

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 6/1/20

TITLE: 7-11 N Pinckney St - Demolition of a
Designated Madison Landmark; 4th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 6/5/20

ID NUMBER: 60396

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, Arvina Martin, and David McLean. Excused were: Betty Banks and Maurice Taylor.

Also present: Alder Michael Verveer, District 4

SUMMARY:

Brad Binkowski, registering in support and wishing to speak

Alex Saloutos, registering in support and wishing to speak

Jason Tish, registering in support and wishing to speak

Mark Binkowski, registering in support and available to answer questions

Kurt Stege, registering neither in support nor in opposition and available to answer questions

Bailey said that at its May 4 meeting, the Landmarks Commission approved the public interest variance request to demolish the landmark property at 7-11 N Pinckney Street. She said that most of the demolition standards are met by the public interest variance, but the commission does need to look at potential conditions of approval, including rescinding the landmark designation, submitting additional documentation of the existing structure, and submitting an archaeological report. Bailey explained that the property is within the boundary of the former capitol effigy site, so the applicants will need to get a Request to Disturb permit for the demolition, which requires an archaeological report that staff would like to include in the preservation file for the property. She explained that only the property owner can submit the request for rescission of the landmark designation.

Andrzejewski opened the public hearing.

Brad Binkowski said they appreciate the action taken at the last Landmarks Commission meeting. He reviewed the conditions in the staff report and said they are happy to comply with all of them, noting that they certainly intend to document the building.

Saloutos said that he supports approval, including staff's three conditions, and said that he would add a fourth condition that the old façade be restored, rehabilitated, and reconstructed to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and subject to the review of the Landmarks Commission. He said that we can first agree that façade-ectomies are not good historic preservation practice. Given the circumstances, he said this is the best outcome because the restored façade will be retained in a location and setting that embodies important elements of its historic value in a location on a retail block on the Capitol Square. He said that there are photos of the building when it was originally built that can be used as resource materials to help in restoring the façade. He said that this will be a huge, positive improvement to its current condition. He said that based on his conversations with the applicants, they are willing and able to do this. He said that he understands objections

that the façade being moved is not true historic preservation, but gave examples of buildings that have had similar treatment or were moved and still designated as landmarks. He said that this façade would be moved 40' northwest and the context and setting will be the same or similar to the original, on a retail block on the Capitol Square. He said that the façade should be restored according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and maintain its landmark status.

Kaliszewski requested confirmation that they are only voting on the demolition of the existing building, not on the design of the new building, so they can discuss the façade-ectomy later. Bailey confirmed that was correct. In response to Saloutos' comments, Kaliszewski explained that the National Register allows the listing of buildings that have been moved if they are eligible for their architectural significance and are able to keep a majority of their integrity even after being moved, and certain procedures must be followed when the building is moved.

Tish suggested that the commission condition the approval for demolition on a commitment from the applicants to reconstruct the façade using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He pointed out that in the proposal, the applicants make a commitment to restoring and rebuilding the façade, but it would be great to see the commission stipulate a commitment from the applicants tonight or at whatever point they think is appropriate. He said that based on previous discussion, he understands if there is an opportunity to do that at a future meeting under a different Certificate of Appropriateness request instead. He said that personally, he would like to see a commitment from the applicants to either reconstruct the façade according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or to reinterpret the design of the façade and not pretend it's a reconstruction of a historic façade. Bailey said that the commission has the option to add conditions related to the building materials on the second story façade of 7 N Pinckney now or wait until they review the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction.

Ald. Verveer thanked the commission for their support of the public interest variance. He said that he has had several conversations over the last few weeks with Saloutos and Binkowski regarding the rescission of the landmark status of the façade and whether the Secretary of the Interior's Standards should be required in future construction. He suggested it would be in order for the commission to ask Binkowski if the applicants have concerns about that because he did not believe it was in controversy. He reminded the commission of his support of the variance as well as the motion for approval tonight.

Andrzejewski asked Binkowski for his thoughts on preserving or salvaging the historic façade. Binkowski said their intent is to reconstruct the building façade to the highest standards and recapture the original form to the greatest extent possible so that it becomes an example of Madison's past that will live on to the future. He said that if the commission feels that a commitment to using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for reconstruction is appropriate, they are happy to do so. He said they will document the building and do everything possible to comply. However, he said that he does believe it is necessary and appropriate to rescind the landmark status upon demolition and have it potentially relisted upon completion. He said that they have reconstructed historic landmarks before and take their commitment seriously, so they will follow whatever standards the commission deems appropriate.

McLean said that the applicants mentioned retaining the original historic materials and details from the second floor up, and asked specifically which details and materials. He said that in looking at the 1980s façade covering the old one, he was curious about how much of the original building might be behind those panels once they start to remove them, and pointed out that the 1980s façade appears to be juxtaposed away from the original façade. He said that if there were any records from the 1980s remodel, they might know whether the façade was demolished or just covered. He suggested the applicants document that as the demolition happens and be sure to retain or salvage what they can for a potential rebuild. Binkowski said that they intend to carefully remove the existing façade to preserve everything behind it. He said that he expects there isn't much there, but would be wonderfully surprised if portions of the original façade were intact behind it. He said they found a company that can replicate the terracotta of the existing façade almost exactly and if the original is not in place, he expects they would take molds and do the utmost to ensure whatever they have to replace

matches the original detailing to the greatest extent. He said they will document the removal, which will be done extremely carefully to preserve anything that might be behind it.

Andrzejewski closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Martin, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the three conditions recommended by staff.

McLean suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to include a fourth condition to carefully deconstruct the existing façade at 7 N Pinckney Street for potential reincorporation into the new construction. Arnesen and Martin accepted the amendment to the original motion.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Martin, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that exterior and interior photographic documentation of the structure and demolition with images labelled and linked to a photographic key be electronically submitted to the Preservation Planner, a copy of the final archaeological report be submitted to the Preservation Planner, upon completion of the demolition of the structure at 7-11 N Pinckney, a request to rescind the landmark designation be submitted, and the applicant explore careful deconstruction of the façade at 7 N Pinckney Street for potential reincorporation into the new construction. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote/other.