

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION
TITLE: 740 Jenifer/741 Williamson Streets _
New construction of residential
building in Third Lake Ridge Historic
District. 6th Ald. District. Contact:
Stephen Mar-Pohl, InSite Consulting
Architects (34796)

PRESENTED: July 14, 2014

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 14, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Christina Slattery and Michael Rosenblum were excused. Gehrig arrived before Item #4.

SUMMARY:

#2: 740 Jenifer Street and #8 739-741 Williamson Street were taken up as one item.

Levitan re-opened the public hearing on 740 Jenifer Street.

Michael Matty, registering in support and available to answer questions. Matty asked the Landmarks Commission to approve a lot division of the two lots as required by Zoning. City staff explained that the lot division issue was not on the agenda, but the general issue could be discussed during the informational presentation of the new apartment building to get a sense of the Landmarks Commission. However, the Landmarks Commission will not be able to make any official finding on the lot division until the City receives an application for an official Certified Survey Map.

Stephen Mar-Pohl, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mar-Pohl presented the details of the 740 Jenifer Street project to the Landmarks Commission. He noted the demolition of the shed and the rear addition.

Chris Oddo, representing RFG, registering in support and wishing to speak. Oddo presented information on the design of the 739/741 Williamson Street project. He said that they had gotten advice from the Urban Design Commission to design a bigger and bolder building with flat roofs and to use the Lindsey Lee house as inspiration for the new architecture along Williamson Street.

Michael Soref, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering neither in support nor opposition but wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Soref presented the Landmarks Commission with a letter dated May 28, 2014 that supported the rehabilitation of 740 Jenifer Street and the construction of an apartment building on the portion of the lot facing Williamson Street. Soref added that the Neighborhood Association determined that they believe that the project as presented in May complies with the BUILD II plan, and that support of the Board was unanimous. Soref did note that the project has changed significantly since

that meeting/vote, including the addition of a fourth-story and will likely require an additional review by the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) Board. Soref added that speaking for himself; he believes that the height bonus is warranted due to the rehabilitation of 740 Jenifer Street.

Matty explained that the three-story version used a pitched roof, and the four-story flat roof version is only a few feet taller than the original proposal.

Gehrig asked why the project went to Urban Design Commission (UDC) first. Matty said it was because this is a Planned Development (PD) zoning request. Rummel suggested that perhaps that process should be reconsidered as proposals in historic districts should come to the Landmarks Commission before UDC even if it is a PD process. Gehrig agreed.

There was a general discussion about materials and Mar-Pohl explained that the elevator shaft would be designed as a living wall. There was discussion about how that would work and what types of vines would be most appropriate. Fowler said that the living wall may really help separate the massing into two. McLean asked if this district limited the width of siding. Staff replied that she believes that the Marquette Bungalows maybe the only district that limits siding width, and maybe University Heights as well. She said that staff could review that language.

Levitan said that the land division issue doesn't really bother him since it was such a long lot. McLean agreed and said that he is pleased that they are not proposing a through-lot new development.

Gehrig appreciated the submittal and all of the diagrams that explain the project, but she is concerned that it will impact the viability of the rest of the block and is worrisome for other houses on Williamson Street. She said that if this project is built, then the Endres-owned buildings on the rest of the block will be very vulnerable.

Levitan asked Commissioners to weigh in on height and massing issues.

Gehrig said that it will be the biggest and tallest building on the block and to her the height issue isn't as great as the width issue. McLean added that he was looking at the same issue but noticed that the two houses next door read like they are almost one unit, too, and that maybe this doesn't disrupt the rhythm that much. McLean added that this project is pushing the limits of those issues however.

Gehrig said that even though the UDC encouraged a flat roof, this is still in a historic district with predominantly pitched rooflines. There was a discussion with the Architect on ways and ideas to bring more pitched roof elements into the design. McLean noted that there are many flat roof buildings across the street that are in the visually related area, and that if he had originally designed the Lindsey Lee house, he might have designed a flat roof for it.

Rummel noted that the smallest house is in the east side of the development so that façade, besides the front façade, will be most visible from Williamson Street.

Rummel said that she likes that the overall project doesn't go all of the way through the block, and thinks that the elevator shaft should really try to break up the two masses. Staff asked about the change in plane between the front façade and the elevator shaft. Oddo replied that on the ground floor the elevator shaft is more prominent due to a visual sight triangle for the garage entrance, but at upper level it site back 4 feet on one side, and two feet on the other.

Gehrig said that there are too many materials for the one building, and that she isn't a fan of the metal. She added that the metal is the material that is most different than the rest of the district and encouraged the Architect to consider brick. Rummel said that she also likes brick. Matty interjected that the BUILD plan says not to use brick on the south side of Williamson Street. Levitan wondered why it said that. Gehrig also didn't know considering that there are other brick buildings on that side of the street. There was continued discussion of the elevator shaft and Rummel wondered if textured/patterned concrete would be a better material than the metal. Gehrig also said that in one of the districts vertical siding is not allowed, and asked staff to look into siding issues before the project comes back.

Gehrig added that she also has an issue with the long vertical windows and wondered if there are other design solutions to break up that verticality, like mullions or breaks in the long panel? Levitan said that he liked the long window. McLean also asked about ways to break up the design of the window, but said that if the proposal was deeper into the district he may agree more with Gehrig.

Gehrig added that it is difficult to use one of the newest buildings in the district, like Lindsey Lee's house to take design clues from, when the whole district should be the basis for the design of new buildings. Levitan also weighed in on incongruence of using a new building in a historic district to justify the design of an even newer proposal.

Levitan asked if any of the Commissioners were concerned about the idea of a lot division for this project. No concern was given.

Levitan closed the public hearing for Agenda Item #2.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to approve the three Certificates of Appropriateness for 740 Jenifer Street including the demolition of a rear shed, demolition of a rear addition, and exterior alteration with staff conditions and adding that staff should also review and approve any new doors as well as windows. The Landmarks Commission also asked that City staff add the MNA letter and the latest design iteration as presented by the Architect this evening to the Legistar file for future reference. The motion passed by voice vote/other.