

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

<b>REPORT OF:</b> LANDMARKS COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> July 20, 2015
<b>TITLE:</b> 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b> Amy Scanlon, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> July 20, 2015 <b>POF:</b>
<b>DATED:</b> July 20, 2015	<b>ID NUMBER:</b> 37499

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Jason Fowler, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

### **SUMMARY:**

Michael Christopher, representing Louis Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Christopher explained that the design team has had numerous meetings with the neighborhood and has been willing to make revisions that the neighborhood has requested. The neighborhood prefers option 1.

Levitan explained that affordable housing and locally owned businesses seem to have played a role in the support of the neighborhood and the representation has been made on the record that these items will be included in the project.

Christopher explained that Fortis is interested in incorporating these issues into the project.

Janine Glaeser, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Glaeser explained that the neighborhood and design team prefer option 1. She explained that the neighborhood approval process was long and that the design incorporates neighborhood comments. Glaeser explained that the project will maintain setbacks from the street along Williamson and Patterson, and at the fourth level; the landscaping including upper level green roof and green screening at Williamson; make a commitment to rent to local businesses; provide 2 affordable housing units; utilize green build home standards; and provide 2 bike parking stalls per unit. Glaeser described the design differences of option 2 and option 3.

Levitan explained that the roof shall be compatible with roofs in the VRA. Glaeser explained that the proposed roof has an industrial character that relates to the industrial corridor. Rummel explained that there is a curved roof at Mad Cat on Williamson, but it is not in the VRA.

Rosenblum asked for clarification about the proposed materials.

Anne Walker, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Walker explained that she is on the MNA Board, but is speaking as an individual. Walker explained that the volume and massing of the proposed building is not right for this location on the narrow street. She explained that the space provided to the street by the large open lot will be replaced by building. Walker explained that the

neighborhood won the American Planning Association Top 10 Award for neighborhood planning in 2013. She explained that there were numerous neighborhood meetings and that the discussions focused on the developer more than the design. She explained that this is a legacy building for the developer and that the building will be in the neighborhood for a long time and should be compatible. Walker shared a historic photo showing the different character of the street in circa 1885.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Lee explained that the focus should be on the ordinance language and the design should be “compatible” with the buildings and “environment” within the visually related area. He provided examples of compatibility and of the eclectic environment of Williamson Street.

Peter Wolff, registering neither in support nor opposition, and wishing to speak.

Wolff explained that the Commission should deeply discuss design options and address concerns about the proposed building design and neighborhood concerns. He explained that height and massing are concerns.

Lynn Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Lee is the President of the Marquette Neighborhood Association. He explained that the neighborhood approval process was long and that the developer incorporated neighborhood comments. Lee explained that options 2 and 3 have not been approved by the neighborhood. He explained that the curved roof is compatible with the adjacent industrial building and that the proposed building reflects the character of Williamson Street.

Levitan explained that the Commission must review the proposed building based on the standards in the ordinance and not on what design the neighborhood prefers.

There was general discussion about the compatibility of the massing, size, height, and volume.

Fowler explained that the demolition was approved and that approval was contingent on the design approval for the proposed building. He explained that he is surprised that the designs for the new building have returned for review without any change. Fowler explained that the proposed building is large. There was general discussion about the desire to have revised or modified designs at the meeting for review.

Staff described how option 3 is compatible with the other buildings in the visually related area and that the historic buildings should be on display in the historic district, not the new buildings.

There was general discussion about the compatibility of the curved roof.

There was general discussion about the proposed materials and the treatment of the setback space between the halves of the Williamson Street elevation. Staff suggested that the brick vertical piers continue to engage the third floor windows to establish the pilaster-bay-pilaster vertical rhythm.

There was general discussion about the alignment and treatment of the windows.

The Landmarks Commission acknowledges for the record that the applicant has made voluntary representations that the project shall incorporate two affordable housing units and non-franchise tenants and the Commission understands these representations to be binding commitments.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development with the following conditions of approval: the curved roof as submitted in option 2, the alignment of the windows shown in option 2; the material palette of option 1; the window configuration of the option 2 (without the wood panels); the introduction of the pilaster-bay rhythm; and the use of the horizontal “white line” detail, and with final review and approval by staff. The Landmarks Commission strongly encourages the Plan Commission and Common Council to incorporate, as conditions of approval, the voluntary representations made by the applicant regarding the inclusion of 2 affordable housing units and occupancy by non-franchise tenants. The motion passed by voice vote.**