development Plan and Specific Implementation Plans and make a

recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Subsections 28.098(1) and (2) and the other requirements of this Subchapter.

## Summary of Design Considerations and Recommendations

Planning Division staff advises that the UDC focus its review on the following specific approval conditions approved by the Common Council. These conditions include the UDC's previously raised comments, which were added as formal conditions by the Common Council. Comments related to these should reflect the aforementioned Planned Development standards, as required by the Zoning Code.

### *Design Comments to Be Addressed:*

- The Urban Design Commission recommends "initial approval" and that the following items be addressed in the applicant's presentation for "final approval."
  - a. Final details of the end walls leaning toward Option 1. (Staff Note: This is a Reference to Materials Presented at Meeting - See Final Page of that presentation for additional information)
  - b. Enlargement and more detailed rendering of the exact metal sheathing and striation.
  - c. A fully detailed roof plan, including rooftop mechanical screening and other possible components (solar, green roof, etc.).
  - d. Refinement of the planters/plantings by eliminating the Juniper in favor of something like Prairie Drop Seed, adding more planting materials to fill them, and looking at shifting some bike racks to Doty Street.
- The Urban Design Commission's final approval shall include specific findings related to the final details of the proposed landscaping, including, but not limited to, details related to surfacing, planters, plantings, fixtures, and lighting. (Note, this condition was intended to relate to non-ROW items as the UDC is not an approving body for ROW improvements. For items in the right-of-way that are not approved as part of the rezoning, staff advises that the UDC can provide an advisory opinion.)

### **Summary of Key Changes**

The applicant's letter of intent and application materials reflect modifications and further detail related to the previously raised conditions, including a-d above. Please see those materials for additional information.

### **Summary of Previously Raised UDC Design Comments.**

As a reference, staff refers the Commission to their comments from previous meetings:

#### ***January 27<sup>th</sup> Initial Approval:***

Site Circulation comments:

- On the bike racks, they appear to be perpendicular to the flow of traffic on the sidewalk and actually overlapping, I'm not sure if that location works. You may have to turn them parallel to the sidewalk, you could even pull some over in front of that row of Karl Foerster Feather Reeds.

Context & massing comments:

- I really like the design. The rooftop elements question from the neighborhood, has that been discussed and resolved?
- You are going to have a considerable amount of rooftop equipment there. It would be good to see a roof plan.
- Is this not the final design of the panel patterns?
- That's a huge portion of the building. I like the project but if that could potentially be drastically different it makes me hesitate. Those patterns can make or break the building. How do we know what we're looking at is what we're going to get?
- Is there a way to make the rendering be accurate, like what we see is what we're going to get?

Façade Detail comments:

- I like the materials, striations, color palette. There are two planting beds flanking the main entry, I'm not buying the Juniper as a ground cover, feels like a lost opportunity for mass plantings with more movement and texture. Maybe Prairie Drop Seed, something more interesting, don't let them be sparse. I like the corners, the specialty paving, although I have a question as to what that is. On each end there is a triangle sliver of planting with two lonely shrubs, those could be packed full of something else, a low ornamental grass or some other species with more interest.
- This is a vast improvement from the last presentation. My concern is that it's too much metal panel for particularly this location. That massing where you have the signage would be more appropriate in masonry, maybe a white brick or a light tone, something to break up that metallic look and have this solid massing that goes to the ground to help offset all of that metal on the façade.
- As much as I like it I think it would have more specialness to it to limit that. Are there any other materials you looked at for that other than masonry?
- I personally don't think every building needs to have brick, I don't know if that's the answer. Do you think it's the metal panel or just the same metal panel? What if it was a different color and texture?
- Maybe that's it. It could be another less striated or less textural material, although masonry does have its own texture to it. Something more solid and possibly in more contrast to that corrugated metal.
- I'm not crazy about that inset. You're framing a different material, it makes it needlessly busy.
- I agree. Don't do option 2 or 3.
- I'm not opposed to keeping it the way it is and adding a decorative lighting pattern.
- Lighting was a suggestion for breaking up that wall rather than architectural elements. I would want more details on the lighting patterns and how that would work. I think you have the right idea of breaking up that mass. I wonder if you have any experience of how this looks in changing daylight conditions, does it pick up the glow of a sunset? Option 1 is more or less the right idea.
- Changing materiality – what I see in the renderings I like, there's a good balance of simplicity and textures without getting too busy. I worry if one side becomes a different material it becomes more complex than it needs to be. I think it's important to scrutinize the metal panel in such a large quantity. The staggering of the lights, it creates more complexity than is needed. There is enough complexity enough already going on.
- I want to remind us all that this is primo real estate with a unique occupancy. I'd like to be really excited about this for Madison and would hope it would be a showcase. The curve is such a great bold move, I see there's a lot of care put into the detail and a lot of thought on materials. I just wonder if it's a little safe when it could be something really pretty unique. When I look at the Wilson Street view there's a curve there but I still feel like it's fighting with the windows. You have some very nice details, I almost wish that frame was even more exaggerated. Boosting up some of the details might add to that a bit.
- The floor plans, at the corner rooms I see desks up against the walls and on this rendering I see floor to ceiling glass. How does that get resolved so we're not looking at the back of furniture with wires?
- But you're not suggesting there would be any spandrel glass there?

- Turning to the other side of the building, the site plans and elevations don't really address what's happening there.
- (Ald. Verveer) I respect the critical role UDC plays in our land use process. I can't thank all of you enough for the roles you play in service to our community. The conversations you have are invaluable to me as an Alder. Recognizing the significant design progression, the steering committee has only met once with the development team back on November 2, 2020. The President of Capitol Neighborhoods, Eli Judge sent a correspondence: the communication from the neighborhood association stands. I want to acknowledge the concerns you raised in your informational session last year were absolutely on point that the end caps were too blank. I think that was solved quite well, and I appreciate the three additional options shared here tonight. Even with those representations the steering committee asked that this matter be referred, with the full knowledge that valuable feedback would be garnered tonight. I respect the development team's desire to move forward, but I have to respect my constituents as well and respectfully ask that you refer this to your next meeting. This is scheduled to go to the Plan Commission on February 8<sup>th</sup>, if this was referred to your next meeting on February 10<sup>th</sup> the team could go to the Plan Commission on February 22<sup>nd</sup> and keep the same Council calendar on February 23<sup>rd</sup>. I know financing is of concern.
- Regarding the process and the letter, it appears as though the end caps and blank walls are a significant portion of the request to refer. Do you think that precludes an initial approval with the applicant having to come back with those elements and get them worked out for final?
- (Ald. Verveer) I encouraged the development team to at least only request initial, but could still continue with their Plan Commission schedule on February 8<sup>th</sup>.
- The concerns aren't substantial with regard to the entrance or height or loading area, it's mostly skin deep.
- That's a fair representation. The written communication you have specifically speaks to the rooftop, interest in sustainability features, solar, green roof, what it will all look like with mechanicals. Loading is another concern as well, I want to again reiterate that this is significant progression of the design. The development team has heard the comments from you and the neighborhood. I would understand if initial was your motion tonight.

#### **November 4, 2020 Informational Presentation Comments:**

##### Site Circulation comments:

- We'll want to see where cars are dropping off and all of that kind of traffic flow around that front door, especially since it is valet.

##### Façade Detail comments:

- More hierarchy to distinguish the vertical from horizontal expressions.
- Lighting, a little color, little more detail, but fundamentally looks like all the parts and pieces are there.
- I applaud the curve on the building, that's quite lovely. Right now the façade is working against the curve. You have a methodical rhythm that seems to be competing with the uniqueness of the curve. Could benefit from accentuating the curve and having more detail in there. This looks plain in comparison to what's going on across the street. This is a primo spot in the City and would benefit from more.
- The end caps jump out to me; that big blank façade towards the left, it's crying for something. Make the building look more dynamic by articulating that blank surface. Lighting and projections, all kinds of stuff that could be done.
- I know those are stair towers, maybe the design team could take a playful or random approach to some openings there. The apartment building (across the street) is very layered in its façade, perhaps you can just start to do something either at the base or top to get more three dimensionality on that curve.

- This side of Pinckney needs more of a base, it seems squat. I appreciate you pulled it off the corner but wonder if that area needs to be defined somewhat, it just looks like a wide sidewalk and doesn't feel like part of the building. Some kind of expression of the building coming out to define that seating area. It looks squat to me and it's a little plain, I would like more definition between the base and top, more differentiation as well.
- I find this building too restrained and too corporate. It's undistinguished, it doesn't excite at all. Given what else is going on at Block 89 and everything else with Judge Doyle, it's too restrained. I recall a shared greenspace between the buildings. We need to see both buildings and how that space is resolved.

Context & massing comments:

- I love the curve, keeping that between the two buildings is good.
- Agree on the low podium, it doesn't seem to echo or respect the podium on the other side.
- Happy to see the initial drawings of this dual project, the shapes are still there if maybe not the gleaming futuristic look in the early versions. At least we have these arcs that have maintained from those earlier versions and I think that's really important. It will set this whole block apart from others downtown.
- It would be useful to see what that apartment building looks like and how it relates to this hotel.
- Very exciting design. I wanted to understand the plan for the back of the building. The front of the building is so exciting but the back, there's a big white block modeled, what's the idea with the back, is there more opportunity there to have more expression and maybe move some of the glass in the front, going with other comments about layering, some of that glass can move to the back and balance out a little bit?
- It's going to be in that slot between the two towers from Doty and Wilson. It will be visible but not how you see it on that particular elevation.
- Building sections – you have a 9'4" floor to floor height, which is also contributing to this compactness of the appearance. Especially compared to other buildings in the area it just looks so pressed down. A second use of this building would be really limited with such a low floor to floor height.

**ATTACHMENT**  
**PD Zoning Statement of Purpose and Standards**

**28.098 (1) Statement of Purpose.**

The Planned Development (PD) District is established to provide a voluntary regulatory framework as a means to facilitate the unique development of land in an integrated and innovative fashion, to allow for flexibility in site design, and to encourage development that is sensitive to environmental, cultural, and economic considerations, and that features high-quality architecture and building materials. In addition, the Planned Development District is intended to achieve one or more of the following objectives:

- (a) Promotion of green building technologies, low-impact development techniques for stormwater management, and other innovative measures that encourage sustainable development.
- (b) Promotion of integrated land uses allowing for a mixture of residential, commercial, and public facilities along corridors and in transitional areas, with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections and amenities.
- (c) Preservation and enhancement of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities.
- (d) Preservation of historic buildings, structures, or landscape features through adaptive reuse of public or private preservation of land.
- (e) Provision of more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space, recreational amenities, and other public facilities than would otherwise be provided under conventional land development techniques.
- (f) Facilitation of high-quality development that is consistent with the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.

**28.098(2) Approval Standards for Project**

The standards for approval of a zoning map amendment to the PD District, or any major alteration to an approved General Development Plan, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant shall demonstrate that no other base zoning district can be used to achieve a substantially similar pattern of development. Planned developments shall not be allowed simply for the purpose of increasing overall density or allowing development that otherwise could not be approved unless the development also meets one or more of the objectives of (1) above. Conditions under which planned development may be appropriate include:
  - 1. Site conditions such as steep topography or other unusual physical features; or
  - 2. Redevelopment of an existing area or use of an infill site that could not be reasonably developed under base zoning district requirements.
- (b) The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans.
- (c) The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed. The City shall be able to provide municipal services to the property where the planned development is proposed without a significant increase of the cost of providing those services or economic impact on municipal utilities serving that area.

- (d) The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands. A traffic demand management plan may be required as a way to resolve traffic and parking concerns. The Plan shall include measurable goals, strategies, and actions to encourage travelers to use alternatives to driving alone, especially at congested times of day. Strategies and actions may include, but are not limited to, carpools and vanpools; public and private transit; promotion of bicycling, walking and other non-motorized travel; flexible work schedules and parking management programs to substantially reduce automobile trips.
- (e) The PD District plan shall coordinate architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.
- (f) The PD District plan shall include open space suitable to the type and character of development proposed, including for projects with residential components, a mix of structured and natural spaces for use by residents and visitors. Areas for stormwater management, parking, or in the public right of way shall not be used to satisfy this requirement.
- (g) The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point.
- (h) When applying the above standards to an application for height in excess of that allowed in Section 28.071(2)(a) Downtown Height Map, except as provided for in Section 28.071(2)(a)1. and Section 28.071(2)(b), the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans and no application for excess height shall be granted by the Plan Commission unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The excess height is compatible with the existing or planned (if the recommendations in the Downtown Plan call for changes) character of the surrounding area, including but not limited to the scale, mass, rhythm, and setbacks of buildings and relationships to street frontages and public spaces.
  - 2. The excess height allows for a demonstrated higher quality building than could be achieved without the additional stories.
  - 3. The scale, massing and design of new buildings complement and positively contribute to the setting of any landmark buildings within or adjacent to the project and create a pleasing visual relationship with them.
  - 4. For projects proposed in priority viewsheds and other views and vistas identified on the Views and Vistas Map in the City of Madison Downtown Plan, there are no negative impacts on the viewshed as demonstrated by viewshed studies prepared by the applicant.
- (i) When applying the above standards to an application to reduce or eliminate stepbacks required by Section 28.071(2)(c) Downtown Stepback Map, the Plan Commission shall consider the recommendations in adopted plans, including the downtown plan. No application to reduce or eliminate stepbacks may be granted unless it finds that all of the following conditions are present:
  - 1. The lot is a corner parcel.
  - 2. The lot is not part of a larger assemblage of properties.
  - 3. The entire lot is vacant or improved with only a surface parking lot.
  - 4. No principal buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed since the effective date of this ordinance

