



# City of Madison

## Meeting Minutes - Final

### LANDMARKS COMMISSION

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

---

Monday, July 9, 2007

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-130 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

#### 1. ROLL CALL

**Present:** Brenda K. Konkel, Daniel J. Stephans, Robin M. Taylor, Michael J. Rosenblum and Randall A. Page

**Excused:** Stuart Levitan and Erica Fox Gehrig

*Guests: Mr. Patrick McDonnell, Mr. Peter Ostlind, Ms. Ledell Zellers, Mr. Lou Host-Jablonski, Ms. Bridget Muldowney, Mr. Mike Wolfgram, Mr. Steve Connor, Mr. Jeff Horein, Ms. Jongyeon Lee, Ms. Melissa Destree, Ms. Linda Horvath*

#### 2. MINUTES

*The minutes of the June 18, 2007 meeting will be submitted for approval on September 5, 2007.*

#### 3. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- A. 1726 Regent Street, University Heights historic district - public hearing and consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for garage

*No one wished to speak at the public hearing, except for the owner, Ms. Muldowney, who presented the plans. Currently there is no garage on the property. The new garage would hold two cars and no zoning variances are needed.*

*The Certificate of Appropriateness for the project was approved on the condition that frieze boards be added under the eaves and that surrounds be added around all fenestration. Further, that the contractor submit plans to Ms. Rankin for final approval.*

**On a motion by Mr. Stephans, seconded by Mr. Rosenblum, the project was approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### 4. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

- A. 2017 Kendall Avenue, University Heights historic district - consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for new front porch stoop and steps

*Mr. Host-Jablonski presented the plans. He said that the owners considered many options for rebuilding the front steps, with and without brick. The final designs represent a compromise between staying true to the original look and reducing the damage caused by water infiltrating the structure at the joints. They managed to keep the steps low in number by adding four risers in the sidewalk. Mr. Stephans noted that it is clear from the photos that the original brickwork showed a lot of inflorescence and repeated tuckpointing, clear signs of a long history of water damage.*

**On a motion by Mr. Stephans, seconded by Mr. Rosenblum, the project was approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

- B. 211 N. Prospect Avenue, University Heights historic district - consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for new mud room and rear deck

*Mr. Connor, the contractor for the project, noted that he had submitted revised plans based on comments from Ms. Rankin. He noted that she had recommended using porch walls of a stucco-like material to provide more solidity to the design and be more in keeping with the stucco of the house. She also recommended a different window configuration for the breakfast area. Mr. Stephans said that the revised designs were an excellent response to Ms. Rankin's suggestions.*

**On a motion by Mr. Stephans, seconded by Mr. Rosenblum, the project was approved as revised. The motion passed unanimously.**

- C. Woman's Building, 240 W. Gilman Street - consider of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for retaining EIFS wall covering and designs for proposed parking lot, outdoor seating, fence, landscaping and garbage enclosure

*Ms. Destree, one of the architects, stated that the garbage enclosure would be composed of cedar fencing. Ms. Rankin reported that the sections of EIFS that had been removed so that the Commission members could see the condition of the brick had been filled back in with EIFS before she went to check it out. Ms. Destree noted that she had not authorized replacing the EIFS and was not happy that that had happened. She noted that Rural Masonry's master mason had written the letter recommending retention of the EIFS. She noted that the reason the building was refaced to begin with was because at that time the brick was delaminating. She noted that the front façade had parging directly onto the brick, probably as a way to retain some of the original trim detail. The previous estimate of \$15,000 by B and B Quality Restoration was only the price for removing the EIFS, not restoring the brick. She was worried that removing the EIFS might open a can of worms. If the EIFS and front parging are retained, there would only be a little bit of repair required to the exterior of the building. The bricks had been painted soon after the building was completed. Ms. Lee, the owner, said that she loves the Woman's Building and wants to do the right thing.*

*Ms. Zellers spoke on the project. She noted that a commitment had been made to the neighborhood that the brick would be restored and that the neighborhood approval of the project was based in part on that assurance. She expressed dissatisfaction that a promise was made and then, down the line, the project was changed. Mr. Page asked if the neighborhood would be willing to consider restoring the front but retaining the EIFS elsewhere, to which Ms. Zellers replied that they had not gotten all that they wanted to begin with, which is not to say that Ms. Lee had not done wonderful things so far.*

*Mr. Ostlind spoke next. He said that back when the Woman's Building was threatened with destruction there was an analysis of removing the EIFS and that the owner and architects knew way back what it would take to restore the brick. He said that if the EIFS is not removed now, it may very well not be in the future.*

*Ms. Destree noted that she had told the Landmarks Commission at its January 22 meeting that they would be assessing the brick in the spring. She said that this part of the project involved many unknowns and financial implications. Mr. Stephans said that he remembers having been told that and did not believe that the approval for the project was based on the condition that the brick be restored. He moved that the Commission defer consideration to a future meeting so that the architects could prepare a more detailed report on the condition of the brick and so that a section of the EIFS can be removed so that the Commission can see for themselves what the possible problems might be. Ald. Konkel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

*The Commission then considered the other aspects of the project. The brick piers will have menu boards on them, the fencing will match that of the church next door, with the addition of painted brick piers. There will be lights on the front wall. The Commission members suggested some other lighting designs that might fit in better with the Craftsman style of the building.*

**On a motion by Mr. Rosenblum moved, seconded by Mr. Stephans, all aspects of the project under review (not including the EIFS) were approved. The motion passed unanimously.**

## 5. DISUCSSION

### A. [06761](#)

Adopting the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Plan as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan.

*Landmarks Commission supports the plan with the addition of notice that Fyfe's Corner Bistro is a landmark.*

**A motion was made by Konkel, seconded by Taylor, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by acclamation.**

*Mr. McDonnell, of the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, noted that the new plan is an update of one that was approved by the Common Council in 1995. He noted that preservation is a major part of the revised plan and that the neighborhood is rich in Landmarks and historic buildings and neighborhoods. He said that the plan calls for stewardship and maintenance, including retaining the landmark houses at 640 and 646 E. Gorham Street, and the Fourth Lake Ridge and Sherman Avenue historic districts. He said the neighborhood is already working on getting those two NRHP districts listed as local historic districts. Ms. Rankin said that the only concern she had with the plan is that it calls for redevelopment of the block that Fyfe's Corner Bistro is on and does not mention that that building is a designated landmark. Mr. McDonnell agreed that it should be mentioned. Ald. Konkel asked commission members if they had any concerns with the recommendation in the plan to demolish the shelter in James Madison Park. No commission members expressed any concerns.*

### B. Report to Landmarks Commission on Certificates of Appropriateness received in 2006 - continued

*No one wished to report on the Certificates of Appropriateness completed in 2006.*

### C. Secretary's Report

*Ms. Rankin passed out photos of buildings recently proposed for demolition.*

## 6. ADJOURNMENT

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.**