

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 1 May 2017
TITLE: 1008 Jenifer St - Exterior Alteration in the Third Lake Ridge Historic Dist., 6th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED:
CONTACT: Thomas Zalewski	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: 4 May 2017	ID NUMBER: 46849

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, David WJ McLean, Lon Hill, and Richard Arnesen. Not present was Marsha A. Rummel.

SUMMARY:

Tom Zalewski, registering in support and not wishing to speak.

Levitan asked Staff to clarify concerns. Staff referenced the donut created in the front yard and had concerns regarding how that would be landscaped/treated in the middle. What's most troublesome to Staff is all the construction in the front yard. Staff asked if the Applicant if it would be possible to push the construction further back.

The Applicant responded that it comes down to math; he needs to achieve a certain slope and can only do it so many ways. The slope of the front walk works with the placement of the ramp.

Andrzejewski asked if the Applicant can apply for a variance. The Applicant indicated that he'd prefer to bring the building into compliance rather than avoid doing so. Per Staff, if the building was a two-unit instead of a three unit, the ramp would not be necessary, but that would require major renovation. The first criterion on the Staff Report is meant to ask if there's any way to get out of the necessity of building a ramp.

Staff asked the applicant if there anything changing the appearance of the front porch skirt board. The Applicant indicated that it won't need to add lattice or panels underneath, and that most people won't notice any difference on the porch.

There was general conversation regarding the language of the ordinance (materials vs. elements).

Andrzejewski noted that this is not the last time a ramp request will be brought before the Landmarks Commission, and that it's something the Commission needs to take very seriously. She also referenced the necessity to look at the language of the ordinance as it pertains to this issue.

Andrzejewski went on to ask the applicant if designing the ramp with a different slope would make much difference in the size/scope. The Applicant responded that it would end up looking very similar; he needs length to achieve the correct slope.

Arnesen asked if they'd explored any other parts of the building where a ramp could go. The Applicant has looked at it, and it's not possible. Arnesen suggested that the Applicant do what he can to reduce the donut effect.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Andrzejewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the Applicant minimize the impact of the ramp and the resulting donut to the extent practical and to comply with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report. The motion passed by a voice vote.