



Project Name/Address: 315 N Carroll Street

Application Type: PUBLIC HEARING
Certificate of Appropriateness for the technical demolition/relocation of the landmark building in the Mansion Hill historic district

Legistar File ID # [35573](#)

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

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Pastor Scot Sorenson

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the technical demolition/relocation and a separate Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of the landmark building in the Mansion Hill historic district.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is a landmark site located in the Mansion Hill Historic District

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

33.19(5)(c)3. Standards. (for Demolition)

In determining whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for any demolition, the Landmarks Commission shall consider and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:

- a. Whether the building or structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State;
- b. Whether the building or structure, although not itself a landmark building, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the District as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State;
- c. Whether demolition of the subject property would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter as set forth in Sec. 33.19 and to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable district as duly adopted by the Common Council;
- d. Whether the building or structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture and/or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense;
- e. Whether retention of the building or 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;
- f. Whether the building or structure is in such a deteriorated condition that it is not structurally or economically feasible to preserve or restore it, provided that any hardship or difficulty claimed by the owner which is self-created or which is the result of any failure to maintain the property in good repair cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness;
- g. Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the buildings and environment of the district in which the subject property is located.

33.19(1) Purpose and Intent It is hereby declared a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of improvements of special character or special historical interest or value is a public necessity and is required in the interest of health, prosperity, safety and welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:

- (a) Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of such improvements and of districts which represent or reflect elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history.
- (b) Safeguard the City's historic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such landmarks and historic districts.
- (c) Stabilize and improve property values.
- (d) Foster civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the past.
- (e) Protect and enhance the City's attractions to residents, tourists and visitors, and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry.
- (f) Strengthen the economy of the City.
- (g) Promote the use of historic districts and landmarks for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the City.

33.19(5)(b)4. Upon filing of any application with the Landmarks Commission, the Landmarks Commission shall determine:

- a. Whether in the case of a designated landmark or landmark site, the proposed work would detrimentally change, destroy or adversely affect any exterior architectural feature of the improvement upon which said work is to be done;

33.19(8) Maintenance of Landmarks, Landmark Sites and Historic Districts.

- (a) Every person in charge of an improvement on a landmark site or in an Historic District shall keep in good repair all of the exterior portions of such improvement and all interior portions thereof which, if not so maintained, may cause or tend to cause the exterior portions of such improvement to fall into a state of disrepair. This provision shall be in addition to all other provisions of law requiring such improvement to be kept in good repair.

Analysis and Conclusion

While it is preferable to leave landmark buildings where they were constructed, there may be instances where a case for relocation can be made. In fact, other City of Madison designated landmark buildings have been relocated. The Stoner House (321 South Hamilton) was moved less than 100 feet north on the same site in 1983 and Brittingham Boathouse was moved less than 100 feet on the same site in 2006. Gates of Heaven was relocated prior to being designated.

The applicant was granted a Certificate of Appropriateness for the relocation of the Steensland House in 2012 that was contingent on the favorable review of the Specific Implementation Plan for the Bethel expansion project. Since 2012, the Bethel congregation and leadership have made different plans for the relocation of the Steensland House so that it can remain on the block adjacent to its original location, but removed from the area of the site where the Bethel expansion may occur. The Landmarks Commission and the neighborhood organization urged the Bethel congregation to keep the Steensland House on the block when reviewing the relocation proposal in 2012.

A discussion of the demolition standards 33.19(5)(c)3. follows:

- a. The existing structure is a designated landmark and is of such architectural and historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State. The loss of the physical presence of the architectural and historic

significance of the landmark building on this specific site is not ideal; however, the appropriate architectural context on this block was destroyed before the Steensland House was designated a landmark and before the Mansion Hill Historic District was formalized. The Steensland House was negatively affected by the previous loss of appropriate architectural context in its current location.

- b. The existing structure contributes to the historic character of the District as an example of a home of one of Madison's prominent citizens in the Queen Anne style. The relocation of the structure to a different site on the same block will retain the structure in the historic district.
- c. The relocation of the existing structure is more in keeping with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance than demolition. The relocation of the structure allows the Steensland House to remain a part of Madison's built environment. Overall, the landmark building is being retained within the Mansion Hill Historic District and that outcome is not contrary to the purpose and intent statements.
- d. The existing structure is a designated landmark building and is of such old and unusual design, texture and material that it could not be reproduced without great expense. Given that the structure is being relocated, this standard does not apply.
- e. The 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. Given that the structure is being relocated, this standard does not apply.
- f. The property owner is not claiming a hardship and is proposing to move the structure because it is in a condition that allows it to have a future use. Given that the structure is being relocated, this standard does not apply.
- g. The current Steensland House site will become an expansion of the parking lot until the larger Bethel expansion project comes forward.

In response to 33.19(5)(b)4, overall, the proposed alterations do not seem to detrimentally change, destroy or adversely affect any exterior architectural features of the landmark building; however, more detail is needed. For example, the material of the existing foundation is regularly sized coursed stones with rusticated finish and tooled square corner details. Many areas of the existing foundation have deteriorated and the submission materials propose that the existing foundation material will be removed and new foundation material will be installed. It is imperative that the new material match the existing material so that the integrity of the original architectural design is retained.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition/relocation of the landmark Steensland House to a site on the same block are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Preservation Planner shall review and work with the Applicant the means and methods of relocation. The Applicant shall provide proof of language in all contracts that includes a reconstruction clause if the landmark building is damaged beyond repair during the relocation process.
2. The Preservation Planner shall review and work with the Applicant to approve any and all alterations to the exterior of the Steensland House as final plans are prepared for the new site.

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of the landmark Steensland House may be met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Preservation Planner shall review and work with the Applicant to approve any and all alterations to the exterior of the Steensland House as final plans are prepared for the new site.
2. The Applicant shall confirm the extent and location of the limestone cap at the perimeter.
3. The Applicant shall confirm the intent of notes C and D on sheet A200.

4. The Applicant shall provide physical material samples for the proposed foundation material.
5. The Applicant shall confirm the extent of the salvage of the front porch materials.
6. The Applicant shall confirm that all windows will be repaired. Note I on sheet A200 mentions the repair of casement windows only.
7. The Applicant shall confirm the treatment and finish of the salvaged and new stone and masonry elements.
8. The Applicant shall confirm the design and details of the railing on the rear roof deck.