

**AGENDA # 9**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

<b>REPORT OF:</b> LANDMARKS COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> July 18, 2016
<b>TITLE:</b> 219 West Gilman Street – Demolish building to construct addition to 223, advisory to Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. Contact: Mark Kruser, Assemblage Architects	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b> Amy Scanlon, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
<b>DATED:</b> July 18, 2016	<b>ID NUMBER:</b> 43694

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Lon Hill, and Marsha A. Rummel

**SUMMARY:**

Levitan briefly explained the referral and that the Alder requested that the Commission provide an advisory review of the project as if it were in the local Mansion Hill historic district. Levitan also explained that the City Attorney suggested that the Commission not make any formal motions related to this referral.

**\*\*The Commission stood informal for 5 minutes while the applicants prepared their presentation.\*\***

Mark Kruser, registering in support and wishing to speak. Kruser showed the Mansion Hill local historic district boundary and the location of the proposed project.

Ron Trachtenberg, registering in support and wishing to speak. Trachtenberg explained that there is concern that the project which includes the demolition of the house at 219 will set a precedent supporting demolition in Mansion Hill. He explained the property is located in the Mansion Hill National Register historic district and that the Commission is being asked to provide an advisory recommendation related to the appropriateness of the project if it were located in the local historic district.

Trachtenberg explained that the ULI HopCat property is located directly behind Chabad House and that there are currently two HopCat access easements from that property. He described different site plan configurations to allow the retention of 219 and the resulting inefficiencies that this causes for the site and the program and the conflict with the easement rights for HopCat.

Trachtenberg explained that this is a unique site that is oriented more toward State Street than the residential neighborhood due to the bisection of the block by the parking lot.

Rabbi Menachem "Rabbi Mendel" Matusat, registering in support and wishing to speak. Rabbi Mendel explained that the site is centrally located near the students that the Chabad House serves and that a different site even 2 blocks away would not be as ideal as this location. The Chabad House is appealing to students because it is a home on a quiet block that is in a central location.

Hamid Noughani, Assemblage Architects registering in support. Noughani explained that the parking lot has created an opportunity for the site which allows the creation of a corner lot that can be accentuated in the architectural response. In addition, Noughani explained that the proposed development proposal will provide an edge at the parking lot that is currently undefined by the fabric of the context.

Mark Kruser, registering in support and wishing to speak. Kruser explained that local architect Charlie Quagliana prepared a condition assessment report for the property at 219. The report concludes that the building retains few essential exterior features that enhance its architectural integrity. The report explains that the building's overall integrity is low and repair costs would be greater than replacement costs.

The proposed design of the addition is respectful and complementary to the context of the neighborhood and the existing building in its placement, scale, materials, colors, proportion of windows, alignment of features and heights, abstraction of details, and rhythm of forms along the street. Trachtenberg explained that designs with other roof forms were preliminarily prepared and studied, but were not successful.

Kruser described the general layout of the site and the program.

Olwen Jaffee registering in support and wishing to speak. Jaffee explained that the Chabad House programming offers a community that is important to student experience and that its location is central to student life and complements the neighborhood.

David Gerbie registering in support and wishing to speak. Gerbie explained that he has been going to Chabad House for three years and he has never seen anyone interested in the history of the house at 219 in a similar way that he saw people in Oak Park touring and appreciating the works of Frank Lloyd Wright as a child. He explained that the central location of the Chabad House is important for student involvement and that the program offers a home-like atmosphere.

Franny Ingebritson registering in support of Alder Verveer's referral and wishing to speak. Ingebritson explained that the parking lot is not a thoroughfare; instead it is a noncontributing area of the National Register Historic District. She explained that she respects and appreciates the programming offered to students by the Chabad House. She explained that the Chabad House is a good neighbor and the neighborhood wishes them success.

Ingebritson explained that the house at 219 is contributing to the National Register historic district and that the structure should remain and maintain the residential character of the street. She explained that the property was purchased for \$125,000 more than the assessed value and that approval to demolish will set a precedent for demolitions in local and National Register historic districts. The Downtown Plan recommends creating coterminous boundaries for the districts to preserve Gilman Street streetscape. The condition report shows the structure is not beyond repair. Ingebritson explained that further discussions have happened with ULI and that they are willing to discuss alternate easement routes. Ingebritson requested that the original house (shown in footprint on the 1892 Sanborn Map) be retained and moved closer to the street to allow a large area to the rear of the property for the addition. This would allow the preservation of the historic district character along the streetscape.

Alder Verveer explained that it has been a pleasure to work with Rabbi Mendel and that this structure is contributing to the National Register historic district and the adopted Downtown Plan recommends that these three parcels be added to the local historic district so the boundaries are coterminous. He explained that he asked Rabbi Mendel to voluntarily come before the Landmarks Commission for the expertise of the membership to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission on matters related to historic preservation.

Rummel asked if relocation of the house has been explored. Verveer explained that they have shown interest in offering the structure to any interested party and provide the cost of demolition toward the relocation expenses.

Levitan asked that Trachtenberg comment about the easement options and other items. Trachtenberg explained that ULI has not provided any alternate easement options to the project team at this time. He also explained that the retention of the existing structure would not allow the desired program as the floors do not align from structure to structure.

The Commission discussed the proposed demolition and new construction at 219-223 W Gilman.

Hill requested clarification on the Downtown Plan recommendation to make coterminous historic district boundaries.

Rummel explained that demolition standard c would apply because the structure contributes to historic character of historic district and that demolition standard d would apply since the demolition would be contrary to the policy and purpose of the ordinance. In addition, she explained that demolition standard h would apply since the new use is compatible with the scale of the historic context.

Andrzejewski and Gehrig agreed with Rummel's comments.

Andrzejewski explained that demolition standard f would apply as an interesting concept for further research of the pattern of historic development that placed rental properties along the edges of these early neighborhoods. Andrzejewski also explained that in response to demolition standard c, National Register historic district designations and local designations have different purposes. The local historic district places all value on the exterior appearance and integrity of the resource where the National Register historic district determines integrity based on interior and exterior features.

Gehrig explained that this structure provides a vernacular character and range of uses constructed within the period of significance. Rummel explained that even though demolition standard g would not apply, the condition report indicates that the building was able to be repaired.

Gehrig explained that if this building were located in a local historic district, she would only support the protection and preservation of the structure.

There was general discussion about the hypothetical coterminous boundary creation and how this proposal should be reviewed.

Rummel explained that the façade of the addition may need to be moved closer to the street. Noughani explained that the existing front façade is in a similar location to the proposed.

Andrzejewski explained that she likes the design concept and appreciates the height, the gross volume, the flat roof, and the borrowed rhythm of the adjacent structure. Gehrig and Rummel agreed with Andrzejewski's comments.

Noughani explained that the project team wants the Chabad House addition to contribute to the overall strength of the neighborhood and that the block will be best preserved by allowing the addition.

There was general discussion about the overall horizontal expression of the addition and how it relates to the existing building.



**Project Name/Address:** 219 W Gilman Street

**Application Type:** Advisory Recommendation for Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission (Referral by Alder)

**Legistar File ID #** 43694

**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

**Date Prepared:** July 11, 2016

**Summary**

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Mark Kruser, Assemblage Architects

**Requested Action:** Alder Verveer requested that the development project at 219 and 223 W Gilman Street be referred to the Landmarks Commission for an advisory recommendation for the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission.

**Background Information**

The subject site is located on a block fronted by State Street and is bounded on one side by a City-owned parking lot. The development site includes the existing Chabad House at 223 W Gilman and a rental property at 219 W Gilman. The intent of the proposal is to demolish the building at 219 in order to construct an addition to 223. Both buildings are contributing buildings in the Mansion Hill National Register Historic District. The buildings are not located in the Mansion Hill local historic district.

Alder Verveer has requested that this proposal come before the Landmarks Commission for an advisory recommendation for the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission, offering these comments related to the Landmarks Commission review – *“I believe that this parcel and her neighbors should be in the local district and would appreciate the Commission offering their advice and expertise to the Plan Commission as if they were.”*

Although this request has not been formally referred to the Landmarks Commission through the development review process, the Applicants have agreed to the review by the Landmarks Commission as requested by the Alder. In order to provide an advisory recommendation related to the Alder’s comments, the following ordinance sections would be relevant if this request were happening in the Mansion Hill local historic district:

- 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:
    - (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.

- (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:
- (a) Whether the structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition or removal would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
  - (b) Whether a landmark's designation has been rescinded.
  - (c) Whether the structure, although not itself a landmark structure, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State.
  - (d) Whether demolition or removal of the subject property would be contrary to the policy and purpose of this ordinance and/or to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable historic district as duly adopted by the Common Council.
  - (e) Whether the structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, method of construction, or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.
  - (f) Whether retention of the structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage.
  - (g) The condition of the property, provided that any deterioration of the property which is self-created or which is the result of a failure to maintain the property as required by this chapter cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for demolition or removal.
  - (h) Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the historic resources of the historic district in which the subject property is located, or if outside a historic district, compatible with the mass and scale of buildings within two hundred (200) feet of the boundary of the landmark site.
  - (i) Prior to approving a certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Landmarks Commission may require the applicant to provide documentation of the structure. Documentation shall be in the form required by the Commission.

#### 41.22 MANSION HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (4) Standards for Review of Development in the Mansion Hill Historic District.
- (1) Any new structure located within 200 feet of other historic resources shall be visually compatible with those historic resources in the following ways:
    - (a) Height
    - (b) Gross Volume
    - (c) In the street elevation(s) of a structure, the proportion of width to height in the facade(s).
    - (d) The proportions and relationships of width to height of the doors and windows in street facade(s).
    - (e) The proportion and rhythm of solids to voids created by openings in the façade.
  - (2) All street facades shall blend with other structures via directional expression. When adjacent structures have a dominant vertical or horizontal expression, this expression should be carried over and reflected.

## Recommendation

Staff does not provide a recommendation on advisory referrals. Instead, the Landmarks Commission's report is forwarded to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission for their information.

# MADISON TRUST



for Historic Preservation



4/25/16

Landmarks Commission  
Amy Scanlon/City Preservation Planner

RE: 219 W. Gilman-Demolition

Dear Amy and Commission Members:

Our organization is opposed to the demolition of 219 W. Gilman St to make way for a new structure combining the property with the adjacent property at 223 W. Gilman. 219 is a property just on the outside of the Mansion Hill Historic District and is in a sensitive area, between a historic residential neighborhood and a historic business district.

The main issue we have is for the potential to create a dangerous precedent in an area that has had enormous development pressures recently to build larger and larger projects that ultimately erode the scale and rhythm of the existing neighborhood. This is a contributing property to the Mansion Hill National Historic District, as is the entire Mansion Hill Local Historic District. As these properties are lost, the National Historic District loses more and more of its continuity, context and contiguousness, elements that are critical to cohesive districts. Precedents of this type will encourage further demolition, increase development pressure and slowly erode the unique fabric of this district.

Please consider the very real potential of creating a dangerous precedent in this proposal by opposing the demolition of this contributing building.

Sincerely,

Sam Breidenbach  
President

*Dedicated to Preserving Madison's Historic Places*

P.O. Box 296 Madison, Wisconsin 53701-0296 608-441-8864 [www.madisontrust.org](http://www.madisontrust.org)