

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 5 June 2017
TITLE: 130 E Gilman St – Exterior Alteration to a Designated Landmark in the Mansion Hill Hist. Dist.; 2 nd Ald. Dist.	REFERRED:
CONTACT: Robert Klebba	REREFERRED:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	REPORTED BACK:
DATED: 9 June 2017	ADOPTED: POF:
	ID NUMBER: 47422

Members present were: David WJ McLean, acting Chair; Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, Katie Kaliszewski, and Lon Hill. Excused were Stuart Levitan, Chair, and Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair.

SUMMARY:

David Waugh, registering in support and available to answer questions.
Robert Klebba, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Staff gave a brief summary of the approval process necessary for this agenda item.

Klebba provided a summary of the proposal. He would like feedback from the Landmarks Commission with regard to accessibility on the West/left side of the building and with regard to parking.

Staff confirmed that Klebba is suggesting a ramp on the west side and asked the Applicant if there would be a need to widen a doorway. The Applicant indicated that it was a possibility, and that is a building inspection and/or variance issue. Klebba has discussed it with Jennifer Davel. He would prefer not to change the door, but it could be redone with narrower windows and a wider door. Davel didn't have problems with that.

Staff asked if the ramp will tie into the existing porch structure. Per the Applicant, it will. The ramp would be left open-air, leading from the parking area to the south. The ramp would be the biggest exterior alteration, and Staff has no issues with it in concept.

Staff indicated that the biggest issue for the Landmarks Commission to consider at this time is parking. When this property came before the Landmarks Commission for land division, the Commission talked about how the rear yard needs to extend as far as possible towards the water, but the front yard treatment wasn't discussed in detail.

Per Klebba, there are two parking spaces on the site now. That area would be widened and turned. They would expand the parking area toward the property line; not toward the structure. They would

like to allow for restoration of the historic porch, not necessarily as a part of this project, but they want to be able to do it in the future.

Arnesen asked whether the plan was to have three separate parking areas. Klebba replied that the goal was two. The two space and the three space would come off of an existing driveway that is part of a previous garage and create one area.

McLean asked what the sequence of entry would be. Per Klebba, customers would have to walk around to the front door.

Klebba is open to feedback as to how to compensate for the change in grade.

Arnesen and McLean asked why there are two parking areas instead of one. Klebba responded that it's because of the trees present on the lot. McLean suggested they could be incorporated (turned into islands). McLean also suggested taking the parking further back, and asked if the flag pole would be removed. Per Klebba, it wouldn't have to be.

Arnesen asked if something could be worked out with the University, which has an easement behind the site.

Staff asked the Commission if they thought the home could be a single family residence. The Commission and the Applicant thought that it could, but it would be very expensive to maintain. It's more likely to be maintained and valued as a hotel or a commercial endeavor.

ACTION:

As this was an informational presentation, no action was taken.