

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 1/13/20

TITLE: 944 Williamson St - Exterior Alteration in  
the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist. -  
Remodel and Installation of Drive  
Thru Lanes; 6th Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 1/22/20

**ID NUMBER:** 58867

---

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Betty Banks, Katie Kaliszewski, Arvina Martin, David McLean, and Maurice Taylor.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Robin Marohn, registering in support and available to answer questions*

Bailey described the proposed work to modify the secondary storefront façade to include two drive-through bays, repair parapets, modify some window and door openings, replace existing awnings and windows, and remove wall lighting. She mentioned that the property was constructed in 1987, so it is well outside the period of significance for the Third Lake Ridge historic district. She showed the building and site plans and pointed out that because this is a corner property, both sides of the building are considered street façades, and the ordinance language does not differentiate between historic and non-historic resources. She said that currently, the exterior of the building has a lot of light fixtures, and the proposal is to remove those fixtures and install internally illuminated signage. She said that would be out of character with the overall historic district, and she would recommend that the complete sign package be reviewed by the Preservation Planner. She said that she recommends the new wall signage have indirect lighting, but agreed that most of the existing lighting can be removed because it is excessive. She referenced the applicable standards, which she pointed out focus heavily on street façades. She said that the rhythm of solids to voids is changing because two car bays are being added, but it is a secondary storefront on a non-historic resource. She said that staff recommends approval with the condition that the future sign package be approved by staff with the stipulation that wall signs continue to have indirect illumination; she mentioned that commissioners could also decide that they would like the sign package to come before the Landmarks Commission for approval.

Andrzejewski referenced the 1987 construction date, and pointed out that it does not relate to the period of significance for the historic district. Bailey said that all structures in the historic district, regardless of the date of construction, have to follow the same process. Taylor asked how realistic it was to hold the applicants to the same standards when the building is from 1987. Bailey said that because the language in the ordinance refers to all properties, not just those in the period of significance, it is how the commission should proceed; however, typically there is more latitude in the interpretation of the standards when a property is not close to the period of significance. Taylor asked Bailey to further discuss the lighting and signage. Bailey said that for this historic district and period of significance, most buildings have indirect illumination such as gooseneck lights pointed on a sign. She said that for the preexisting internally illuminated sign, it is simply a change of copy, which is acceptable; however, for any new signage, she recommends that it be in keeping with the overall character of the historic district.

Kaliszewski asked Marohn what he thought about staff's recommendation for the lighting. Marohn said that there is indirect lighting on the building now, and agreed with Bailey that it is more than what is needed. He said that the only thing that needs to be lit on the signage is the business name. He said that he has already let the project manager know this was a concern, and they recognize there are things they will need to work on with the neighborhood. He said that their other concern is security, but he does not think that will be an issue with what is being proposed by staff. Kaliszewski said that she would prefer indirect lighting rather than an internally lit sign.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by McLean, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the future sign package be approved by staff with the stipulation that wall signs continue to have indirect illumination. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**