

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 7/26/21

TITLE: 101 N Hamilton St - Exterior Alterations to
a Designated Madison Landmark
(Draper Brothers Block); 4th Ald.
Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 8/5/21

ID NUMBER: 66291

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

SUMMARY:

Emily Mader-Kiley, registering in support and wishing to speak

Greg Thomas, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey said this landmark structure is unusual in its configuration. She provided information on the history of the property, pointing out that the landmark is comprised of two separate addresses that have development differently over time. The building at 101 N Hamilton is a sandstone Italianate and the building around the corner at 110 E Mifflin is a brick vernacular commercial building, which does not have a lot of character remaining. She said that the front façade of 101 N Hamilton is ornate sandstone, but the side is sandstone rubble with no street presence or ornamentation. She described the proposed work for each of the buildings. She said that the buildings are already painted, and the applicants are proposing to change the paint colors. She said the applicants also intend to replace the windows, which are not historic. She pointed out one historic window on the 2nd floor of the stone building, which will be repaired. She said that the new limestone base proposed for the E Mifflin Street side of the building is somewhat decorative and will stand out with the new paint scheme, but she understood the rationale to introduce some protection to this area against the salt in winter. She said the sign panel is proposed to continue from the street façade to the E Mifflin side. She recommended the commission look at the buildings as two separate structures. She showed historic photos and Sanborn maps of the properties, as well as plans for the front façade, pointing out the proposal to remove the narrow deck and reconfigure the entryway. She recommended they modify the proposed planter, which could be a pedestrian trip hazard. On the side of the building, the applicants are proposing to punch in new window openings so the interior spaces have light. Bailey recommended they follow the window pattern established on the front façade for the new windows. She pointed out there is one existing historic window on this façade, so they know the width the windows would have been. She said there should be single-width windows on the upper floor with larger windows on the lower floor. She said the rectangular windows rather than arched help differentiate the new windows from the old. She said that she does not agree with continuing the decorative belt band around the side of the building, and it should stay in the front. She said that the sign band should also not extend across the entire side of the building. She said that if there needs to be signage over the side entrance, she would recommend a sign band only over the doorway, and the sign band should be painted rather than replicating unpainted wood. She said that she would treat the brick building separately. She said they know the size of the existing window openings on this building, and rather than continue the window pattern from the stone structure, the new window should be in proportion to the other three window openings on this building. She said that she didn't know if there was a signage band on this building historically because anything decorative was removed from the building. She said that the existing window to the right of

the doorway is currently enclosed with wood, and the applicants are proposing to keep it for forensic purposes but enclose it with brick.

Kaliszewski asked about the filled-in window on the 2nd floor of the stone building. Bailey said that it used to be a door for the exterior stairs, and the applicants are now proposing to put a window there.

Bailey discussed the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Regarding standard #1, she said that some of the proposed modifications could be workable, but the way they are proposed crossed the threshold in terms of modifying the existing structure and causing the character of the building and site to be lost. Regarding standard #3, she said the proposal adds conjectural elements and turns the side of the stone building into a street frontage when it has never operated that way historically. Regarding standard #9, she said that the proposed window sizes are problematic; one should differentiate the old from the new but do so in a way that is compatible with the existing architectural features. Regarding standard #10, she said that when punching additional windows, once one removes the historic material, it is gone, which should be considered. She pointed out that the side rubble wall is a different situation than the decorative sandstone blocks on the front façade. Regarding the parging on the brick structure, she said that it could be destructive to remove but the applicants are proposing to expand the area of historic brick to be covered in parging. She said that staff recommends the commission provide detailed feedback to the applicants and refer the item to a future meeting so the applicant can update the proposal to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Kaliszewski said that she understood why the commission cannot dictate paint colors but asked if they could tell applicants not to paint stone when it is obviously a detriment to the building. She asked how painting the building did not come before the commission for approval. Bailey said that the building was designated as a landmark in 2002, and she thought the building was already painted at that time. Arnesen confirmed the building had been painted well before that.

Mader-Kiley said the proposed design is appropriate for the building. She explained that they used larger windows in order to distinguish from the original windows. She said that the signage banner was added so that people can see the tenant signage from the Capitol area. She mentioned that adding signage above the side door could be confusing because it is not the main entrance.

Kaliszewski asked about the condition of the stone under the paint. Mader-Kiley said that it has been painted for a long time, and there are some areas where the paint is peeling. She said that based on the exposed walls on the inside, there doesn't appear to be problems with leaking, but it needs to be repainted. Kaliszewski asked if the paint the applicants were proposing could be used on stone, and Mader-Kiley said that it could. Mader-Kiley said that they are changing the color scheme so the building stands out and contrasts from its neighbors.

Kaliszewski asked how punching new windows in the building meets the standards, particularly the large windows proposed. She said that punching any holes in a building, even for smaller windows, does not typically meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She said that opening up the existing windows that were filled in would make sense but not creating new openings. She suggested the applicants look into not painting the building because one is not supposed to paint masonry.

Bailey said that her interpretation regarding the stone building was that punching windows on the primary façade would not meet the standards. However, she thought there was precedence for the side of the building as a secondary elevation that has never functioned as a front façade, particularly if the openings were stepped back from the primary façade. She acknowledged that the side of the building is street facing in the downtown core, so it is problematic. She said that the street façade of the brick building has undergone many modifications over time and was missing its historic integrity, so it was less problematic.

Kaliszewski agreed on the brick building being less problematic, particularly adding a window on the other side of the door; however, she was very uncomfortable with punching five new openings on the stone building. In reference to Mader-Kiley's earlier comments, she said that making the new windows larger to show they are

modern does not make it meet the standards. Andrzejewski referenced the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #2 regarding retaining the historic character of a property and avoiding the removal of historic materials. Kaliszewski agreed that standard #2 was important when considering the proposed changes to the windows, as well as #3 regarding a false sense of history.

Mader-Kiley asked for clarification from Kaliszewski on painting the building. Kaliszewski said that there are nondestructive ways to remove paint from masonry, but she wasn't sure if it would work for this building. She said that she would prefer the paint be removed completely, but that is probably not a possibility for this proposal. She said that once a building is painted, one must keep it painted or water gets behind the paint and causes the masonry to slowly deteriorate. Taylor asked if paint removal was under the commission's purview. Bailey said that for buildings that were previously painted, the commission has typically allowed them to be maintained by keeping the paint, though she said she has approved the removal of paint as well.

Taylor asked if it was a possibility to use smaller windows for the 2nd floor. Mader-Kiley said they could look into it, but she was hesitant because installing four small windows would be more expensive than installing two large windows. She said their main goal was to bring in more light and have Capitol views, and smaller windows would change that.

Andrzejewski explained that the Landmarks Commission needs to ensure that whatever they approve is compatible with the federal standards; according to the ordinance, they must review the alterations relative to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, not aesthetics. Mader-Kiley said she understood. She said that any photos of the E Mifflin Street façade of the building were more recent and not pretty, so they couldn't base their design on those images. She said they want to preserve the front of the building and clean it up because it is the historic façade. She said that the E Mifflin side is currently a pedestrian façade, but it is ugly and doesn't fit with the rest of the buildings nearby. She said that if it were a historic façade, this design is what she thought someone would have done there. She said that she understood punching openings doesn't follow the federal guidelines.

Kaliszewski acknowledged that there aren't a lot of historic images of the E Mifflin Street side of the building for them to know what it looked like, so they don't know if there were ever other openings there. She said that that Secretary of the Interior's Standards are specifically written so that we don't put historic conjecture on these types of buildings, which is what the applicants are proposing to do. She said that part of preservation and preservation architecture is about preserving what is there, not trying to make the building prettier by adding new features that are pleasing to the modern eye. She said that some of the proposed designs do not follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it doesn't sound as though that is what the applicants are using as the background for their design. Andrzejewski emphasized this was important because the Landmark's Commission's jurisdiction is relative to those standards.

Mader-Kiley said that one of the first questions they asked staff was about window openings, so they are not trying to go against the standards. She said that anything is better than what is there now, and asked if it will be possible to add new window openings.

Thomas, the new owner of the building, said they are trying to preserve the historic value of the building, so they focused on the front façade that faces the Capitol because it is the most visible. He said that they are amenable to the commission's suggestions to make the windows smaller. He said that they added the signage board on the E Mifflin side to avoid using awnings on the Capitol side of the building.

Taylor asked if staff approves of adding windows on the 2nd floor if they are smaller or if punching windows would take too much away from the character of the building. Bailey said that there is potential for introducing new windows on the stone structure that are significantly stepped back from the primary façade if they are single openings on the 2nd floor and larger on the 1st floor. She said that the large windows across E Mifflin Street and additional decorative elements in the current proposal ends up going over the threshold of there being too much change. She said that if other elements not meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

were addressed, it would be easier to evaluate if the introduction of new window openings would be too overwhelming.

Arnesen said that he agreed with Kaliszewski and would rather not see the building painted. He said that if the applicants could look into stripping the paint, that would be best, otherwise he would like to see it left as is. He said that he is in favor of windows as long as they fit within the guidelines because they need to balance the viability of the building as an income-producing property, and new windows could come a long way. He said that he was not prepared to give specific recommendations, especially without Commissioner McLean present, and would like to refer the item. Bailey referenced McLean's written comments that were submitted immediately before the meeting, which were available to the applicants.

Andrzejewski agreed with the standards called out in the staff report and said that she also had concerns about standard #2 related to the windows. She said that she would consider new, smaller window openings if they are done in a way that preserves the overall historic character of the building and doesn't make the façade compete for visual attention with the primary façade. She added that the sign band is not in keeping with the historic character of the building.

Kaliszewski said that the very large windows on the 2nd floor are a no go. She said that she disagreed with staff and could not see the windows on the 1st floor meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Taylor said that it needs to be a functional building, so he understood the desire to add more light and Capitol views with the larger windows. He said that the small or large windows would work for him.

Thomas asked about how to address the signage board because tenants will want their name on the building. Andrzejewski suggested they work with staff. Bailey said they should also reach out to Zoning to discuss the signable area because the current proposal may not meet Zoning standards.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Martin, to refer the item to the August 16, 2021 Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.