

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 17, 2011

TITLE: 1112 Spaight Street – Third Lake Historic District – Demolition of existing residence and construction of new residence. 6th Ald. District. Contact: Amy Hasselman, Architecture Network (23871)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: October 17, 2011 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Gehrig, Vice Chair; Robin Taylor, Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Connor and Abigail Sabatino, 508 S. Ingersoll Street, appeared on behalf of the project. Connor Sabatino spoke about house going on market in 2010. Sabatino explained that full restoration would come to \$600,000 for a 1300 square foot house. House in current condition is not contributing to the historic nature of neighborhood. There were orders from back in the 1950s asking that the current owners jack up the sagging porch. They feel that the time for restoration was decades ago. They have had 6 open houses to date, letters sent to neighborhood and only one neighbor has come forward to oppose their proposal. Abigail Sabatino stated that they love the neighborhood and this proposal allows them to stay.

Levitan stated that all Landmarks Commission members except Rosenblum have toured the property.

Arlan Kay, 116 E. Dayton Street, provided an overview of a budget estimate for restoration. Kay explained that the existing house is appraised at \$200,000 and they will add \$100,000 to repair to meet minimum housing standards. Marquette Neighborhood is a very desirable neighborhood.

Amy Hasselman, 116 E. Dayton Street, spoke on demolition and reconstruction. Hasselman explained that the residence was built in 1889 and this building has stopped contributing to the historic neighborhood. Most neighbors support the demolition. The new house is a revival of typical Queen Anne in the neighborhood and retains the context of a modest house next to a landmark. The context is being preserved. The proposal uses materials that are similar to the ones used in historic district including a shingle roof, fiber cement composite shake in the gable, composite material for siding, wood for trim and railings. All are visually compatible materials. The feel they will be able to work with staff recommendations in staff report. The new house will be compatible and will contribute to the living situation for the next 100 years.

Written communications received in opposition from John Coleman, Gregory Humphrey, and James Wilson, Linda Lehnertz, Gary Tipler, Sharon Kilfoy, and John Martens. In support from Chris Lucas, Anna Campbell, and John Olson who is the owner of the property.

Judith Guyot, 936 Jenifer, spoke in opposition. She is not opposed to the proposed house, but to the precedent being set by allowing demolition. The push for a historic preservation started about 25 years ago in the 900 block when a Taco Johns was proposed and never built. There is a commitment in the neighborhood for preservation. Demolition is a disservice to those who already have had to conform to the standards now set.

Scott B. Thornton, 1104 Jenifer Street, registered in opposition but did not wish to speak but would be available to answer questions.

T. R Loon, 1134 Spaight Street, spoke in support. He lives 5 houses down from property in question. He feels the house is old but not historic. What is there now is in dreadful condition. The proposal will contribute to the housing stock in the neighborhood.

Leila Pine, 1122 Spaight Street, spoke in support. She lives 2 doors down from the house. She bought in 1977 and loves older homes and historic places. 30 or 40 years ago the house was not fit for human habitation and the current owner does not wish to fix the house. The new plans from the prospective buyers will be an asset to the neighborhood.

Richard Slone, 1132 Spaight Street, spoke in support. He lives at 1132 and supports the demolition and the new structure. This building is not worth saving. He used to work for Commonwealth Development, co-partners of Willy Street Fair, started the Barrymore rehab.

Ben Anton, 201 Dunning Street, registered in support but did not wish to speak.

Rummel asked Scott Thornton to speak. Mr. Thornton said there were several meetings with applicants and the Marquette Neighborhood Association Preservation Committee and board in August. Preservation Committee voted 6-1 against demolition. Full board was concerned with precedence and the vote was close. Cited examples of recent demolitions including 1310 was demolished and a 2-flat was built in its place, the silo house (517 S. Baldwin) and 14 S. Franklin (loss due to fire). Lots of houses in neighborhood are in poor condition and need repair. The Marquette Neighborhood Association board supported Ace Hardware in demolition of house next door. He thought house was fixable.

Gehrig asked Gary Tipler if the house was salvageable. He thought it was. It takes time to research the building's history. Vernacular homes are historic. Anna Andrzejewski looked at the home and thought it met the conditions.

Levitan asked Conner Sabatino for final comments. Conner and Abigail have been working on this since April and has been a labor of love. He understands that Landmarks Commission has a difficult decision to make.

Public Hearing closed at 6:10. Recess 5 minutes.

General discussion of issues. Evaluate. Levitan thinks it satisfies Criteria A, satisfies Criteria D, fails on B, satisfies C, and satisfies G.

Rosenblum asked what the other commissioners thought of the building tour. McLean was not impressed with the house when walking through the door but found that it wasn't in as bad a shape as he originally thought. It does need work both inside and outside. Rummel said this house was a habitable house. Not pretty and nice, but with work, it could be. Levitan thought it was not structurally in bad shape, but that the renovation option lacked economic feasibility. Rummel said it was better inside than the front porch made it seem. Inside it is very simple, very vernacular. It is basic with small rooms. Levitan said the upstairs ceilings were low. Gehrig said

that there is an eclectic fabric in the district that this house is part of. It is a mix of craftspeople, merchants, railroad tycoons, etc. The Curtis house is stunning. Taylor said the ordinance is vague. She agrees that this is not a stellar house. The City should not let these properties deteriorate. The porch has been under orders by the City several times. Rosenblum said the criteria asks if this one house is demolished if it will diminish the character of the historic neighborhood. He feels a new house will improve the district. Levitan said that this is a neighborhood not a museum. McLean said simple structures belong in the neighborhood.

Staff will consult with Anna Andrzejewski and Amy Hasselman to coordinate efforts to prepare measured drawings.

Amy Hasselman strongly feels that modern materials should be used on a modern home. No vinyl will be used. Aluminum will only be used on flashing and cladding.

ACTION:

1. A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition with the following conditions:
 1. The following elements shall be salvaged for re-use and possibly donated if not desired for use in the new residence: Wood floors, pre-1930 window sash including glass and related hardware, wood doors of panel construction including related hardware, wide sheathing boards, and miscellaneous parts that another home restoration project may find useful. The Preservation Planner shall review the demolition recycling plan to verify compliance with conditions.
 2. The building shall be photo documented. At a minimum, this documentation shall include views of each primary building elevation and a view of the residence in context with neighboring buildings. Additional views (for example original siding detail at building corner, front porch decorative details, front door design, etc.) are encouraged. The Applicant or Applicant's representative shall send high quality digital images to staff before the Certificate of Appropriateness is sent to the Applicant.

The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1). McLean noted No. Taylor abstained. Levitan did not vote.

2. A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by McLean, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction with the following conditions:
 1. The window proportions shall be unified. The paired window proportions seem most appropriate. The wider single double-hungs on front and rear elevations and the casements in the Living Room and Kitchen shall be revised to more closely match the paired window proportion.
 2. The Applicant shall explain the materials proposed to be used for the brackets, fascia and soffits, apron boards, porch deck, foundation, and decorative window adjacent to the front door and staff suggests that the soffit material be selected so that the final product is installed in a historically appropriate way (so that beads run perpendicular to the rafter).

The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

3. A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the new development does not adversely affect the adjacent landmark. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.