

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 31 July 2017
TITLE: 801 Williamson Street - Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Demolish current structure, replace with a new mixed-use building. 6th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED:
CONTACT: Jim Glueck; Glueck Architects	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: 7 August 2017	ID NUMBER: 43805

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Lon Hill, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused were Marsha A. Rummel and Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair.

SUMMARY:

Jim Glueck, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Brandon Cook, registering in support and available to answer questions.
John Martens, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Levitan opened the public hearing.

Glueck explained that there are multiple design options for the proposed structure and provided drawings. In response to the height issue discussed at the last meeting, he sent around a perspective rendering showing the proposed building in the existing context. Levitan explained that there are significant differences between the rendering provided by Glueck and the rendering provided by Martens.

There was discussion about height measurements. There may be 12 inches in disagreement between the renderings. There are 8 foot ceiling heights with a 9 foot ceiling on the first floor in the proposed building

Glueck asserted that the rendering Martens provided looks off and is from a different viewpoint.

Levitan indicated that no HVAC equipment can be visible at the street face. The Mitsubishi system needs to be landscaped at the rear or be on the roof and screened.

Kaliszewski commented that she would prefer masonry on the side instead of siding. Glueck responded that they may take the brick back further or, if budget allows, make the entire side brick.

McLean asked if the material of the bays help offset the costs of the brick. There was discussion about the face brick options. Arnesen said he preferred to increase the brick return and that siding would be fine along the side elevation, since very little of the side will be visible.

Glueck explained that a short retaining wall is needed at the bike parking and some regrading would be necessary to pitch the grade away from the building. He mentioned that the Martens representation does not show the proposed final grading. The sidewalk will be 4.8%, and since it's not considered a ramp, rails won't be needed.

Arnesen asked what the bay color will be. Per Glueck, it'll be contrasting complementary colors. Arnesen asked about the windows. Glueck responded that they'll be fiberglass in a sandstone or bronze color. They will not be white.

John Martens explained that the plan does not show a depressed floor at the lower level apartment, and that other details are not shown. He asserted that more details are needed to show the actual project. He feels that the proposed structure is too large for the site, and that the masses & spaces are significant to the character in this historic district. He believes that the proposed structure is bigger than anything related to the lot size.

Martens commented that authentic neighborhood style has been preserved and that historic district standards were created to continue preserving historic character. He went on to say that now, sub-standard buildings are being sold for redevelopment and the redevelopment proposals build lot line to lot line for the maximum cost and economic gain. He would like to see costs and economically feasible alternatives for this site and proposal. He feels that other options could be explored and that due diligence has not been undertaken.

Martens asserted that his documents were accurate within to within an inch. He passed around photos of buildings in the visually compatible area.

McLean asked what the floor to floor heights were for the proposed building. Glueck responded that there is an 8 foot ceiling height, which is 6 inches below the code standard. There is a 20 inch floor depth at the trusses at the first floor ceiling. They will make the building as low as possible, given code and construction requirements.

There was general discussion about finding extra inches.

Arnesen indicated that the Applicant was already making compromises about heights. He feels that they shouldn't also have to compromise floor space or structural efficiency.

There was general discussion about lot size and the rhythm of building masses and spaces.

Martens believes that the masses and spaces is the predominant characteristic in the historic district.

There was general discussion about the visual compatibility map and proposed setbacks.

Martens explained that he remembers reading a recent document describing variety and scale in the district. Martens went on to talk about the character of the district and the overall feeling of variety.

Arnesen said he had a slightly different view of the district. There are many buildings that are close to the lot line and have large gross volume.

McLean asked what the existing distance was between buildings (801 to 805 Williamson Street). An actual dimension was not discussed, but Glueck and Martens agreed that it is close in its current form.

Arnesen commented that street corners/intersections tend to be more commercial in nature in the historic district.

Levitan asked which was more important; the height of the building or its footprint. Martens responded that it is the gross volume, which is a combination of height and footprint.

There was general discussion regarding the lot and its size.

Levitan closed the public hearing.

Hill indicated that he felt the previously proposed building looked big, and that the brick feels better without the bays. Kaliszewski concurred, and commented that the side seems better.

Arnesen indicated that he prefers the design without the bay on the front and is indifferent about the bay on the side elevation.

McLean commented that he would prefer the exterior to be entirely brick, and would like to see both bays removed, as they are vertical elements and contribute to excessive detail on the façade. He went on to say that the lot is small, and a house would have a similarly sized footprint. The visual compatibility map shows closeness between buildings. He would encourage creative ways to find efficiency in the heights related to the structural system.

There was general discussion about height, ways to reduce it and ways to construct with that reduction. Arnesen said that the Commission should ask the Applicant to come back with specifics instead of tweaking the design during the meeting.

There was discussion about the building being 33 feet and 4 inches tall. Glueck indicated that it would not be over 33 feet from the Williamson Street sidewalk.

Levitan asked the Commission for its thoughts about the side bay. Arnesen and Kaliszewski were indifferent, other than to say it should not be white.

Martens commented that water should not drain onto 805 Williamson Street. Glueck responded that code will not allow for that to happen anyway, and that water will drain to the front. He suggested that property owners consider a combined swale between the buildings.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by McLean to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulations that there be a side bay and not a front bay, that the brick should be extended to windows on the side, that the building not exceed 33 feet in height, and that the Applicant should work with Staff to review colors for the project. The motion passed on a voice vote.



Project Name/Address: 801 Williamson

Application Type: PUBLIC HEARING
New construction in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District

Legistar File ID # 43805

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: July 17, 2017

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Jim Glueck and Brandon Cook

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing structure and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new building in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on Williamson Street in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District

Relevant Landmarks 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) N/A
 - (b) N/A
 - (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.

41.23 THIRD LAKE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (6) Standards for New Structures in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Mixed-Use and Commercial Use. Any new structures on parcels zoned for mixed-use and commercial use that are located within 200 feet of other historic resources shall be visually compatible with those historic resources in the following ways:
 - (a) Gross Volume
 - (b) Height
 - (c) The proportion and rhythm of solids to voids in the street facade(s)
 - (d) The materials used in the street facade(s)
 - (e) The design of the roof
 - (f) The rhythm of buildings masses and spaces

41.02 DEFINITIONS.

Visually Compatible means harmonious with location, context, setting and character.

Analysis and Conclusion

The previous property owner was issued a notice of Demolition by Neglect on August 14, 2015. The Landmarks Commission noticed a public hearing on the matter and the property owner requested that the item be referred to a future meeting to allow the sale of the property. The property was conveyed to Brandon Cook and the Demolition by Neglect issue was placed on hold. Building Inspection staff and the Landmarks Commission directed that if Mr Cook does not provide the City with a proposal for alteration, the Demolition by Neglect public hearing will be noticed and acted upon. Mr Cook is proposing the demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new structure in lieu of making alterations to the existing structure.

The property owner appeared before the Landmarks Commission on August 1, 2016 and at that time the Commission received an Informational Presentation about potential treatments for this site. The Landmarks Commission toured the existing building on August 10, 2016 to review the conditions of the site and the historic value of the existing structure. During the tour, provided by property owner Brandon Cook and historian Gary Tipler, there was general discussion about the chronology of the building campaigns as interpreted by existing physical evidence. The Applicant requested a public hearing on November 7, 2016 to discuss the possible demolition of the existing structure. At that meeting, the Landmarks Commission discussed the possibility of demolition and the condition of the building when purchased by Mr Cook and referred the item to a future meeting for consideration of the Certificates of Appropriateness.

The Landmarks Commission granted a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing building on June 5, 2017. At that meeting, the Landmarks Commission also discussed the proposed new construction and requested additional information from the Applicant including other alternatives and related massing considered and other treatments of the facades. The item was referred to a future meeting.

41.18(1)(c) Instructs the Landmarks Commission to use the standards of 41.23(6) to determine the appropriateness of the proposed new construction. The Visual Compatibility map is attached to this report. A discussion of the new construction standards of 41.23(6) follows:

- (a) The gross volume of the proposed building is compatible with the gross volume of other buildings in the historic district and within the area of visual compatibility.
- (b) The proposed building is 3 stories tall. Other buildings in the area of visual compatibility are of similar height.
- (c) The proposed building has a proportion and rhythm of solids to voids in the street facades that are similar to other buildings in the historic district and within the area of visual compatibility.
- (d) The Applicants have provided two options for the exterior material treatment. The first option is all brick and provides a calm appearance as a background building in the historic district. The second option has a brick exterior wall material with a projecting bay element on the side (facing Livingston Street) that is clad in fiber cement panel and a similar bay element on the front elevation. There is fiber cement lap siding on the side. The brick and siding materials are common in the historic district and in the immediate context of the subject site. The fiber cement panel material is less common, but could be interpreted as being similar to stucco or painted masonry and is compatible with many materials in the historic district. The Commission should discuss the two versions. In addition, the Commission should discuss the use of a utility brick on the side elevation instead of lap siding.
- (e) The proposed building has a flat roof which is similar to numerous buildings in the historic district and with buildings in the area of visual compatibility.

- (f) The proposed building is larger than the existing building and takes up more of the site which changes the rhythm of building masses and spaces, but the proposed building creates a rhythm of masses and spaces that seems to be compatible with other patterns in the historic district and within the area of visual compatibility.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction may be met and recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Applicant shall indicate the location of exterior HVAC equipment.
2. The Landmarks Commission shall provide the Applicant with direction related to the two options for the exterior material treatment.

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 5 June 2017
TITLE: 801 Williamson Street – Demolish current structure, replace with a new mixed-use building in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6 th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED:
CONTACT: Jim Glueck, Glueck Architects	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: 9 June 2017	ID NUMBER: 43805

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair, David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, Katie Kaliszewski, and Lon Hill. Excused was Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair.

SUMMARY:

Brandon Cook, registering in support and wishing to speak.
Scott B. Thornton, registering in support and not wishing to speak.
John Martens, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.
Gary Tipler, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak.

Levitan opened the public hearing.

Levitan asked if Cook could discuss the demolition before getting into the new project. Per Cook, the damage at 801 is so extensive that any attempt at rehabilitation would result in a totally different building. Cook showed images of the elevation of the proposed building adjacent to the existing neighboring building.

Martens provided a handout at the meeting. Martens described his handout and discussed standard (g) within the ordinance. Martens went on to discuss his other handouts, with specific reference to the visual compatibility standards with which the new building must comply. He contends that the proposed building does not comply with these requirements.

Levitan questioned Martens' interpretation of the ordinance, highlighting that standard (g) is only one standard of many that the Landmarks Commission must review. Martens disagreed, maintaining that each standard must be considered, and went even further to say that demolition permits in historic districts should not be issued unless there are extenuating circumstances (ex. a tree falls on it).

McLean asked about the number of stories on other buildings in the district. Per Martens, there are three other three story buildings within the Visually Compatible Area (VCA).

Levitan congratulated Martens on his reception of the Lifetime Achievement Award bestowed upon him by the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation.

Gary Tipler discussed his prepared history of 801 Williamson Street and described the meetings that P&D MNA held for that site. They discussed the massing, form, function, lot coverage, setbacks, etc. In general, there were mixed reviews for the new building. P&D voted 4-3 in support with the idea that there would be some minor tweaks to the building. The Marquette Neighborhood Association's board voted 4-4, and the president voted against it, after deciding not to vote on demolition and construction separately. No one countered the demolition; it's the new construction that caused ambivalence.

Hill asked if there was a certain aspect of the new building that made people hesitant to approve of the building. Per Tipler, people doubted the legitimacy of commercial space on the corner without parking. The other aspect they did not like was the height of the building.

Cook indicated that the difference in height between the structure at 805 Williamson Street and the proposed structure at 801 Williamson Street is three feet.

Rummel asked if Cook had considered a Conditional Use for the building. Cook responded that he'd explored it and could propose up to four stories, but decided not to. He has still not considered a residential only building. Rummel asked what kind of commercial use Cook envisions, and what kind of business would work without parking. He replied that it depends on the business, and that the lack of parking is something he will take under consideration. He thinks with the right business, the proposed structure will fit in well on Williamson Street.

Hill asked if there was a parking stall behind the building. Cook responded that there is a curb cut, but that he doesn't believe it's a legal parking area.

Levitan closed the public hearing.

Rummel indicated that there was no sentiment present for saving the building, that it isn't historically significant, and is in terrible shape. The main concern is what is right for the space. She struggles with whether the scale is appropriate, and would like to look at options that are potentially smaller and more residential.

Rummel questioned how much Cook was responsible for the current state of the building, given that he's owned it for more than a year.

Hill would like to see a smaller building. He also does not think demolition by neglect applies to Cook.

Levitan asked the Commission to clarify whether anyone would argue against demolition. McLean indicated that, having toured the house and found no historical value, he has no objections to demolition. Arnesen commented that none of the items other than (g) are applicable, and that Cook is not responsible for the neglect. Arnesen indicated that he wasn't sure what reducing the mass would mean, and that there are other buildings of that size on the street. Kaliszewski commented that the building is dissimilar to other buildings on the block constructed within the period of significance, which is what concerns her. Arnesen asked which buildings should be included in their perspective. Staff responded that the Commission should consider the buildings in the VCA as stated in the ordinance, but to also keep in mind that this context fits within the rest of the historic district.

McLean asked for the floor to floor dimensions. Cook explained that he is proposing 10' at the first floor, 9' at the second and third floors.

Rummel said that the usage of the lot was not similar to the other buildings in the visually compatible area and wondered if the building could be made shorter. She realizes that this would change the whole project, but would like the Commission to think about the way the lot is filled.

McLean asked if Cook had considered making the building smaller. Cook replied that it's a 1,500 square foot building footprint, which is already fairly small. To make it smaller is not possible with the current plan/design. Arnesen asked if making the building smaller would even assuage the issues people have with it. McLean agreed that it would not.

Levitan indicated that section (g) should be discussed with the City Attorney's Office.

Staff discussed Glueck's responses to the conditions outlined on the staff report.

Kaliszewski asked if the quarter column would be metal. Staff confirmed that it would be.

Staff asked if Cook would consider a utility brick instead of siding. Cook confirmed that he would.

Hill thinks the building looks too big. Kaliszewski agrees that it seems too large, and isn't sure how she feels about the material and treatment of the bays within the district and feel it impacts the cohesive design of the building.

Arnesen questioned what comes next and commented that Cook is to be commended for proposing something for this site that works with Zoning. Arnesen feels making the building smaller is not a solution in and of itself. He thinks that some level of compromise from the Commission is necessary, and a smaller building will fail economically.

Rummel has issues with the zoning code and wants the building to be residential only.

McLean said that the bays could be eliminated, but then the building looks traditional. He went on to say that to make the building smaller in a way that makes sense, Cook would likely lose financial viability.

Rummel said that, to her, the big issue is that the building takes up the entire lot. She asked whether the proposal could take up less space on the lot. She also brought up the issue of the lack of parking again.

Arnesen asked what Cook can do next. Per Staff, he was granted a permit for demolition, and is not prevented from proposing another project. He can bring a new project back to the Commission.

Levitan indicated that it was possible to reconsider the initial denial of the request and to refer the item to a future agenda.

ACTION:

1.) A motion was made by McLean and seconded by Arnesen to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. The motion passed on a voice vote.

2.) A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by McLean to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the stipulation that the Applicant abide by Staff

recommendations. The motion failed, with McLean & Arnesen voting in favor; Kaliszewski, Rummel, Hill opposed.

3.) A motion was made by Rummel and seconded by Hill to reconsider the earlier motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

4.) A motion was made by Rummel and seconded by Hill to refer the item to a future meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote.



Project Name/Address: 801 Williamson

Application Type: PUBLIC HEARING
Demolition and new construction in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District

Legistar File ID # 43805

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: May 22, 2017

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Jim Glueck

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing structure and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new building in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on Williamson Street in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District

Relevant Landmarks 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) N/A
 - (b) N/A
 - (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.
 - (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:
 - (a) Whether the structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition or removal would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
 - (b) Whether a landmark's designation has been rescinded.
 - (c) Whether the structure, although not itself a landmark structure, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State.

- (d) Whether demolition or removal of the subject property would be contrary to the policy and purpose of this ordinance and/or to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable historic district as duly adopted by the Common Council.
- (e) Whether the structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, method of construction, or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.
- (f) Whether retention of the structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage.
- (g) The condition of the property, provided that any deterioration of the property which is self-created or which is the result of a failure to maintain the property as required by this chapter cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for demolition or removal.
- (h) Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the historic resources of the historic district in which the subject property is located, or if outside a historic district, compatible with the mass and scale of buildings within two hundred (200) feet of the boundary of the landmark site.

Prior to approving a certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Landmarks Commission may require the applicant to provide documentation of the structure. Documentation shall be in the form required by the Commission.

41.23 THIRD LAKE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (6) Standards for New Structures in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Mixed-Use and Commercial Use. Any new structures on parcels zoned for mixed-use and commercial use that are located within 200 feet of other historic resources shall be visually compatible with those historic resources in the following ways:
 - (a) Gross Volume
 - (b) Height
 - (c) The proportion and rhythm of solids to voids in the street facade(s)
 - (d) The materials used in the street facade(s)
 - (e) The design of the roof
 - (f) The rhythm of buildings masses and spaces

Analysis and Conclusion

The previous property owner was issued a notice of Demolition by Neglect on August 14, 2015. The Landmarks Commission noticed a public hearing on the matter and the property owner requested that the item be referred to a future meeting to allow the sale of the property. The property was conveyed to Brandon Cook and the Demolition by Neglect issue was placed on hold. Building Inspection staff and the Landmarks Commission directed that if Mr Cook does not provide the City with a proposal for alteration, the Demolition by Neglect public hearing will be noticed and acted upon. Mr Cook is proposing the demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new structure in lieu of making alterations to the existing structure.

The property owner appeared before the Landmarks Commission on August 1, 2016 and at that time the Commission received an Informational Presentation about potential treatments for this site. The Landmarks Commission toured the existing building on August 10, 2016 to review the conditions of the site and the historic value of the existing structure. During the tour, provided by property owner Brandon Cook and historian Gary Tipler, there was general discussion about the chronology of the building campaigns as interpreted by existing physical evidence. The Applicant requested a public hearing on November 7, 2016 to discuss the possible

demolition of the existing structure. At that meeting, the Landmarks Commission discussed the possibility of demolition and the condition of the building when purchased by Mr Cook and referred the item to a future meeting for consideration of the Certificates of Appropriateness.

COA for Demolition

41.18(1)(d) The Landmarks Commission shall determine if the demolition of this property frustrates the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources. The Landmarks Commission is charged with protecting and enhancing the perpetuation of historic districts and the City's cultural heritage. The demolition of any period appropriate structure would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this Ordinance and the objectives of the preservation plan for the district. The integrity of the existing structure affects its ability to contribute to the historic character of the historic district.

A discussion of the demolition standards of 41.18(2) follows:

- (a) The existing structure is not of such architectural or historic significance that it meets the standards for landmark designation as the language of this standard suggests. Instead, with other vernacular structures in the district, this structure represents vernacular working class housing intermixed with commercial structures along Williamson Street that establishes the historic character and significance of the historic district.
- (b) N/A This property is not a landmark.
- (c) This vernacular building form contributes to the distinctive architectural and historic character of the historic district; however, the integrity of this specific structure affects its ability to contribute to the historic character of the historic district.
- (d) The Landmarks Commission is charged with protecting and enhancing the perpetuation of historic districts and the City's cultural heritage. The demolition of any period appropriate structure would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this Ordinance and the objectives of the preservation plan for the district. The Third Lake Ridge Historic District Plan states, "The Third Lake Ridge is a study in diversity, an agglomeration of many themes: ethnic settlement, railroad development, urbanization, civic improvement. Its architecture reflects this diversity of development and change." The integrity of the existing structure affects its ability to contribute to the historic character of the historic district.
- (e) The structure was originally constructed in 1884 (other research indicates 1874). The existing structure has been largely modified from the original. Existing floor framing and roof framing are not original and have been replaced with modern (nominal) members in numerous places. Some areas of the foundation appear to be original construction. The structure does not convey a traditional method of construction as this standard suggests and could be reproduced using standard construction materials.
- (f) The building does not meet the intent of this standard. However, the general welfare of the public is promoted by the retention of the City's cultural resources and historic identity.
- (g) The existing building is in poor condition. Mr Cook purchased the property in poor condition so the condition is not self-created or the result of his failure to maintain the property. The poor condition is the result of failure to maintain the property over time by many previous owners.
- (h) The proposed new structure is a three story mixed use building (commercial space on the first floor with 4 residential units above) with flat roof and brick exterior. The form and treatment are similar to a typical commercial structure of the 1900s. Similar typical commercial forms of similar height with flat roofs and/or brick exterior materials are found within the historic district and in the area of visual compatibility.

COA for New Construction

41.18(1)(c) Instructs the Landmarks Commission to use the standards of 41.23(6) to determine the appropriateness of the proposed new construction. The Visual Compatibility map is attached to this report. A discussion of the new construction standards of 41.23(6) follows:

- (a) The proposed building has a larger gross volume than the existing building, but the gross volume of the proposed building is compatible with the gross volume of other buildings in the historic district and within the immediate context of the subject site.
- (b) The proposed building is 3 stories tall. Other buildings in the general context are of similar height. The proposed building is taller than the adjacent 2 ½ story gabled roof building to the east, but is similar in height to the newer building across the street.
- (c) The proposed building has a proportion and rhythm of solids to voids in the street facades that are similar to other buildings in the historic district and within the immediate context of the subject site.
- (d) The proposed building has a brick exterior wall material. There is a projecting bay element on the side (facing Livingston Street) that is clad in fiber cement panel. A similar bay element is on the front elevation. There is fiber cement lap siding on the side. The brick and siding materials are common in the historic district and in the immediate context of the subject site. The fiber cement panel material is less common, but could be interpreted as similar to stucco or painted masonry and is compatible with many materials in the historic district. The Commission should discuss the bay element on the front elevation and numerous materials of the elevation that are not noted. In addition, the Commission should discuss the use of a utility brick on the side elevation instead of lap siding.
- (e) The proposed building has a flat roof which is similar to numerous buildings in the historic district and with buildings in the immediate context of the subject site.
- (f) The proposed building is larger than the existing building and takes up more of the site which changes the rhythm of building masses and spaces, but the proposed building creates a rhythm of masses and spaces that seems to be compatible with other patterns in the historic district and within the immediate context of the subject site.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition may be met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the request. If the Landmarks Commission does not believe the standards for granting the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition are met, staff recommends the Landmarks Commission specifically describe those standards that are not met and refer the review of the demolition and the new construction to a future meeting.

Staff believes that the standards for granting the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction may be met and recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Applicant shall confirm the material of the storefront system, the brick size and color, the siding exposure, the window trim material, and the material and appearance of the corner column.
2. The Applicant shall confirm that windows will have head and jamb trim of similar width and that the stone lintel will extend past the masonry opening width by at least 4" on each side. The stone lintel shall be treated in a similar manner at doors and above the store front system on the front elevation.
3. The Applicant shall indicate the location of HVAC equipment.