



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development
Planning Division

Website: www.cityofmadison.com

Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL100
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985
FAX 608 267-8739
PH 608 266-4635

To: Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission
From: Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planner
Re: 100 Block State Street Development
Summary of Landmarks Commission Actions
Date: March 1, 2012

At its meeting on February 27, 2012, the Landmarks Commission discussed the referred items related to the Block 100 Foundation development proposal. The following actions were taken:

- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the Fairchild (Stark) Building at **122-124 West Mifflin Street** has architectural, cultural and social value and recommends that it should not be demolished.
- A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to refer further consideration of the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the landmark Schubert Building at **120 West Mifflin** to the next meeting (March 12, 2012).

At its meeting on January 30, 2012, the Landmarks Commission was presented with the Block 100 Foundation development proposal. The following actions were taken:

- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations to the Castle and Doyle Building at **125 State Street** subject to terms of staff report of January 27. The motion passed on a voice vote/other. (The terms of the staff report are listed on the reverse)
- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rosenblum, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the new building at **127-129 State** is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark and include staff comment. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.
- A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Taylor, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the Vallender Building has social and architectural historic value. If the existing building at **127-129 State** is demolished, the Landmarks Commission requests it be replaced with a building in a historically appropriate style. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.
- A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the current iteration of the 4th story and the Fairchild elevations of the building at **121 State Street** is visually intrusive and adversely affects the character and integrity of the adjacent landmark. Specifically, the Landmarks Commission notes the adverse affect of the minimal setbacks, proposed material color, and overall perspective when coming up State Street. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

- A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by McLean, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the **Buell Building** has historic value based on the Craftsman style and historic mixed use. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.
- A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by McLean, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the historic value of the **Haswell Building** has been largely lost to exterior alterations. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.
- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel, to refer the consideration of the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the Schubert Building at **120 West Mifflin** and discussions about historic value of **122-124 West Mifflin** to the next Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

The following items to be approved by Staff, or the Landmarks Commission if determined necessary by Staff related to the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alterations to the Castle and Doyle Building:

1. Exterior alterations that differ from or are in addition to those included above.
2. A more detailed scope of the exterior restoration work.
3. All existing terra cotta tiles shall be restored in situ. Should any tiles need to be removed from the façade for restoration work, the request for removal must be approved by Staff prior to performing the work. The replacement of terra cotta tiles is not part of the proposal and approval for replacement is not being considered.
4. Samples of the proposed granite material.
5. Additional information on the scope of work proposed for the first floor display window and the central window of the second floor.
6. Further explanation of the proposed installation of insulated glass.
7. A window replacement plan including locations and replacement window product information.
8. Two existing windows on the Fairchild Street elevation are proposed to be changed to doors. Additional information about this scope of work shall be provided. The elevation drawings are not shown consistently in the submission. The existing masonry opening width is retained in some views and has been widened in other views. Staff would prefer that the widths of the existing masonry openings and related arches be retained. If retaining the width is not possible, the Applicants shall provide a more detailed drawing showing the proposed alterations. Staff is concerned that any new brick arches shall relate to the width of the new openings in a historically appropriate way.
9. More information about the brick restoration work. Staff is most concerned about the appearance of the replacement brick; the mortar mix, color, texture, and pointing style; quantity and location of replacements required; location of area(s) requiring pinning; and method proposed for removal of coatings.
10. There is a change in the plane of the exterior wall in a portion of the Fairchild Street elevation that is not accurately shown in the submission documents. The Applicant shall provide drawings that accurately depict the final appearance of this elevation and the treatment of the window located in the area.

The January 30, 2012 meeting minutes have been approved and are attached for your review. The February 27, 2012 meeting minutes have not been completed. Also attached for your review is the Staff Report to the Landmarks Commission and a communication from City Attorney May.