



Project Name & Address: 101 N Hamilton Street, Draper Brothers Block

Application Type(s): Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations to a Designated Madison Landmark

Legistar File ID # [66291](#)

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: August 11, 2021

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Emily Mader-Kiley, Angus-Young

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for repainting the brick exterior, creating new window openings, filling a window opening with brick, replacing 2nd floor windows on the front façade, replacing side doors, installing a limestone base along the E Mifflin Street façade, and adding a panel signage board.

Background Information

Parcel Location/Information: The subject site is a Designated Madison Landmark

Relevant State Statute Section:

Wisc SS 62.23(7)(em)2m. In the repair or replacement of a property that is designated as a historic landmark or included within a historic district or neighborhood conservation district under this paragraph, a city shall allow an owner to use materials that are similar in design, color, scale, architectural appearance, and other visual qualities.

Relevant Ordinance Sections:

- 41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.
- (1) New construction or exterior alteration. The Landmarks Commission shall approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior alteration or construction only if:
 - (a) In the case of exterior alteration to a designated landmark, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (b) In the case of exterior alteration or construction of a structure on a landmark site, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (c) In the case of exterior alteration or construction on any property located in a historic district, the proposed exterior alteration or construction meets the adopted standards and guidelines for that district.
 - (d) In the case of any exterior alteration or construction for which a certificate of appropriateness is required, the proposed work will not frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City’s historic resources.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis and Conclusion

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations, including repainting the already painted masonry exterior, creating new window openings on the Mifflin St façade, filling a previously wood-filled window opening with brick, replacing nonhistoric 2nd floor windows on the front façade of the brick structure, repairing a remaining historic window on the 2nd floor of the stone structure, replacing nonhistoric doors, installing a limestone base along the E Mifflin Street façade, installing a belt band on the side of the stone structure and a signage band on the brick structure, removing an existing patio at the front corner of the building and replacing it with a ground-level planter and new entrance platform, and adding a panel signage board on the brick structure and a projecting sign on the side of the stone structure.

At its July 26 meeting, the Landmarks Commission reviewed the proposal and provided detailed comments on proposed revisions to the design in order to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The applicant has worked with staff on the current revision. The applicant reached out to a contractor who removes paint from historic buildings and they were concerned that given the material of the structure, that the process of paint removal on the delicate sandstone would be more destructive than repainting. The applicant is proposing to repaint with a color that more closely matches the Madison sandstone and Cream City brick of the existing structures so that areas of paint failure will be less apparent.

The applicant has modified the design of the proposed new windows on the Mifflin St side of the structure to meet the dimensions and configuration recommended by the commission. Staff had asked that they consider

removing the upper window closest to the front façade of the stone structure as that room will have a window providing light from the front façade and put the rest of the new windows on the secondary elevation significantly stepped back from the front façade. The commission will need to determine if this window is set back far enough from the front façade to preserve the historic character of the stone structure.

The applicant replaced the signage band on the side of the stone structure with an unornamented belt band and modified the signage band above the entry of the brick structure to include a decorative cornice that replicates the style found on the front of the stone structure. There is a proposed projecting sign on the side of the stone structure, close to the front façade. Final sign style will be determined at a future date. This type of signage band is period appropriate for commercial storefronts in the 19th century. The new limestone base on E Mifflin now comes below the window sills and will be the same color as the painted masonry. The front entry is reconfigured to have a taller planter and pedestrian access off of E Mifflin St.

A discussion of the relevant standards follows:

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

1. The changes to this structure primarily involve modifications to the secondary elevation of the stone structure and rehabilitation to the primary façade of the brick structure. The changes to the brick structure bring this façade back to a period appropriate storefront appearance. The modifications to the secondary elevation of the stone structure are mostly significantly stepped back from the primary façade. Those modifications are largely done so as to introduce minimal change to the character-defining architectural elements to the existing structure. The changes to the front of the stone structure include replacing nonhistoric upper windows with windows that actually fit the openings and replacement of a nonhistoric front deck with a minimally decorative new entrance that addresses the grade change of the front corner of the property.
2. The historic character of the front of the stone structure is being retained. The proposed work will rehabilitate the brick structure to allow it to read as an active commercial structure again. The changes on the side of the stone structure involve introducing a window into a previously enclosed doorway and introduction of four additional windows. Most of the windows are significantly stepped back from the primary façade. The minimal decorative details and having most of the modifications pulled back from the primary façade allow this elevation to still read as a secondary. The commission will need to decide if the window closest to the front façade provides enough of a break between the primary and secondary facades.
3. The current proposed modifications largely allow the historic character of the structures to be maintained. The introduction of the limestone base will provide protection from the base of both structures, which are being significantly impacted by winter salting of the sidewalk. At some point a significant area of the brick structure had a cementitious parge coating applied to 2/3rds of the first floor. The proposal is to extend the parge coating across the remaining area of the front façade as removing it would be destructive to the historic masonry. The former parged signage area does not appear to be historically significant. The introduction of a signage band is proposed in a way that is period appropriate, but will still read as new so as not to create a false sense of history.
4. None of the work will remove changes that are historically significant to the property.
5. The areas where distinctive features and craftsmanship will be altered include the removal of the rubble stone masonry on the side of the stone structure and covering of the remaining brick on the first floor of the brick structure. While those are distinctive materials, there will be a substantial amount of remaining historic materials to convey the forensic history of these structures.
6. N/A
7. N/A
8. N/A.

9. The new work proposed is differentiated and largely separated from the character-defining features of the existing structures. The new work is largely compatible with the historic elements of the structures while still reading as new.
10. None of the modifications will alter the essential form of the existing structures. If the windows are removed in the future, compatible replacement stone could infill. The new parge coating on the first floor of the brick structure will likely not be removable. All other proposed alterations are potentially removable.

Recommendation

Staff believes the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness could be met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the project with the following conditions:

1. Final sign package be submitted to the Landmarks Commission for approval.