

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 25, 2012

TITLE: 100 Block State Street Development – Proposed exterior alterations to designated Landmarks at 120 West Mifflin Street (Schubert Building) and 125 State Street (Castle & Doyle Building), and new development adjacent to landmarks. 4th Ald. District. Contact: Doug Hursh, Potter Lawson, Inc. (26725)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 25, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, Robin Taylor and Michael Rosenblum. Gehrig excused.

SUMMARY:

Levitan read a statement into the record about his previous actions regarding the Block 100 Foundation proposal and that due to the new proposal, the City Attorney has determined that he may participate in the review and discussion.

George Austin, 2316 Chamberlain Avenue, representing the Block 100 Foundation, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Austin provided a brief introduction. Mr. Austin explained that the project was placed on hold following the March 19 Plan Commission meeting to determine the future of the project.

Mr. Austin explained that the Block 100 Foundation listened to the comments from Commissions and the public and decided to move forward with the project. Mr. Austin explained that the new proposal has elements that remain unchanged. These include a retail-restaurant mix at the first level and office space in the upper floors and that massing is retained. The changes include the retention of the Schubert and Stark Buildings, elimination of open space, relocate the entrance to the upper floors to Fairchild Street, construction of a new building at mid-block, and deep stepback of new building at fourth floor.

Doug Hursh, 15 Ellis Potter Court, representing the Block 100 Foundation, registering in support, wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Mr. Hursh provided a presentation of the new proposal. Hursh noted that there are some changes to the proposal to accommodate comments in the Staff Report.

Mr. Hursh explained the comparison between the existing massing and the proposed massing. He noted that there is a 10 foot stepback at the upper floor of the new building along the Castle and Doyle Building, along State Street and along Fairchild Street.

Mr. Hursh described the proposed floor plans and explained that the retail rhythm of State Street would be maintained. He explained that there is a service core for retailers and new entrance for upper level offices on Fairchild Street. He explained the conceptual layout for the proposed restaurant that would utilize the Stark Building as the main dining area and the Schubert Building as additional flex space dining. Mr. Hursh noted that the proposal calls for a small addition to the rear of the Schubert Building for kitchen functions. He explained the second floor will be flexible office space and that new openings in existing party walls will be created to link adjacent spaces. Large skylights are proposed for the Stark Building and the new building in place of the Vallender Building. The third and fourth floors are proposed to have office space.

Mr. Hursh explained that the building that replaces the Buell and Haswell Buildings is in a modern style, but reflects contextual development along State Street. He explained that the new building is divided into four modules along State Street that respect the Castle and Doyle Building, but all would be slightly different in design. The fourth floor is proposed to be all glass to provide a reflective transparency.

Mr. Hursh explained that the rear elevation of the Castle and Doyle Building will be restored and will not have doors added. The new building in place of the Vallender Building will continue toward Castle and Doyle to fill in odd void and create more street presence.

Mr. Hursh explained that the Fairchild elevation of the proposed new building will have similar style to that on State Street. He noted that transom windows will be replaced on the Stark Building where they are currently covered and that the decorative metal balconies will remain.

Mr. Hursh explained that the marquee will be removed from the Schubert Building. He continued to explain that the doors and storefront glass would be replaced, paint will be removed from the limestone and brick will be repaired and probably repainted. The alley wall of the Schubert Building will be repaired, the stamped metal panels will be replaced with cement board siding due to structural issues, windows will likely be repaired, drainage issues will be remedied, and stained glass will be protected during work.

Rosenblum asked for clarification about replacement material behind the metal panels that are proposed to be removed. Mr. Hursh explained it could be stucco, but cement board provides fire resistant qualities.

Levitan requested clarification on material colors shown in renderings. Mr. Hursh explained that the Stark Building will be the color of clean Indiana limestone and the new Vallender will have a sandstone colored brick instead of a red brick.

Rummel requested clarification on the materials of the State Street façade as they relate to Castle and Doyle. Mr. Hursh explained that the new building would have a lighter brick similar to that being proposed for the new Vallender Building. Rummel asked if the project team had considered a color that would not be similar to the Castle and Doyle façade to allow it to stand out. Hursh explained that the terra cotta of Castle and Doyle has green and blue elements that would set it apart from the new material.

Rummel noted her appreciation for this submission. She asked if the project team would be willing to consider the reproduction of the style of the existing Vallender Building. Mr. Hursh explained that the current proposal shows a building that has similar arched recessed windows and brick piers at the upper level. The lower level will maintain the retail character.

Rummel requested that the project team consider the look of a three-story exterior to replicate the overall scale and proportion of the existing Vallender Building within the proposed 2-story building. Mr. Hursh explained that there may be some design elements that the project team could consider.

Taylor asked for clarification about the removal of paint on the Schubert Building when it was previously stated that the paint could not be removed from the Vallender Building. Mr. Hursh explained that the majority of the bricks on the Vallender Building are in poor condition.

Levitan questioned if this development would read as a unified development in the future. Hursh explained that the desire to break up the massing to retain the scale and rhythm of State Street will allow the new development to fit in the context while reading as a unified development.

Rummel asked that these new buildings be of the design and quality of landmarks. Mr. Hursh explained that the detailing of the building and the material selections will make exquisite buildings.

Jason Tish, 2714 LaFollette Avenue, representing Madison Trust for Historical Preservation, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Tish explained that he is in support of this proposal because it retains three of the existing historic buildings, retains the character of the block and district, and shows dramatic concessions in design approach by the Block 100 Foundation. He noted the appreciation of the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation to the Foundation for recognizing the validity of preserving and rehabilitating the building in the proposal and achieving a workable compromise that allows economic development and historic buildings to work together to create the mix needed to achieve vibrant downtown.

Tom Link, 1111 Willow Lane, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Mr. Link requested that the Landmarks Commission and the project team consider the restoration of the existing Vallender Building in lieu of new construction.

Alder Mike Verveer, 614 W. Doty Street, #407, representing the 4th Aldermanic District, registering in support and available to answer questions. Alder Verveer explained that he appreciates the continuous philanthropy of the Frautschi family. He noted that this new proposal exceed his expectations and shows that the Block 100 Foundation has been listening to the comments during the review process.

Grant Frautschi, 1801 Laurel Crest, representing the Block 100 Foundation, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Sarah Frautschi, 1801 Laurel Crest, registering in support but not wishing to speak.

Eric Lawson, 15 Ellis Potter Court, representing the Block 100 Foundation, registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as previously approved with conditions of approval for the exterior alteration to the Castle and Doyle Building. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff comments for the exterior alterations of the Schubert Building. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Slattery, to recommend to the Plan Commission/Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission find that the new building at 127-129 State Street is not so visually large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the adjacent landmark. The Landmarks Commission would welcome a design with scale and treatment of fenestration that is more appropriate to historic character of the existing building. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

There was discussion about the Landmarks Commission's desire to have the color of the exterior material of the new building offset/not compete with the color of the Castle and Doyle terra cotta.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by McLean, to recommend to the Plan Commission/Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the new building at 121-123 State Street is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rosenblum, to recommend to the Plan Commission/Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the building at 117 State Street is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to recommend to the Plan Commission/Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the building at 122 North Fairchild Street is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to amend the previous finding of historic value for the Buell Building to advise the Plan Commission that while the Landmarks Commission finds the Buell Building has historic value, this finding should not impede the current development proposal. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 11, 2012

TITLE: 100 Block State Street: 117-119, 121-123, 125, 127-129 State Street; 120, 122 West Mifflin Street – Project that Involves the Demolition, Renovation and Refurbishing of Some Structures, as well as New Construction in the C4 Central Commercial District. 4th Ald. Dist. (24478)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: July 11, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 11, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the demolition, renovation and refurbishing of structures, as well as new construction in the C4 Central Commercial District located at 117-119, 121-123, 125, 127-129 State Street; 120, 122 West Mifflin Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were George Austin, Eric Lawson, Doug Hursh, Grant Frautschi, and Sarah Frautschi, all representing the Block 100 Foundation; Scott Kolar and Mary M. Kolar. Austin stated that the Frautschi’s and the Block 100 Foundation listened very carefully to all the input from the community and City boards and commissions. Their objectives are to honor State Street’s historic past, sustain its retail character, enliven North Fairchild Street, give the properties another 100 year life, benefit the Overture Center and provide an addition tax base. The Stark building will be retained, eliminating the public garden aspect previously discussed and holding the corner. The office entrance has been moved from State Street to mid-block on Fairchild Street. The new construction will be a “modern design of our time,” rather than keeping the Buell façade. The setback of new construction has been increased from the Castle & Doyle building to not be visually intrusive. Hursh reviewed the surrounding context, massing models and design changes. Retail remains on State Street with the ability for some small retail to occur within the new development. They are creating a service corridor behind the retail to provide accessible restrooms, storage below in the basement and trash storage. A small lobby area will also attract more activity to the Fairchild elevation. The Stark building and the Schubert building will be a restaurant space. The kitchen will be at the center of the block to keep the activity on the perimeter. The upper floors will be connected to keep them as open as possible. Skylights into the Vallender and Stark buildings will add some natural light to those spaces, as well as green roofs. A 10-foot setback on the fourth floor has the possibility of being residential. Glass front retail will run along the first floor elevation of State Street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You've done a great job mixing old with new. I love the Fairchild elevation. It's a beautiful complement to the Overture and library, and what the existing buildings are. I'm just thrilled about this.
 - The one piece that feels klunky here is the State Street elevation of the big glass piece, the bold piece. It looks like it's a piece out of a box from 20 or 30 years ago, but I trust that you'll make it work.
 - I love the refinements you've made to the piece on Fairchild. Perhaps research the possible need for a mid-block crossing from that Fairchild entrance to the Overture Center, but that's beyond our purview.
 - Regarding the glass piece on State Street, perspectives showed a lot more detail than on the elevations. Is there some articulation there?
 - It's a zinc frame, a reveal, a smaller frame that the glass would go in. Within that frame, the idea is to keep that fairly clean glass without surface mullions, and be able to see through that, to see the structural slab and detailing. No spandrel. We've talked about the possibility of doing a foot coating so from the outside you get a light sandblasted feel where you could see but it would still obscure that.
 - Do you think the awnings are necessary on State Street, because you said they are not there for shading purposes.
 - I think what it does is allow some color on the building in a more lighter, playful way versus trying to put it in the bricks and mortar, where you'd be stuck with it forever.
 - Have you looked at not doing that central piece in the new Vallender building?
 - When you looked at doing the floor volumes in the new building; you had two buildings but you have four volumes. There's that datum line going across all of them, are you doing it because it's next to the Castle & Doyle building? I would like to see your building be the new landmark in 100 years and not because it's next door to a landmark building. That line is very strong.
 - If you look at places that have that sense of urban unity but still have interest, there are those datum lines that start to connect the buildings even though they are separate. We did look at these windows starting to align here, part of that is the fact that the floor level is here and we wanted to line that up, but the windows could align with the Castle & Doyle building. These windows are starting to pick up that rhythm while not repeating it exactly as it is.
 - If people choose not to have awnings, will there be signable areas built into the buildings?
 - We did talk about that and show it on the brick here because awnings can become flat. These are shown as awnings so they are smaller and cleaner, and they protrude out at an angle where you wouldn't want to necessarily put a sign on it. There is an area on the brick for that.
- Make sure signable areas are provided in lieu of awnings.
- This is a building that very much nestles itself into the context and creates an urban datum, while allowing those other buildings to maintain that historic continuity. Each building has its own character. The elevations may read flatter than it really is going to be; that's going to do a lot to change the character of essentially four façades on State Street. It wants you to appreciate where you are rather than focusing at that section of the building.
 - I'd like to express a deep appreciation to the Frautschi's for their patience and coming back and bringing us a project that meets many goals the City has, as well as some of theirs.
 - If I look at the Fairchild façade in the glass openings, I count six bays across and when I look at the floor plan the lobby doors come out to the left, but the renderings show them on the right and the floor plans actually show another door on the right. Since the documents are basically the foundation for what gets approved you're going to need to revise something there to make that clear.
 - The elevations you have are more current. They should jive with the floor plan.
- But the floor plans as I see it show the lobby having double doors and then there's an exit from the stairwell as well, so there would be three doors opening into those six slots and the double doors seem to be on the right rather than the left. It's a technical kind of correction.

That is a change we made recently.

- Trash doors on rendering versus elevation needs to be consistent as “solid.”
- Are you going to put a name, address or signage on that side of Fairchild? It almost says, “what is this?”
 - It could be a possibility. We have to have the address for sure.
- Given the standard palette I think those splashes of color would be important. And the selection of color is important. The awnings are critical.
- The glass proportions seem not quite right to me.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL AND FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0) with advisory address of comments made.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. 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. The overall ratings for this project are 7, 8, 9, 9 and 10.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 100 Block State Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	9	-	-	-	-	9	9
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	9	-	-	7	-	9	9
	8	8	-	-	-	-	8	8

General Comments:

- City should place focus on the design of the streets at this node. Insertion of a modern volume in a historic context very successfully done on a Citywide scale. Appreciate the applicants' continued care in designing individuality into each space and each 20' State Street bay.
- Excellent solution to difficult problem. Details will be critical.