

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 11, 2019
TITLE: 201-213 N. Blount Street – PD, New 8-Unit Residential Apartment Building, 2 nd Ald. Dist. (45920) *Change to vinyl siding rather than wood siding*	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 11, 2019	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Tom DeChant, Craig Weisensel, Rafeeq Asad, Syed Abbas and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 11, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to the January 15, 2020 meeting. Registered and speaking in opposition was Robert Klebba. The Secretary gave a brief background on the project, approved by the Commission in 2017. The focus is on the building that was moved to Dayton Street, with the applicant requesting a change in siding material. The PD was recorded as maintaining its existing wood siding and trim, however the work has already been completed and the house has been reclad in vinyl siding. Two letters of concern were submitted from neighbors.

Michael Matty stated he never intended to keep the siding. The intention was to build it for the tenants rather than for what the building looked like, to create a home for families. The lead paint, aluminum windows and asbestos were removed, the home was moved, and new mechanical systems and insulation were added. They are trying to reflect what is going on in the neighborhood but in reality the house right next door was just sided in vinyl, and there is vinyl siding throughout the neighborhood.

Public Comment:

Robert Klebba spoke, urging the Commission to go back to the original language in the PD. This PD was developed over an 18 month period, what you see is an amicable compromise between the developer and the neighborhood. We allowed the developer to tear down two buildings in our neighborhood. Every demolition chips away at the character of our neighborhood and the historical fabric of our city. The compromise is that the buildings that were to remain would be repaired with replacements made consistent with the character of the neighborhood, not vinyl siding. What we saw with the four buildings that remain on the property, all the original wood windows were removed, all the original siding was removed. We have vinyl siding on the building under discussion. We have a composite wood material with a very shiny finish for the three buildings on Blount Street. We can argue about the precedent of allowing this to happen and unfortunately we already have allowed a similar situation to happen with a previous PD on Johnson and Blair Street, where there was a commitment to tear down a significant number of buildings on Johnson Street, but buildings on Blair and

Gorham would be remodeled. The developer sold those buildings without completing the remodeling. The sets precedent for vinyl siding, but also not adhering to the Planned Development agreed upon.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Do you have any photos of the house in its current condition?
 - It's barn red vinyl.

The Secretary reminded the Commission that they are setting a precedent with a Planned Development if they approve vinyl siding.

- I'm in general disappointed that this decision was made, it seems there's some ambiguity here. I would have thought questions would have been asked.
- The elevations we reviewed called out existing painted wood clapboard siding.
 - That was existing but when we proposed the language our understanding was we were agreeing to the 3 existing houses. The siding was taken off before the house was even relocated, and the siding was rotting and had no insulation.
- This says "to remain," and that's where our assumption was, that's where the approval came across.
- I'm torn between it seeming extreme to make them remove this, but I don't think they should be rewarded for doing something that is contrary to what the City would prefer to happen here.
- I would cut to the chase and make a motion for referral. If you want to make the justification for reversal of the previous motion, I would need to see a lot more than this. Additional justification, etc. I don't see any justification for overturning the previous motion.
 - The issue is we're spending \$1.8 million on nine units. The justification is the neighborhood wants the outside, we're trying to make a home for long-term families. We agreed to the three houses on Blount Street, this is vinyl siding, it's not cheap. If I have to fix up a house for a family, what are we doing?
- If it doesn't look bad, I have no idea.
- We don't have a picture, we don't have a drawing, we don't have a physical sample. We don't know the details of the corner boards or windows.
 - Lead paint was removed, but that's OK if that would have stayed on. The asbestos that was there. There's no TIF money, no houses given by the City to me, this is all our money, no partners, my wife and I. This is what makes it extremely difficult to even do anything in this town anymore.
- We need more information. If they are going to rule in your favor we can't do that without any information. I know this is a PD but what's our range in terms of private residences?
- If this was a private residence in a residential zoning district we would have no jurisdiction, but this is a Planned Development. There is concern that something was submitted and approved and a lot of concern about what was provided.

ACTION:

On a motion by Weisensel, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The referral required the following additional information:

- Provide photos of the existing building.
- Provide a sample of the siding material.
- Provide product information and connection details for the siding and trim material.