

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** July 29, 2013

**TITLE:** 210 South Brooks Street – Designated Landmark – Alteration to Longfellow School for adaptive reuse and construction of a new apartment building. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald District. Contact: Randy Alexander, The Alexander Company (29679)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** July 29, 2013

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Jason Fowler, Christina Slattery, David McLean and Michael Rosenblum. Rummel and Gehrig excused.

### **SUMMARY:**

John Seamon, representing the Alexander Company, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Seamon briefly presented the changes to color palette and materials that have been made since the last meeting. Seamon explained that the EIFS has been removed and replaced with brick. Seamon explained that the elevations were also changed to bring in design elements that would allow for color and material changes. Seamon provided material and color samples for Commission review.

Levitan explained that the Commission appreciates that the materials have changed to brick and that the project team has continued to have a dialogue with the Commission.

Staff explained that the staff recommendation requests more color changes. The recommendation suggests that the body of the new building be changed to brick that matches the brick of the landmark building.

Seamon explained that the design intent has always been to allow the landmark to stand as the focal point and the materials for the new construction were chosen so that the power and importance of the landmark would not be diluted.

Randy Alexander registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions. Mr. Alexander further explained some design considerations including the articulation of the building and the reasoning behind the material and color changes. Alexander explained that the review of the treatment of the new building is subjective and that the National Park Service may not approve a brick that has the same appearance on the brick as the landmark.

Alexander explained that he prefers to keep a bold color for the metal panel and to have the fascia and soffit in the same material.

Jeremy Frommelt, representing the Alexander Company, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Slattery explained that the current brick color (“Dark Brown”) is not warm enough.

Rosenblum agreed with Slattery and explained that the staff elevations show a more appropriate brick color.

McLean also agreed with the need for a warmer palette that is more similar to the brick of the landmark.

Fowler agreed that a warmer color palette would help, but he also expressed concern about the possibility that a close match to the landmark brick might not be close enough.

Slattery explained that the actual brick selection should determine the metal panel color.

Alexander explained that the doors on the landmark may be painted a different color and should not be used for determining colors on the new construction.

Seamon explained that he is concerned that there is a risk in trying to match the brick.

Levitan explained that the architectural differences allow each building to be distinct even if the materials are the same. Slattery explained that out of respect for the Urban Design Commission, the Landmarks Commission should allow for a middle ground in the particulars of the metal panel color.

McLean explained that he appreciates the flexibility of the project team related to this conversation.

The Landmarks Commission discussed and found agreement that the metal panel color should be complementary to the landmark and may be neutral or an interesting pop of color.

Cheryl Elkinton, representing Vegan Haven Central Inc., registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Ms. Elkinton requested that the City review development plans with an understanding of our city’s economic and ecological crisis. She expressed concern that by allowing Longfellow to become residential units, it cannot be used as a school.

The Landmarks Commission discussed the color for the masonry block and requested that the project team make changes to the color and/or treatment of the block. There was discussion that the block could be a color that is already in the elevation instead of introducing another color as currently submitted.

The Landmarks Commission discussed that the architecture has previously been reviewed and that there are no further Landmarks Commission comments related to architecture.

Staff will provide a summary of the Landmarks Commission requirements to share with Urban Design Commission for their review of the project.

### **ACTION:**

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the following conditions:

1. Change the brick depicted as “F-Dark Brown” in the submitted drawings to a brick that is similar in color to the main brick of the landmark building. The “C-Ultra Brown” brick color shall remain as submitted.
2. Consider colors for the horizontal architectural metal panel that allow for options that are complementary to the warm color palette.
3. Consider options to integrate the upper wall elements into the base by changing the color of the proposed block and/or by changing the placement and quantity of the block.
4. The project team shall review the materials, final colors, and revised architectural details with staff for staff approval on behalf of the Landmarks Commission before a Certificate of Appropriateness may be granted.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.