

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 14, 2016
TITLE: 722 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Construct a new building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Lance McGrath, McGrath Property Group, LLC	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: 3/14/16 POF:
DATED: March 14, 2016	ID NUMBER: 41937

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Lon Hill, Marsha A. Rummel, and Christina Slattery

SUMMARY:

Levitan opened the public hearing.

Marc Schellpfeffer, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Paul Cuta, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Michael Metzger, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Metzger provided a brief description of the proposed project which will include three components: environmental remediation, renovation of the Olds Building, and construction of new building.

Schellpfeffer described the site and locations of proposed elements. He explained that they originally proposed an addition to the Olds Building, but decided not to pursue that improvement. Instead they have chosen to develop a focal point at the center of the site and develop a promenade along the side of the Olds Building to move pedestrians toward the center lantern element. The promenade has two levels – an upper level walkway under shed roof directly adjacent to the building and a lower level walkway at grade.

Schellpfeffer explained the materials and that the proposed materials would not mimic the existing brick of the Olds Building or Harvester Building, but instead would use masonry of complementary colors – an orangey brown iron spot brick on the lantern and new building and a buff color on the new building with two colors of metal panel.

Schellpfeffer explained that there would be new retail openings in the side elevation along the promenade. The promenade would have lightweight steel frame with trusses that correspond to existing haunches on the side elevation. The lantern has a second floor outdoor amenity space. The mass of the lantern does not engage the corner of the Olds Building.

Schellpfeffer explained that the new building along the bike path was designed so that the material placement and material selection helps to break down the visual size and scale. An entry door is provided on the rear elevation to engage the activity on the bike path and provide a connection to the center of the site.

The Olds Building was previously renovated with replacement windows, the alteration of the storefront, and the installation of EIFS on the sides and rear. The original storefront openings will be restored and the existing EIFS will be removed and replaced with a new EIFS system. The existing EIFS system was not installed with a drainage layer and is doing damage to the brick wall. The new EIFS system will be installed with a drainage layer. The masonry of the front elevation will be restored and the glazing of the storefront transoms will be replaced with reeded glass panels. Schellpfeffer and Cuta described where new openings would be created and that the original openings on the front elevation of the Olds Building would be retained and restored.

Rummel asked for clarification on the proposed EIFS replacement, about using reeded glass instead of Luxfer prism glass to replicate the original, and the appearance of the storefront doors. Schellpfeffer explained that the reeded glass provides a similar filtered light quality on the interior and an obscured glass appearance from the exterior as the Luxfer. The openings on the side elevation will be glass paneled garage doors that could be opened to the promenade. He explained that the existing EIFS needs to be repaired and when they removed a portion and found the deterioration of the brick, they decided it would need to be removed and replaced.

Levitan asked Schellpfeffer to comment on the conditions in the staff report. Schellpfeffer explained that the EIFS would have joints to indicate the concrete structure of the wall, that the promenade trusses would engage the existing haunches, and that the materials used on the mass of the rear building break down the visual scale.

Gehrig requested that the applicant investigate more ways to reduce the volume and scale of the rear building. Hill explained that the building is very large and continued efforts to reduce the size would be appreciated.

John Coleman, registering neither in support or opposition, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions. Coleman explained that the report from the MNA Preservation and Development Committee is that the committee supports the project with the following conditions – that it is further set back from the bike path, that the owner commit to leasing only to local businesses, that the owner commit to providing affordable housing, and that the architecture connect to the bike path. He explained that in his personal opinion, the rear elevation needed work and that the door on the rear elevation went directly into the garage; it was not an engaging entrance. Like a lobby that would make it a destination. He explained that setting the project back would allow more space to engage the bike path with outdoor activity spaces and landscaping. He quoted from the East Rail corridor plan about the need for more green space in the area.

Levitan reminded the Commission that they should only consider the elements of the project within their purview of review.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee explained that he is a neighbor and local business owner. He agrees with the staff report and supports the proposed project. He explained that while possibly outside of the purview of the Commission, he wanted the record of the review of the project to include his testimony that another developer provided a written commitment to lease only to local businesses and that chains would change the character of Williamson Street.

Rummel asked Lee for his thoughts about the rear elevation. Lee explained that setting the building back further from the bike path would be better for open space improvements and use, but may be difficult to accommodate with the building footprint.

Levitan closed the public hearing.

There was general discussion about the interpretation of “street facades” and the treatment of E Wilson Street right-of-way as a street with a “street façade”.

There was also discussion about the divisions of the windows on the front elevation and how that gave a similar appearance to the historic appearance, but it was a false historic treatment. The Commission discussed the historic industrial window type and how a double hung had a more residential feel which would be appropriate in an adaptive re-use project where the original windows were previously replaced.

There was discussion about the EIFS and the use of EIFS at grade which would likely be discussed by the Urban Design Commission. Staff suggested that the Commission discuss appropriate materials in lieu of EIFS at the lower level to assist UDC with their discussion. Staff explained that the original building has a concrete frame with brick infill and that the infill was usually soft brick. In many cases that soft brick began to deteriorate and was covered with a parge coat which has a thin “stucco” appearance. The appearance of EIFS is similar to stucco. There was discussion about the need to maintain a stucco or concrete appearance at this level and not introduce brick.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Hill, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction and exterior alteration with the conditions of approval in the staff report. Slattery suggested an amendment, seconded by Hill, to include the use of one-over-one double hung windows on the front elevation as part of the motion. The amendment to the motion passed on a vote of 3:1.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Hill, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction and exterior alteration with the conditions of approval in the staff report and using one-over-one windows on the front elevation instead of the divided as proposed. The motion passed by voice vote.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Gehrig, to advise the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark site. The motion passed by voice vote.

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

March 14, 2016

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



Project Name/Address: 722 Williamson Street
Application Type: PUBLIC HEARING Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction, and Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration in Third Lake Ridge Historic District, and adjacent to landmark 744 Williamson, Madison Candy Company.
Legistar File ID # 41937
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared: March 3, 2016

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Lance McGrath, McGrath Property Group, LLC

Requested Action/Proposal Summary: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction and for exterior alteration in the Third Lake Ridge historic district.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located 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

- (6) Standards for new Structures in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Mixed-Use and Commercial Use. Any new structure on parcels zoned for employment 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 rhythm of solids and voids in the street façade(s)
 - (d) The materials used in the street façade(s)
 - (e) The design of the roof

- (f) The rhythm of building masses and spaces
- (7) Standards for Exterior Alterations in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Mixed-Use and Commercial Use.
- (1) Any exterior alterations 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) Height
- (2) Alterations of street façade(s) shall retain the original or existing historical proportion and rhythm of solids to voids
- (3) Alterations of street facade(s) shall retain the original or existing historical materials.
- (4) Alterations of roof shall retain its existing historical appearance.

28.144 DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO A LANDMARK OR LANDMARK SITE.

Any development on a zoning lot adjoining a landmark or landmark site for which Plan Commission or Urban Design-Commission review is required shall be reviewed by the Landmark Commission to determine whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark or landmark site. Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission.

Analysis and Conclusion

The proposed project includes the exterior alteration of the existing Olds Seed Company Building and the construction of a new building on the north portion of the lot. The exterior alterations to the Olds Seed building include the installation of a covered walkway, removal and replacement of synthetic stucco wall material (EIFS), creation of three openings on the east side elevation at first level, opening of previously infilled openings on side elevation, installation of storefront system on street façade and side elevation, installation of new windows, and masonry repair. The proposed new building minimally touches the rear elevation of the Olds Seed building at the first floor level.

The Visual Compatibility map is attached to this report.

A discussion of the new development standards 41.23(6) follows:

- (a) The gross volume of the proposed building is of a similar gross volume to other buildings in the 200' area, and the design is generally compatible with the other buildings on the north side of Williamson. The volume of the long mass along the bike path/East Wilson right-of-way could be modified to be more visually compatible with the buildings in the 200' area. This modification may include providing a break in the building volume to allow a smaller visual expression of volume.
- (b) The proposed building is taller than the neighboring buildings in the 200' area, but is relatively consistent with the heights. The standard relates to the visual compatibility of the height, not the mathematical calculation of the height.
- (c) The proposed building is located behind the existing Olds Seed building and does not technically have a "street façade" along Williamson Street. There are portions of the proposed new building that are visible from Williamson Street and the rhythm of solids and voids in those portions of the proposed building are generally compatible with the buildings in the 200' area. The public street right-of-way of East Wilson Street exists between Blount and Livingston Streets and could be made into a functioning street in the future. This East Wilson "street façade" has a similar rhythm of solids and voids as the façade visible from Williamson Street.
- (d) The proposed building is located behind the existing Olds Seed building and does not technically have a "street façade" along Williamson Street. There are portions of the proposed new

building that are visible from Williamson Street and the materials used in the visible portions of the proposed building are generally compatible with those used in the buildings and environment within the 200' area. The public street right-of-way of East Wilson Street exists between Blount and Livingston Streets and could be made into a functioning street in the future. This "street façade" has a similar material treatment as the façade visible from Williamson Street.

- (e) The proposed building has a flat roof which is compatible with other buildings in the VRA.
- (f) The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the construction of the proposed building is compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces within the 200' area. The modification of the volume of the mass in (a) above would assist with the creation of appropriate masses and spaces. The proposed building touches the existing Olds Seed building in a small area on the first level of the rear elevation. This allows the buildings to be separated in the upper stories and provide a space between the masses which is similar to the masses and spaces in the context.

A discussion of the exterior alteration standards 41.23(7) follows:

- (1) The exterior alterations to the Olds Seed building are not going to affect the height.
- (2) Alterations of street façade(s) of the Olds Seed building will retain the original historical proportion and rhythm of solids to voids. The original openings at the first level will be opened to their original size. While the east side elevation is not technically a street façade, it is visible from Williamson Street and contributes to the character of the historic district. The proposed treatment of the east side elevation creates new openings for fenestration. These include three openings at the first level, three paired window openings and three triple window openings.
- (3) Alterations of street facade(s) shall retain the original or existing historical materials. The front elevation drawing (sheet A211) indicates the EIFS will be on the front elevation. Staff believes this is an error and that the masonry façade will be restored. The double hung windows proposed for the front elevation are shown with divided lights. While the east side elevation is not technically a street façade, it is visible from Williamson Street and contributes to the character of the historic district. The drawings indicate that the EIFS will have joints in the surface to express the structural system of the building. It is not clear in the historic photo provided, but some industrial buildings built circa 1900 had an expressed concrete structure with brick infill on the sides and rear. Usually the brick used in the infill was soft and quickly deteriorated resulting in the installation of a stucco coat to protect the brick. The EIFS provides a stucco-like appearance, but the UDC review will likely result in the need to provide a masonry material at the lower level at a minimum. The Commission should discuss alternatives that may be appropriate. Related to the materials, the rendering showing the promenade structure does not show the existing structural brackets. The historic photo of the Olds Seed building shows industrial type windows with divisions and some operable panels. The proposed windows of the front elevation show double hungs with divided lights. The window types are different than the types shown in the historic photo.
- (4) The exterior alterations to the Olds Seed building are not going to affect the roof. The roof will retain its existing historical appearance.

Recommendation

Staff believes the standards for granting the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction are met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the request with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Applicant shall investigate providing a break in the volume of the long portion of the building to allow a smaller visual expression of volume and to assist with the appropriate masses and spaces in the historic district.

Staff believes the standards for granting the Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alteration are met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the request with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Applicant shall bring material and color samples to the meeting for review.
2. The Applicant shall confirm that the note for EIFS on the front elevation is incorrect and that the existing masonry will be restored.
3. The Applicant shall confirm that the EIFS will have joints indicating the structural system of the building on the side elevations.
4. The Applicant shall confirm that the trusses of the proposed promenade will use the existing structural brackets.
5. The Commission shall discuss the appropriateness of the divided lights in the windows of the front elevation.
6. The Commission shall discuss the appropriate material treatment of the side elevation at the first level in lieu of the proposed EIFS.

Staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission advise the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark site.