

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 4, 2016
TITLE: 2020 Eastwood Drive – Construct an addition on the Kennedy Dairy Barn landmark. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Jon Brakebill; Filament Marketing, LLC	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: 4/4/16 POF:
DATED: April 4, 2016	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Lon Hill, David WJ McLean, and Christina Slattery

SUMMARY:

Revised drawings were provided at the meeting.

Russell Kowalski, registering in support and available to answer questions. Kowalski described the proposed revisions and how the revisions better address the standards. He also explained the proposed addition massing and materials. The materials will be metal panel and some of the “glazing” along the property line is metal panel to meet fire code requirements. Some of the “glazing” metal panel locations may shift as the interior spaces are finalized.

Staff explained that the proposed massing meets the standards and that the largest issue with the previous design was that the roof form was obscured by the proposed massing.

There was general discussion about massing, details and materials.

Kowalski explained that there are mechanical screens provided on two ends of the proposed building. Kowalski also clarified how the addition wall material interacts with the existing wall. There was general discussion about the bearing condition of the wall and how the siding material stops at the existing masonry material. Kowalski confirmed that the metal panel is painted and is not galvanized.

Edward Kuharski, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak. Kuharski explained that the proposed addition is foreign and detracting to the original barn building. Kuharski explained that the upper metal addition pushes the parapet line down. He suggested that a grade level addition in the adjacent parking lot would be better for the landmark building than the proposed second story addition. Kuharski also suggested that the mechanical equipment could be located on the addition roof.

There was general discussion about the location of the mechanical equipment and screening and the possibilities to locate the addition on the site. Kowalski drew the wall section of the existing addition to explain the bearing condition for the addition and there was general discussion about the revisions that would be necessary to

accommodate the bearing condition. Slattery explained that more breathing room on the southeast mechanical screen would be preferred.

Andrzejewski explained that she believes the addition meets the standards and gives the historic building breathing space in a way that is consistent with the standards and not significantly distracting.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Gehrig, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition to the landmark building consistent with the discussion of the Commission and final details to be reviewed and finalized by staff. The motion passed by voice vote.