

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 8/27/18

TITLE: 1 E Gilman St - Exterior Alteration to a Designated Madison Landmark in the Mansion Hill Hist. Dist. (Quisling Towers); 2nd Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: William Fruhling, Acting Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 9/10/18

ID NUMBER: 52816

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Excused was Katie Kaliszewski.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Ken Miller, registering in support and available to answer questions.  
Franny Ingebritson, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak.*

Fruhling explained that this request was for work already completed on Quisling Towers, a landmark site. Three windows were replaced in the upper rear corner of the building and the fascia of the entrance canopy was redone. The existing double-hung windows on the building have horizontal muntins on the upper and lower portions, but the replacement windows do not have horizontal muntins. The canopy fascia was previously one piece of stainless steel with a solid appearance, and was replaced with a black background and three thin strips of stainless steel to create a striped appearance.

Levitan asked if staff is okay with the windows. Fruhling said that the replacement windows would be acceptable if horizontal muntins are added to match the existing windows. Miller said that the replacement windows are exactly the same as the other windows. Fruhling pointed out that there are muntins on all of the existing upper and lower double-hung windows. There was further discussion about the muntins on the existing windows. Miller said that it is possible to purchase and add muntins to the new windows.

Levitan asked staff about the canopy fascia. Fruhling said that the canopy now has a striped appearance. He mentioned that a member of the public, Joe Bonardi, submitted comments and photos for the Commission's review, which showed art deco buildings with striped appearances. Fruhling pointed out that in all of the examples, the striping had some dimension to it and cast shadows to create a three dimensional feature, whereas the canopy at 1 E Gilman has applied thin metal strips.

Levitan asked Miller why he changed the canopy fascia without coming to the Landmarks Commission for approval. Miller said that it was leaking in the entryway, and a roofing company told him they would need to put a new band on the fascia to hold the rubber down so it doesn't leak. He said that Bonardi had sent him a photo of a building in New York with a striped canopy, which he thought was beautiful and decided to add striping to the canopy of his building. He said that he is constantly battling leaks, so this was a way to solve the leaking in the entryway. He suggested that he could paint the black parts silver so that it doesn't appear striped.

Andrzejewski suggested that for any future leaks or renovations, Miller could apply for tax credits from the Wisconsin Historical Society.

Levitan asked what an acceptable solution would be for the canopy. Fruhling said that a single wide stainless steel band would be acceptable. Miller said that in the older photos of the building from the 1930s, there do appear to be stripes on the canopy. Ingebritson shared a photo from the Wisconsin Historical Society website of the building in the 1930s, and the group consensus was that there did not appear to be stripes on the canopy.

Rummel asked Ingebritson why she opposed the project. Ingebritson said that she was surprised that Miller had owned this National Register and locally landmarked property for 50 years and did not follow the correct process to gain approval. She said that people need to get the Commission's advice on exterior work in order to maintain the integrity of historic buildings.

Rummel asked Miller if he read the staff report and understood the recommendation that the canopy fascia should be replaced with a singular stainless steel band. Miller said that he could take off the new rubber and stainless bands that were put on top of the old band, which is still there. Levitan asked for clarification that the old singular stainless steel band is underneath the new materials. Miller confirmed this was true, and said that they added the new bands to hold the rubber that flips over the top of the canopy. Arnesen mentioned that the rubber would be over the edge if Miller were to remove the new materials, and McLean pointed out that the old stainless steel band would now have screw holes in it.

Andrzejewski asked if painting the black parts of the canopy silver, as Miller suggested, would meet the standards. McLean said that it would not and Fruhling agreed, noting that paint is different than stainless steel, so it would not meet the standards related to materials. Fruhling stated that in both the National Register and local landmark nominations, the simple design of the entrance canopy was mentioned, so it is an important feature to retain.

Andrzejewski said that the installation of a new stainless steel panel is an option. Miller said that the previous stainless band is still there. Arnesen asked if Miller needed a cap for the rubber going over the edge, and Miller said that he did. Arnesen suggested that Miller remove the stripes and put a new stainless wrap around the canopy. Miller asked why he would need to add a new stainless band because the old one is still underneath. Arnesen responded that installing a new band would help to waterproof it, which was the reason that the new bands had been added; he said that whatever method is used to fix the canopy, it needs to be approved by staff. Miller again said that he would take the new materials off to expose the old band and leave it as it is. McLean said that he had concerns with how the flashing is terminated as well as the additional screw holes in the old band, which would affect how water repellent it is. Miller said that the band holds the rubber down. He said that he had previously used glue to adhere the top 2 inches, which came loose and caused the water leaks.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Andrzejewski, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulation that the applicant work out the canopy fascia details with staff and horizontal muntins be added to each window. The motion passed by voice vote.**