



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

---

Monday, February 28, 2011

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

Stuart Levitan; Christina Slattery; Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans;  
Robin M. Taylor; Michael J. Rosenblum and Erica Fox Gehrig

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to APPROVE the February 14, 2011 minutes.  
The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to take the agenda items out of order.  
There was no comment from the public, so the motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

### PUBLIC HEARING - CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

2. [21413](#) 14 South Franklin Street - First Settlement Historic District - Demolition of existing structure and construction of new two unit residence.  
Contact: Chris Muchka and Audric Schieve  
Audric Shieve and Chris Muchka, Progress Investors, briefly presented the project. Mr. Muchka explained that the existing 4 unit structure was lost to fire on October 6, 2010 and that they are proposing to demolish the existing structure and construct a new 2 unit.  
Carol Crossan, East Main Street, registered in support, but did not wish to speak.  
Jim Skrentny, East Main Street, registered in support. Mr. Skrentny explained that he is representing the First Settlement District of Capitol Neighborhoods and that the group supports the Applicant's proposal.  
Mr. Levitan asked if the Applicant would address the comments in the staff report. In response to the comments in the staff report, Mr. Muchka stated that the front window was placed to provide

symmetry with the opposite door, but that they would consider moving the window. He explained that the paired windows would reduce energy efficiency, but that they would be agreeable to adding a paired storm window at the rear stair enclosure. He explained that the 24" overhang at the front porch was designed to provide protection for the front steps, but that he would consider reducing the overhang.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to APPROVE the new construction as submitted with the condition that the storm window in the upper level of the rear stair enclosure be changed to look like a paired double hung window and the cantilvered corner of the upper stair platform have a decorative bracket and "beam" expressed in the siding detail.**

**The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

**A motion was made by Gehrig to APPROVE the new construction with a reduced porch overhang at a dimensions to be reviewed and finalized by Staff. The motion did not receive a second.**

**A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to APPROVE the demolition.**

**The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

1. [20928](#)

209 North Prospect Avenue - University Heights Historic District- construction of a new single-family home in the University Heights Historic District and adjacent to a designated landmark (Ely House).

Contact: Johnsen Schmaling Architects

Julie and Matt Sager, 639 Knickerbocker Street, briefly presented the proposed project. They explained that the proposed residence would be modestly sized with a 945 square foot footprint and 2000 square feet of total living space. They explained the shape of the lot and that the house was sited to retain green space along Propsect Avenue, to keep the view of the Ely House from Prospect, and to maximize privacy for all neighboring homes. They described discussions with the City Engineer regarding the storm water management swale, the elevation studies relating the height to the residence at 211 North Prospect, the streetscape views of the proposed residence in relation to the neighboring buildings, the use of high quality materials, the green aspects of design, and the timeline of the process to date.

Ms. Sager explained that the stakes on the site are from the topographic survey. She clarified that the cedar siding will be smooth, not beveled. Mr. Levitan asked if the Applicants had considered aligning the rear of the house with the others to continue the pattern seen in the various maps of the submission materials. In response, Ms. Sager explained that there were many issues that were considered before locating the house. These issues included the narrow lot shape at the street and the resulting geometry of the site, the distance to the neighboring homes and the resulting privacy issues, the garage location on the side, retaining the green space at the street, and the efficient location for passive solar use. Mr. Levitan asked if the Applicants understood when they were purchasing the lot that it was located in a historic district. Ms. Sager stated that the Landmarks Ordinance was supplied to them when they were in negotiations for the purchase and that they had previously resided in the district.

Brian Johnsen and Sebastian Schmaling, Johnsen Schmaling Architects, registered in support and were available to answer questions.

Betsy Haimson, 209 North Spooner, registered in opposition. Ms. Haimson stated that there were no flat roof forms in the visually related area. She explained that upon review of the contextual views she realizes her property will not be directly affected, but she feels the house at 1712 Summit will be negatively impacted.

Trudy Barash, 205 North Prospect, registered in support. Ms. Barash stated that University Heights is an eclectic grouping of buildings and she wonders what Mr. Ely was thinking in 1900 as other homes were being built around his home. She explained that she was pleased by the consideration of the setback and that the careful placement provides unbroken green space at the street.

Tom Neujahr, 168 North Prospect, registered in opposition. Mr. Neujahr stated that the city process should adopt a policy in historic districts to consider land division while also considering what is

proposed to be built on the new parcel. Mr. Levitan asked if he felt a modestly sized structure could be placed on this site without affecting the neighboring landmark building. Mr. Neujahr stated that the lot should be left unbuilt to give some space to the landmark structure. He explained that the proposed building should be pushed back further to give more breathing room to the street and the neighboring homes.

Jeremy Levin, 1715 Hoyt Street, registered in support. Mr. Levin explained that he finds the modestly sized home welcome in the neighborhood of eclectic styles including the International style home at the corner of Ely and Summit and the nearby Gilman House by Frank Lloyd Wright.

Mary Yockey, 1602 Summit Avenue, registered in opposition and did not wish to speak, but provided a statement that was added to the public record.

Joan Knoebel, 1712 Summit Avenue, registered in opposition. Ms. Knoebel explained that the siting of the proposed residence is very close to the rear property line and because of the topography, her home is 5-12 feet lower than the site of the proposed residence. She explained that her home was built in 1928 and overlooked the neighboring green space. She feels that the views out of the windows on the back of her home will be ruined by the location of the proposed residence. She explained that the flat roof is a difficult element to support with regard to the interpretation of the Ordinance. She noted that a residence with no pitch is not similar to homes with pitched roofs.

Reed Jones, 211 North Spooner Street, registered in support. Mr. Jones stated that this property was a difficult shape to build upon and that he commended the Applicants for their modest design with flat roof. He noted that there are many flat roofs in the neighborhood and complimented the Applicants for how they conducted the entire process with the neighbors.

Michael Cullenward, 1712 Summit Avenue, registered in opposition. Mr. Cullenward explained that he would have preferred that the site remain unsubdivided. He noted that there would be a fair amount of earth moving to allow for the building to be considered a 2 story. He also noted that 8 different categories for sloped roof types are shown in the submission materials and it would have been more clear to show pitched roof forms compared to flat roof forms in order to understand a dominant roof form.

Linda McNeel, 220 North Prospect Avenue, registered in opposition. Ms. McNeel would prefer that nothing be built on this site. She stated that she does not believe the addition of the proposed residence will maintain the character of the historic district. She suggested that density could be achieved by the addition of another floor on an apartment or condominium building instead of this proposed construction.

Darsi Foss, 2533 Kendall, registered in support. Ms. Foss suggested that everyone move past the division of the lot and discuss the issue before us. She stated that she thought the setback showed appreciation for the Ely House landmark and that she liked the project.

Marsh Shapiro, 205 Princeton Avenue, registered in opposition. Mr. Shapiro stated that he didn't think the property should have been subdivided and that this proposed building does not belong on this property. He stated that the driveway is not shown in any of the elevations and asked how the site would be lighted.

Lisa Kisling, 211 North Prospect Avenue, registered in opposition. Ms. Kisling explained that she currently has vista of green out of her windows and that the proposed residence will loom over her house, block views, and affect privacy. She stated that she felt the proposed residence was negatively affecting the value of her property while it is currently on the market. She stated that she invested in good quality materials to do the renovation work on her house and might have made different decisions if she had known the value of her home would be negatively impacted. She said she would prefer to have the house pushed further back on the lot.

John Schlaefer, 1814 Kendall Avenue, registered in support. Mr. Schlaefer stated that the Applicants have done their due diligence to reach out to the neighbors and design a building that does not overwhelm the neighboring buildings by setting it back and restricting its size. He explained that the neighborhood evolved stylistically over time and that this proposal brings the twenty first century into the continuum of design.

Lynn Gilchrist, 113 Ely Place, registered in opposition. Ms. Gilchrist provided a statement that was added to the public record. The statement questioned the required information needed for submission and stated that the streetscape drawing would be helpful in evaluating the proposal.

Jennifer Nashold, 167 North Prospect Avenue, registered in opposition. Ms. Nashold stated that the Landmarks Commission should consider Mr. Neujahr's recommendation. She explained that she does not believe this design fits in the historic district and she does not believe the design will stand the test of time.

Craig Schoenecker, 1024 Jenifer Street, registered in support, but did not wish to speak.

Steven Sager, Fond du Lac, registered in support, but did not wish to speak.

Bonnie Tompkins, 207 North Prospect, registered in opposition. Ms. Tompkins explained that she felt the proposed design would detract from the neighborhood. She noted that she heard the theories regarding infill in historic districts, but would prefer a traditional style. She explained that she would prefer less square footage with lower height.

Craig Christianson, 234 Lathrop, registered in support. Mr. Christianson explained that he will probably be able to see the proposed residence from his property and he commends the Applicants for investing in the neighborhood with a design that meets the high quality and integrity of design that is common in the neighborhood. He stated that a wider latitude of architectural styles should be encouraged in the historic district.

Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, 2704 Kendall Avenue, registered to speak. Alder Bidar-Sielaff stated that the Applicants made numerous efforts to reach out to the neighborhood as part of an open and transparent process. She described the timeline of communications with the neighborhood about the proposed residence. She described the history of the subdivision of the land and noted the memorandum prepared for this meeting by Assistant City Attorney Noonan. She explained that she agreed with the recommendation from Mr. Neujahr. She explained that a modern architectural design is more preferable as infill in a historic district. She noted that she was pleased that the streetscape views were provided after being requested at the neighborhood meeting. She suggested that the Applicants consider a request, heard at the neighborhood meeting, to study lowering the vertical presence by increasing the footprint.

Ms. Gehrig stated that she appreciated the engagement of the Alder and the neighbors throughout the process. She noted that she understood that the residents were interested in their historic district and encouraged them to be supportive of all historic districts in the City. She asked City staff to clarify what was involved in the subdivision of the land. Tim Parks, City Planner, explained that the request for land division was reviewed by the Plan Commission and that a Class 2 notice was done for the Plan Commission public hearing in March 2008 and that notices were sent to owners and occupants within 200 feet of the property. The Plan Commission referred the matter for more discussion on the subdivision. The matter was approved on April 7, 2008 with conditions including a tree preservation plan and front and northern side property lines.

Mr. Levitan asked for clarification about the amount of earth being moved and how stormwater runoff would be controlled. Mr. Schmalzing explained that they worked with the City Engineer to develop a swale on the north edge that would direct the stormwater runoff in a pipe to the street. He explained that the swale would control the runoff. Mr. Johnsen explained that the small building size would aid in the reduction of runoff and that a larger footprint would negatively impact the runoff.

Mr. Levitan asked Ms. Barash to clarify her representation during the earlier conversation. He asked for clarification about the letter to the Plan Commission from 2008 that stated a Georgian style home may be built on the subdivided site. Mr. Harvey Barash, 205 North Prospect Avenue, asked to speak in response to this question. He stated that they worked out a right of first refusal agreement with the neighbor. He explained that the lot was originally subdivided for their use and was never officially for sale until the Sagers approached them about purchasing the site.

Ms. Slattery asked if the height was accurately represented in the elevation studies. Mr. Johnsen stated that the first floor is 9 feet high and the second floor is 8 feet high. He explained that the building is set into the grade and that moving it forward or to the side will not affect the height. He explained that the height is similar to the height of the house at 211 North Prospect. Mr. Levitan requested that the Architects share the topographic model. Mr. Schmalzing briefly shared the model.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Maniaci, to CLOSE the public hearing.**

**The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

Staff explained that there are a variety of roof forms in the visually related area, and noted the

Ordinance refers to "roof shapes and pitches on existing buildings" in the visually related area and does not specify primary roof shapes and pitches. Staff explained that there were flat roofs on portions of the residences at 1712 Summit Avenue and 1711 Kendall Avenue. Mr. Levitan requested that the Commission have a preservation theory discussion about whether contemporary infill is appropriate in a historic district. Ms. Gehrig explained that the infill should be of the architecture of the time and she appreciates that the proposed residence emulates the International Style. Mr. Rosenblum explained that he agrees that the infill building should be in the style of the time. Ms. Slattery explained that the continuum of styles in the district should be encouraged. Mr. Levitan explained that he would prefer to see the structure space structure rhythm and asked what issues the Landmarks Commission discussed three years ago regarding the subdivision. Planning staff explained that the lot division was presented to the Landmarks Commission on February 25, 2008.

Alder Maniaci stated that she thought the proposal was appropriate and that this neighborhood is a parade of homes of different styles. Ms. Taylor explained that the idea of new in old is common and that she appreciates that the style is sensitive to the site and that the Applicants are using green technologies. She explained that someone will be affected by the proposed residence regardless of where it is located on the site and that this location is most agreeable. Mr. Rosenblum stated that all parties will not be agreeable and that he does not have a problem with a new style in a historic district. He noted that this historic district has a variety of house styles and house placements on lots.

Ms. Slattery asked that Staff clarify the reason to use criteria 33.19(5)(b) to review this proposal. Planning staff explained that the Plan Commission applied those criteria to the Certified Survey Map to consider the landmark site as a whole even though it was divided into two separate parcels. Mr. Stephans explained that there are numerous styles in the historic district and that he would strongly object to a period style that was not honest to its period. He noted that this proposal is consistent with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards. Mr. Levitan is concerned about the flat roof criteria in the visually related area and how the proposal might affect the Ely House. He noted that he feels the magnitude of the landmark needs breathable area. Ms. Gehrig stated that she was glad the Landmarks Commission would get to review the proposed construction next to the Ely House. Mr. Stephans noted that the contemporary style enhances the traditional style of the Ely House.

**A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Rosenblum, to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction with the following conditions:**

- 1. The Applicants shall submit window information including cut sheets, frame and sash material and color, and window details.**
- 2. The Applicant shall submit door information including cut sheets, frame and door material and color, and door details.**
- 3. The Applicants shall submit a wall section drawing to explain the details and relationship of adjacent materials.**
- 4. The Applicants shall explain rain water conduction methods.**
- 5. The Applicants shall submit final construction document floor plans and elevations.**
- 6. the Applicants shall submit a final tree planting and preservation plan prior to issuance of building permits.**

**The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

**Ayes:** 5 -  
Slattery; Maniaci; Taylor; Rosenblum and Gehrig

**Noes:** 1 -  
Levitan

**Non Voting:** 1 -  
Stephans

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 3. [21101](#) Landmarks Commission Procedures

**Ms. Gehrig made a motion to nominated Mr. Levitan to act as Vice Chair. Ms. Taylor seconded the nomination. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

Mr. Levitan suggested that the document be revised to say when Scanlon is absent, Fruhling or Cnare may be designees.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to REFER the discussion of the procedures document to the next meeting. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

4. [17835](#)

Landmarks Ordinance Revisions

Staff suggested that Ordinance revision discussions be conducted at a future meeting.

5. [20957](#)

Buildings proposed for demolition - 2011

Staff explained that there were numerous buildings of note in the current demolition notice. Ms. Gehrig asked if anyone had any ideas for a place to relocate Parmans.

6. [07804](#)

Secretary's Report

Staff explained that the City had been informed that the Certified Local Government Grant for the west side Post World War II architectural survey had been awarded funding and that Staff would apply for the grant for the survey on the east side again next year.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to ADJOURN at 7:30 P.M. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**