



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

---

Monday, September 14, 2009

4:45 PM

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

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 5 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans; Stuart Levitan; Christina Slattery  
and Erica Fox Gehrig

**Excused:** 2 -

Robin M. Taylor and Michael J. Rosenblum

### APPROVAL OF August 24, 2009 MINUTES

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Gehrig, to Approve the Minutes from the August 24, 2009 Landmarks Commission meeting with the following additions:

To add: "that staff mentioned that part of the Mansion Hill Neighborhood is also in the Langdon Street National Historic District."

To add that Michael Bridgeman said: "That contrary to earlier comments, that both Ms. Zellers and Mr. Mohs are excellent stewards of the Mansion Hill Historic District, and that they even open up their homes to tours and other people interested in the district."

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

### PUBLIC HEARING

1. [15469](#) 2021 Van Hise Avenue - University Heights Historic District  
Consideration of Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for a side yard addition.  
Contact: Colin Godding  
Colin Godding, 107 N Hamilton St, presented information about the project and included a drawing that shows a revision of the driveway layout in order to address the concerns about the removal of a tree.  
  
Mr. Godding presented several drawings of the proposed addition, along with photographs of other houses in the neighborhood that had attached garages. Mr. Godding also presented the Commission with three letters of support from neighbors. These letters came from Linda Micke, 26 N Prospect Ave., Cornelia McDermott, 2103 Van Hise Ave. and Catherine Montgomery, 101 S Prospect St.  
  
Fred Osborne, owner of 2021 Van Hise Ave., discussed that his family is moving from San

Francisco, and that they bought the double lot in order to have a large lot size that would support a larger house. The addition is basically a master bedroom suite, updated kitchen and the two-car garage.

Staff stated that they had received a letter from Ms Joyce Knutson, regarding the oak tree. Staff also received a voice mail from Don Nichols at 2111 Van Hise who is concerned about the proposed addition. He said that the house is a significant architectural building within the neighborhood. Mr. Nichols expressed that while he is okay with garage, he thinks that the middle addition could be moved back 15-18 feet from the proposed location in order to be more deferential to the main house façade.

Karen and Walter Pridham, 2011 Van Hise Ave., and Robert Heyden, 2016 Van Hise Ave., registered in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Christina Pawney, 21 Prospect Ave., registered in neither support nor opposition, but wished to express that she is happy that the owner has agreed to move the driveway to save the oak tree. She would also like the owners to consider permeable pavement for the driveway in order to protect the adjacent trees.

Michael Whitmore, 2010 Van Hise Ave., registered in opposition and submitted letter which stated that the proposal "would represent an architectural loss".

Lawrence Shriberg, 2015 Van Hise, registered in opposition, and handed out a packet of information to share with the Commission. Mr. Shriberg discussed that the neighborhood is excited for new young families to move in and that his concerns are completely architectural and are not meant to be personal. He said that his wife Linda will elaborate on their concerns.

Linda Shriberg read a letter that stated that the expansion plans are not right for the neighborhood. She showed a photo of the Schultz House in Winnetka, Illinois that was the inspiration for this house. She also showed an expansion of the Schultz house which was designed to be on the back façade which was much more compatible than this proposed expansion. Ms Shriberg also displayed examples of other prairie style houses within the neighborhood. She added that this proposal doubles the length of the existing façade, and that allowing this kind of addition would affect the Historic District.

Alder Bidar-Sielaff said that she thinks a referral to a future meeting would allow the owner and architect time to consider design alterations that could respond to the concerns of both planning staff and the neighborhood.

Ms Gehrig appreciated the research that was done by the neighbors and added that the existing house is a 'jewel box' that needs careful consideration of any addition. Mr. Godding added that he thought that their proposed addition was similar to the side addition at the Schultz House.

Mr. Levitan noted that the proposed plans will be almost an 85% street coverage along Van Hise Ave that will prevent the views into the wooded areas. He also noted that while individual components are symmetrical and well intended, the overall impact of the addition is very long.

Ald. Maniaci asked that the owners consider a smaller addition with perhaps a single car garage, considering that the existing house already has six bedrooms. She also asked the applicant to consider a rear yard addition with driveway access off of the rear/side street. Mr. Godding asked if a rear/side yard would be considered a side addition. Staff replied that it would be considered a street facing addition; however, it could be considered a rear yard addition that would have less impact on the front facade design.

Ms Slattery referred to the Landmarks Ordinance language that stated that they, and the owners need to consider whether or not this addition detracted from the original façade.

**A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Levitan, to close the public hearing and Refer to a future meeting of the LANDMARKS COMMISSION in order to allow the applicant to consider design revisions. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

---

**CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

2. [15483](#) Edgewater Redevelopment - 666 Wisconsin Avenue - Mansion Hill Local Historic District.
- Contact: Amy Supple, Hammes Company
- A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Slattery, to Rerefer to a future meeting of the LANDMARKS COMMISSION as requested by the applicant. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
3. [15892](#) 1914 Arlington Place - University Heights Local Historic District, proposal to remove existing chimneys and add a rear dormer.
- Contact: Bruce Kieffer
- Bruce Kiefer, 1914 Arlington Place described the proposed alterations to the house. He said as both the architect and the owner of the house, he was unhappy with the design and the maintenance issues that have come because of the large Chimneys. He also stated that the new dormer was designed to take advantage of a lake view from that vantage point.
- David Pesch, N7771 Omar Ln, New Glarus, is the builder and registered in support and was available to answer questions.
- Noting the staff report, a motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Maniaci, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
4. [15893](#) 640 West Washington Ave - Designated Landmark, Alteration to previously-approved Certificate of Appropriateness for enclosure under overhang.
- Contact: Del Henning, Williamson Bikes & Fitness
- Mr. Henning , 640 West Washington Ave presented information about the project. He discussed that he was fine with the staff conditions.
- Mr. Levitan asked about staff condition number three in the staff report, and asked that it be changed to say "that the fencing should not be visible from the street or parking lot when not in use." He also reiterated the issue that the fencing must be inside of all of the columns and brick piers.
- Ms. Gehrig noted that she liked this solution better than the one that was previously approved, and added that The Madison Trust for Historic Preservation also supported this design solution.
- Ms. Maniaci asked if the Commission could get an update on this project in one year. Mr. Stephans replied that individual Commissioners usually check up on past projects, and discuss during the Secretary's report if they have concerns over past approvals.
- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Levitan, to Approve the alteration to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions as follows:**
- 1. The fencing must be installed on the inside of both the brick piers and the stone columns.**
  - 2. The applicant must work with staff and provide design details so that the end result of installation and attachment to the brick piers will be minimal, reversible, and that the overlap of the fence sections will have a clean and deliberate looking appearance.**
  - 3. The fencing should not be visible from the street or parking lot when not in use.**
  - 4. No additional signage is to be attached to the interior or exterior of the**

fencing panels.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

5. [08717](#) Buildings proposed for demolition

There was no discussion.

6. [07804](#) Secretary's Report

The Commissioners discussed the room arrangements and that Room LL-110 meets their needs better than LL-130. Staff agreed to try to schedule both the remaining 2009 meetings, as well as all of the 2010 Landmarks Commission Meetings in Room LL-110.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to Adjourn at 6:20 p.m.  
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**