

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 20, 2015
TITLE: 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: July 20, 2015 POF:
DATED: July 20, 2015	ID NUMBER: 37499

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Jason Fowler, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Michael Christopher, representing Louis Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Christopher explained that the design team has had numerous meetings with the neighborhood and has been willing to make revisions that the neighborhood has requested. The neighborhood prefers option 1.

Levitan explained that affordable housing and locally owned businesses seem to have played a role in the support of the neighborhood and the representation has been made on the record that these items will be included in the project.

Christopher explained that Fortis is interested in incorporating these issues into the project.

Janine Glaeser, registering in support and wishing to speak. Glaeser explained that the neighborhood and design team prefer option 1. She explained that the neighborhood approval process was long and that the design incorporates neighborhood comments. Glaeser explained that the project will maintain setbacks from the street along Williamson and Patterson, and at the fourth level; the landscaping including upper level green roof and green screening at Williamson; make a commitment to rent to local businesses; provide 2 affordable housing units; utilize green build home standards; and provide 2 bike parking stalls per unit. Glaeser described the design differences of option 2 and option 3.

Levitan explained that the roof shall be compatible with roofs in the VRA. Glaeser explained that the proposed roof has an industrial character that relates to the industrial corridor. Rummel explained that there is a curved roof at Mad Cat on Williamson, but it is not in the VRA.

Rosenblum asked for clarification about the proposed materials.

Anne Walker, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Walker explained that she is on the MNA Board, but is speaking as an individual. Walker explained that the volume and massing of the proposed building is not right for this location on the narrow street. She explained that the space provided to the street by the large open lot will be replaced by building. Walker explained that the

neighborhood won the American Planning Association Top 10 Award for neighborhood planning in 2013. She explained that there were numerous neighborhood meetings and that the discussions focused on the developer more than the design. She explained that this is a legacy building for the developer and that the building will be in the neighborhood for a long time and should be compatible. Walker shared a historic photo showing the different character of the street in circa 1885.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Lee explained that the focus should be on the ordinance language and the design should be “compatible” with the buildings and “environment” within the visually related area. He provided examples of compatibility and of the eclectic environment of Williamson Street.

Peter Wolff, registering neither in support nor opposition, and wishing to speak.

Wolff explained that the Commission should deeply discuss design options and address concerns about the proposed building design and neighborhood concerns. He explained that height and massing are concerns.

Lynn Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Lee is the President of the Marquette Neighborhood Association. He explained that the neighborhood approval process was long and that the developer incorporated neighborhood comments. Lee explained that options 2 and 3 have not been approved by the neighborhood. He explained that the curved roof is compatible with the adjacent industrial building and that the proposed building reflects the character of Williamson Street.

Levitan explained that the Commission must review the proposed building based on the standards in the ordinance and not on what design the neighborhood prefers.

There was general discussion about the compatibility of the massing, size, height, and volume.

Fowler explained that the demolition was approved and that approval was contingent on the design approval for the proposed building. He explained that he is surprised that the designs for the new building have returned for review without any change. Fowler explained that the proposed building is large. There was general discussion about the desire to have revised or modified designs at the meeting for review.

Staff described how option 3 is compatible with the other buildings in the visually related area and that the historic buildings should be on display in the historic district, not the new buildings.

There was general discussion about the compatibility of the curved roof.

There was general discussion about the proposed materials and the treatment of the setback space between the halves of the Williamson Street elevation. Staff suggested that the brick vertical piers continue to engage the third floor windows to establish the pilaster-bay-pilaster vertical rhythm.

There was general discussion about the alignment and treatment of the windows.

The Landmarks Commission acknowledges for the record that the applicant has made voluntary representations that the project shall incorporate two affordable housing units and non-franchise tenants and the Commission understands these representations to be binding commitments.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development with the following conditions of approval: the curved roof as submitted in option 2, the alignment of the windows shown in option 2; the material palette of option 1; the window configuration of the option 2 (without the wood panels); the introduction of the pilaster-bay rhythm; and the use of the horizontal "white line" detail, and with final review and approval by staff. The Landmarks Commission strongly encourages the Plan Commission and Common Council to incorporate, as conditions of approval, the voluntary representations made by the applicant regarding the inclusion of 2 affordable housing units and occupancy by non-franchise tenants. The motion passed by voice vote.

AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 6, 2015
TITLE: 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 6, 2015	ID NUMBER: 37499

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY – REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION REQUEST:

Michael Christopher, representing Louis Fortis, and registering in support. Christopher explained that he believes the Commission should vote to reconsider the demolition request because the request meets standards b and c of the demolition standards. He explained that the request to demolish meets the standards in the purpose and intent section of the ordinance. Christopher explained that this proposed project will stabilize and improve property values and strengthen the economy of the city.

Lou Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Fortis explained that the Commission should reconsider because this project is one that the neighborhood association supports and what the neighborhood wants.

Lawrence Hands, registering in support and available to answer questions, but choosing to speak on this item. Hands explained that the Commission should reconsider because the replacement of the gravel parking lot and obsolete single family residence with this multi unit mixed use development is better for the neighborhood and does not diminish the characteristics of the historic district. The increased tax base will benefit the schools and general services.

Anne Walker, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Walker explained that the Commission should not reconsider their decision on the demolition. She explained that the development team worked with the neighborhood and the existing residence could use some maintenance work, but the historic fabric of the historic district is important to maintain. She also explained that this large project is not appropriate for this site as Williamson Street is a very narrow street and a large building very close to the lot line will affect the character and make the street feel even narrower.

Lynn Lee, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA), registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee explained that the MNA voted in support of the project and would support the Commission's decision to reconsider their previous decision on the COA.

Karen Hendrick-Hands, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Hands explained that she supports the reconsideration so the merits of the proposed project can be expanded. She submitted written comments for the record.

Jesse Pycha-Host, representing the MNA, registering in support and wishing to speak. Pycha-Host explained that he supports reconsideration and submitted written comments for the record.

Rummel explained that the developer appealed the previous decision of the Commission to the Common Council and she contemplated reconsideration to try to get closer to a compatible design that might be acceptable to the Commission.

Levitan explained the reconsideration process.

ACTION FOR RECONSIDERATION REQUEST:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Slattery to reconsider the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of 906 Williamson. Motion passed by voice vote.

SUMMARY:

Lynn Lee, Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA), registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee explained that the project team went through a considerable neighborhood process and they made concessions which were included in the design. The neighborhood also requested that the project team provide money toward the relocation of the existing building. The MNA believes the proposed project is a good fit of the neighborhood.

Levitan asked if part of the neighborhood support was based on the condition of the existing property. Lee explained that the support may have been partially based on the condition of the building. He explained that he walked through the building and that one of the only remaining original architectural elements was the stair railing. Lee explained that the character of the block had previously been affected and the removal of this house would not harm the character.

Levitan asked if the demolition of this building was validating demolition by neglect. Lee explained that MNA did not find that this was demolition by neglect. He explained that it was economically infeasible to make repairs and purchase the property at this location.

Rummel asked Lee if the scale of the building relates to the visually related area. Lee explained that the MNA talked about this and determined that if it works at Baldwin, it could work here.

Michael Christopher, representing Louis Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Christopher explained that he would prefer that the Commission deal with this issue at this meeting instead of referring it. He explained that context must be considered and that the intent of the historic district is to live work and play in the neighborhood. The existing building is structurally unsound. He explained that the commission should consider what the existing building contributes to the historic district. Christopher explained that the neighborhood plan should be given a lot of weight in this case. He quoted Gehrig's comments from the April meeting when she said that redevelopment seemed appropriate on the north side of the 900 block of Williamson Street. Christopher explained that demolition standards b and c and f and g and the purpose and intent of the Commission should be reviewed. He explained that demolition is not inconsistent with any of the policy statements. He explained that to bring the building up to code would be economically infeasible.

John Coleman, registering in opposition. Not present to provide comments.

Peter Wolff, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Wolff explained that the costs to rehabilitate the building are unknown and that the current owner could make the repairs or reduce the price due to the demolition by neglect that has taken place. The developer's own professionals describe the poor condition of the building. He explained that the example of the downspouts draining directly toward the foundation, Wolff explained that the commission made the right decision at the previous meeting and the appeal should be discussed at the Common Council.

David Lohrentz, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lohrentz explained that he supports the proposed project and that it is unfortunate that landlords do not take care of their properties, but that is irrelevant at this point. Given the situation and the condition, this is the best option for the site.

Anne Walker, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Walker explained that she is speaking as an individual. She explained that she appreciates the historic district and the commercial area along Williamson. She explained that she does not support the demolition of the existing building or the proposed project. Walker explained that the existing building could be charming and if it had been well maintained it would be seen as an integral part of the district. She explained that Williamson is a narrow street and the proposed building is tall and right against the sidewalk which will affect the character. She is concerned about the size of the proposed building and the lack of green space. Walker explained that currently the green space is at the street level and is appreciated by the public and that the proposed roof top green space will have a different feeling.

Janine Glaeser, registering in support and available to answer questions. Glaeser showed images of buildings in the historic district and explained that the district preservation plan states, "The Third Lake Ridge is a study in diversity and agglomeration of many themes, ethnic settlements, development, urbanization, civic improvement; it's architecture reflects this diversity of development and change..." She explained that the existing building is not contributing and that the area of consideration extends through the entire district.

Levitan asked why Glaeser would call a 110-year old building non-contributing to the historic district. Glaeser explained that the building has lost integrity due to later additions and modifications.

Randy Bruce, representing Louis, Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Bruce explained that the neighborhood plan designated certain sites for development and this is one of those sites. He explained that the proposed development is compatible with the visually related area. Bruce explained that the scale and massing and rhythm of the proposed building is consistent with the context. He explained that step backs and articulation and materials are being used to make the building compatible with the district.

Rummel asked Bruce if other designs were developed for discussion. Bruce showed the proposed design and discussed the window pattern, the simplification of materials, and the curved roof form. Rummel explained that she also requested a reduction in volume and lot coverage. Bruce explained that the building size could not be reduced due to the affordable housing that was trying to be achieved in the project. He showed a revised design that aligned the windows, simplified the materials, and removed the curved roof form.

Peter Bock, registering neither in support nor opposition, and wishing to speak. Bock explained that the existing building is an outlier and an orphan. He explained that there is another house on the block and that demolition of this building will not affect the neighborhood. Bock explained that he is speaking to a landmarks commission and that Merriam Webster defines a landmark as a structure of unusual

historic and unusually aesthetic interest. He explained that the existing building is not a landmark as it does not meet the definition.

Levitan explained that this building is not a designated landmark and that it is in a historic district.

Rummel explained that there are residences across the street in the visually related area and that there are many houses in the district like the existing building. She asked Bock if he was suggesting that all of the residences should be demolished. Bock explained that a mixed use building seems appropriate for this lot.

Scott Freeman, registering in support and wishing to speak. Freeman explained that he is speaking as an individual. He explained that this particular building does not need to be retained for the sake of the historic district. He appreciates that the project team worked with the neighborhood to improve the project. He explained that this project will continue to reduce urban sprawl and allow more people to enjoy the neighborhood.

Steve Gallo, registering in support.

Kassandra Neff, registering in support and wishing to speak. Neff explained that the variety of the neighborhood attracted her to the area. She explained that the existing building is not what brings people to the area.

Karen Kendrick-Hands, registering in support and wishing to speak. Kendrick-Hands explained that she appreciates the stamina and commitment of the commissioners. She explained that she also appreciates the character of the historic district, but that character is missing from this block of Williamson Street. She explained that the condition of the house has continued to decline since she moved to the neighborhood in 2009. She explained that the neighborhood is in transition and that the proposed project is consistent with that transition. She explained that the project will increase the tax base and may create jobs and affordable housing. She explained that the Commission should embrace a project like this.

Louis Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Fortis explained that he lives in the neighborhood and that while this building has been neglected; the structural issues are a concern. He explained that the building has lost its integrity. Fortis explained that Central Park a few blocks away will compensate for the loss of green space. He explained that he worked with MNA and was guided by the neighborhood plan recommendation to redevelop the site. He explained that he met with staff and Alder to discuss revisions to the design.

Rummel explained that she struggles with mass and volume of the proposed building and how that relates to the pro forma and the visually related area. She asked Fortis how the price of the property affects what he can do with the mass and volume. Fortis explained that he cannot provide an analysis of how the size would affect the project financials.

Levitan asked Fortis how affordable units would be provided. Fortis explained that one unit will be 80% rate and one will be 60% rate based on the City's new affordable housing program. Rummel explained that the affordable housing program was not a formal plan yet.

Levitan explained that he was not familiar with the addition to this building and that if the addition was constructed in 1980's, it would have been before the Landmarks Commission for a COA.

Slattery explained that local historic districts do not differentiate between contributing and non-contributing buildings, but as an architectural historian who does this professionally, the National Register would consider

the existing building a contributing building because overall mass and scale are intact and it has relevant integrity.

Levitan explained the ordinance language and the charge of the Commission.

Rummel explained that the neighborhood needs to learn about historic districts and that each building in the district is part of the fabric of the district. She explained that having a diverse and lively neighborhood is important, but those issues and the creation of new buildings are not the obligation of the Landmarks Commission. The commission must preserve and perpetuate and honor the historic fabric. She explained that lack of maintenance brings issues where people see an ugly building when really the building may need new siding or some paint, but not demolition. People live in the area so the existing building is not isolated. The new structure must be compatible with the visually related area and the standards of the district. She explained that the scale of the building is a concern. Rummel explained that the structural issues are a concern, but most buildings of this age would have the need for upgrades and repairs and it is the responsibility of the property owner to make those repairs. Rummel explained that the building could be a single family residence, a multi-family residence, a restaurant, and other options.

Levitan asked Rummel if the building contributes to the distinctive architectural character of the district. Rummel explained that the building does contribute to the architectural character.

McLean explained that he agreed with the things that Rummel said. He explained that there are many options for the property and this would be an interesting place for a garden to table restaurant. He explained that the loss of green space will harm the character of the historic district. McLean explained that the East Washington corridor is an appropriate place to develop residential density, but the purpose of the historic district is to preserve the historic fabric and that the neighborhood is strong and eclectic because it is a historic district. When you take away the historic fabric, the neighborhood will suffer. McLean explained that if the neighborhood is in transition, then the historic district standards are not doing what they are supposed to be doing since the historic district is supposed to remain historic. The tax base can be grown outside the historic district. The district was created for preservation not for redevelopment.

Levitan explained that the ordinance enumerates stabilizing the economy and increasing the tax base as the purpose. The rehabilitation of this property is not economically feasible. He explained that he could make an argument for why this project should be denied, but historic districts are not museums. He explained that there are numerous points in the purpose and intent that support redevelopment.

McLean explained that the 1980s addition approval and the climate of preservation and the historic district was different than the current view.

Slattery explained that the purpose and intent should be read differently – that you would enhance the economy of the city by preserving the building not by allowing demolition for development. She explained that the broader issues are not the purview or the responsibility of the Landmarks Commission. Slattery explained that the condition issues have become the reason for demolition when that wasn't the reason for demolition during the previous discussion.

There was general discussion about the revised designs. Staff explained that the alignment of the windows and the simplified materials are improvements. Staff explained that the curved roof element should be more integral to the overall design composition.

Rummel explained that the proposed lot coverage is not compatible with the visually related area. She also explained that there is a hierarchy of buildings in historic districts – some that were constructed during the period of significance and others that were not – and those that were not would have an easier time being demolished.

Levitan explained that staff would recommend approval of the redesigned building. Slattery explained that staff also recommended denial of the COA for demolition. Slattery asked staff if any of the testimony or discussion had changed staff's recommendation. Staff explained that it had not.

Levitan explained his concerns about the reputation of the Landmarks Commission and the perception by others that historic districts are museums. He explained that politically he would rather have a local Langdon historic district than retain 906 Williamson.

Slattery explained that the reputation of the Landmarks Commission is not a standard in the ordinance. The appeal to Council would allow for all of the broader issues to be taken into consideration. The politics of the situation are outside of the ordinance.

There was general discussion about the issue. Fowler explained that the demolition should be based on an approved design of the new building.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Slattery, to approve the COA for demolition contingent on the approval of COA for new development. The motion was approved 3:2 (Ayes: Fowler, Rummel. Noes: McLean, Slattery. Levitan voted Aye to break the tie).

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to refer the discussion of the new development to a future meeting. The motion was approved 4:0 (Levitan does not vote).

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 15, 2015
TITLE: 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 15, 2015	ID NUMBER: 37499

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Randy Bruce, representing Louis Fortis, registered in support. He gave a brief overview of the project, stating that the Willy Street BUILD II Plan highlights certain areas where the quality should be improved and redevelopment should occur. This site is one of those sites. He noted that the BUILD plan includes a diagram showing proposed heights allowed. He feels that they are meeting the heights within the BUILD plan and this is a site that the neighborhood had previously identified as suitable for redevelopment. The plan is substantially the same as previously presented. It's designed as three separate masses; one at the front of the building is three stories in height. The roof system is barrel shaped that connects the site through the center with a flat roof portion in the back. The rear two portions are both at four stories. The height of the building is 52' to the top of the barrel and 49' to the parapet height in the back. The only real change to the exterior of the building since last time the Landmarks Commission saw it is they've taken the front elevation and bisected it with some corrugated metal to help identify smaller store fronts and make it more compatible with the neighborhood. They have been working extensively with the neighborhood. A memo of support was received from the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA). They've kept open space on the front corner, minimizing the patio off to the side, giving assurances about maintaining street trees, providing a substantial green roof on the three-story elevation and committing to some affordable housing. He feels strongly that the barrel shaped roof is a strong design element and works well with the gable roof element. He said the window pattern on both the west elevation and on the Paterson Street side is kind of a non-traditional pattern, and although not strongly married to it, they feel that it adds something to the design. If the Commission feels it's inappropriate, they can look at making modifications. At the first Landmarks meeting, he did not hear that demolition was a big concern and they moved forward with design work. At that meeting they had a number of neighborhood residents who spoke in opposition to the project. He feels like they now have a consensus of support from the neighborhood, but not 100%.

Bruce said they have asserted to providing two one-bedroom apartments for affordable housing, one that would be at the 60% of Median County Income and one at 80% of Median County Income. The funding source for that has not been locked down. The developer is making that assertion as a condition of approval. It could be put into a deed restriction and limited to a 10-15 year term.

Slattery asked about the home inspection report and the demolition standards. Bruce said that a home inspection report was done to understand what it really means to bring this house up to a good standard. In terms of the number of items that need attention, some of them are really significant. There is a process that went along with that which shows the cost would be hundreds of thousands of dollars to repair. That was done by an outside contractor. In terms of demolition standards, he feels that the site and particular home cannot be maintained in its existing form and condition and the only reasonable development opportunity requires demolition.

Levitan asked about the BUILD Plan. Bruce said the Plan shows certain areas that are noted where quality needs to be improved. Levitan asked is it says redevelopment, or the quality should be improved. Those are not necessarily the same thing. It's a big difference.

John Coleman, registered in opposition. He said that the BUILD Plan takes a strong stance against demolition and should only be done under very unusual circumstances. This project does not meet the standard and demolition is not justified. This building is in better condition than a lot of the other buildings in the neighborhood. Using those criteria, we would lose a huge number of houses in the neighborhood. This project does not meet that high bar for justifying the demolition in a historic district. Gehrig asked whether there was a switch in MNA regarding demolition. It seems they were less supportive of demolition and now they are more okay with it. She asked whether this is a floating house in an otherwise commercial block.

David Lohrentz, registered in support. He stated that the developer has done a pretty good job of listening and feels it's a pretty good design. The land is assessed at \$30,000 more than the house itself, which is not typical in Madison.

Peter Wolff, registered in opposition. The BUILD plan says quality should be improved, not that it should be torn down. He talked about a survey (done in 2000 or 2001) of 87 people, 80% were residents, 20% absentee landlords. There was very little sentiment for tearing down this building or doing something more with this corner. What is this going to do for the neighborhood and the historical district? The argument for additional tax base is an argument for tearing down the whole historic district.

Lindsey Lee, registered in support. He is a small business owner and supports strategic infill development where appropriate and this is an appropriate location. This project has not been controversial in the neighborhood. Although there is some opposition. He feels that the bigger issue is whether this is an exceptional project. We should protect historic landmarks and contributing houses in historic districts, but we should also create landmarks for future generations. Given the constraints of this project, the design is pretty good. The developer has made a commitment that he will rent retail space only to local businesses. Rosenblum asked if Lee sees this project as a future landmark. Lee said it's hard to say, noting that many buildings built 100 years ago weren't viewed as future landmarks. McLean asked why this site is more appropriate for density. Lee said it is an orphaned house removed from other houses on a busy corner.

Anne Walker registered in opposition. She said that although she is not representing the MNA Board, they seemed to support this based primarily on affordability. She does not support the demolition of the building. It could be a business; it doesn't have to be used as a home. She also expressed concern about providing room to plant canopy trees and for them to thrive.

Peter Bock registered in support. He said the proposed site is a single-family home with two vacant lots on either side. It's run down.

Janine Glaser, representing Louis Fortis, registered in support and available to answer questions.

Bruce clarified that the language in the BUILD doesn't clearly say it's okay for development, but it gives us the impression that redevelopment is an available option.

Bruce said that in terms of the standards for demolition, the building is not an unusual or uncommon design. It does not have special historical significance. The building is in such a condition that it is not economically feasible to preserve it. The proposed redevelopment will be a positive addition to the neighborhood.

Levitan asked of the \$385,000 estimate from the home inspection report, what Bruce believes is necessary to bring it up to code vs. making it perfect. Bruce said he could not answer that. The structural and electrical systems are two items that would need immediate attention and are probably code related. The roof is another item.

Levitan mentioned that Lindsey Lee said the developer will only rent commercial space to local businesses. How will that work? Bruce said the language will be no chain businesses. He didn't think there was an actual definition yet.

Levitan said the points in the purpose and intent section of the ordinance to strengthen the economy of the city and to stabilize property values seem most applicable.

Rummel said the report made her think the house was neglected. She asked if the Commission treats orphaned houses differently. McLean said its part of the fabric – not an orphan – it's a district. Rosenblum said he can see the argument for orphan house where much of the context has been lost, but he comes back to what is the owner's responsibility, in a historic district, to maintain a property? What alternatives have been looked at? Slattery stated that the house is part of the character/fabric/rhythm of the district and she doesn't see it as an orphan. She is having a hard time seeing how to weigh the criteria and whether it contributes to the character of the neighborhood.

Levitan asked about the demolition standards and whether the Commission could agree that the building is not of such historical or architectural significance to trigger Section 33.915(5)(c)3.a. (Whether the building 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.)

He said it seems the most relevant criteria might be Section 33.915(5)(c)3.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) and 33.915(5)(c)3.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.)

He suggested the Commission also weigh Section 33.915(5)(c)3.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.)

Levitan stated that's why he asked about the affordability and the agreement regarding the retail because that goes to the benefits of the property. Ultimately he feels the decision has to balance b. and c. vs. g.

Slattery noted that the MNA supports, but they don't necessarily have to address the same standards as the Landmarks Commission.

Levitan asked what will happen if the demolition is denied. Slattery said only the owner can answer that, but it might continue on as is. McLean asked if that is a bad thing.

Rummel said the new development fills up the entire lot and she thinks that open space is part of the historic context and asked how the Commission can find that is consistent of this historic district. McLean stated it is not. Levitan asked if that implies if a better building was proposed, demolition could be okay. Rummel replied yes, maybe.

Levitan asked if the design were better or different or smaller if that could justify demolition. Gehrig said no. Rosenblum said yes, noting that one thing is the loss of open space and rhythm of solids and voids and the voids are being lost. McLean said yes and the rhythm of solids and voids are part of the whole block historically. He doesn't think he can see an appropriate new building, but he can't commit at this time. Slattery said it would need to be a drastic change, not a tweak. It is a building in two historic districts. Its size and open space are major issues.

Levitan asked Bruce if he wanted a motion or a referral. Bruce said they won't change it significantly. He said he understood from the last meeting that they were on the right track and worked with the neighborhood.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing building based on Section 33.19(5)(c)3b., c. and g. as the new building is not compatible with the historic district. **The motion passed by the following vote:**

Ayes: 4 – Marsha A. Rummel; David W.J. McLean; Christina Slattery and Erica Fog Gehrig

Noes: 1 – Michael J. Rosenblum

Excused: 2 – Jason T. Fowler

Non Voting: 1 – Stuart Levitan

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to table the certificate of appropriateness for new construction. Motion passed by voice vote.

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 27, 2015
TITLE: 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 27, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Erica Fox Gehrig, Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Gehrig opened the public hearing

Randy Bruce, representing the owner, Louis Fortis, registered in support and wishing to speak. Bruce briefly explained the project. He explained that the Williamson Street BUILD plan identifies the site on the corner of Paterson & Willy St as one appropriate for redevelopment. He also explained the preferred setback on the upper levels (3 stories on Willy Street, stepping back to 4 stories) is consistent with Williamson St BUILD plan and that after many neighborhood meetings, the project team made many adjustments to design drawings. Bruce explained that the neighborhood is concerned about saving the tree on the corner of Paterson and Willy St so they moved the building mass from the corner which provided space for the tree and breathing room for the corner itself. Bruce explained that the massing pulls the height to middle of the block and away from Williamson St. The project team chose very traditional appearance and materials on the front side of the building and a more industrial feel along the back side. The neighborhood thought there was too much metal siding and would prefer a masonry façade so the project team changed the whole back piece to masonry. The project team also used a different window pattern on the industrial piece to purposely create a modern and eclectic feel. The staff report suggests that barrel shaped roof is not appropriate, but this element received a positive reaction from the neighborhood. Bruce explained that the project team reviewed building heights and volumes and how the proposed building relates to the surrounding areas. On the corner of Paterson and Willy, their bldg is 30' high; surrounding buildings are 29'7", so it's slightly taller. Other buildings are predominantly two stories. Top of barrel shaped piece is 52' high and then the back piece is 49' high. That compares to the bldg in back at 41.5'. In terms of volumes, the buildings range between about 104,000 cubic feet; 215,000 cubic feet; and 135,000 cubic feet. Bruce explained that the proposed building works in this collection of masses.

Janine Glaeser, registering in support and wishing to speak. Glaeser spoke of sustainability issues, green building, insulation and windows, green roof, rain water harvesting and solar opportunities. She explained that they are willing to work with the residents on a recycling plan.

Ken Saiki, Ken Saiki Design, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Saiki said they met with the Landmarks Commission, the neighborhood association, P&D and MNA. Saiki explained that this project will benefit the neighboring property owner. They didn't find any recorded easements that allow access to the existing parking behind the Cha Cha building. If the proposed building was built to the property line, there would not be a compliant parking lot area so they worked with Chris Warren and made the suggestion to memorialize the access to this parking lot and set the bldg back far enough that would allow it to be a legal parking lot with permanent access. The building that is being requested for demolition has been neglected for years. Saiki explained that the project team has been working with neighborhood to do something of quality on this site.

Louis Fortis, registering in support and wishing to speak. Fortis explained that he lives in the Third Lake Ridge historic district and that the neighborhood plan indicates that this property should be improved. He explained that there have been multiple meetings with MNA and other individuals about this project. MNA is concerned with lack of affordable housing. The project team reached out to Jim O'Keefe (City of Madison) regarding affordable housing and discussed a new buy-down program to allow for low-income housing.

John Coleman, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA), registering in opposition, and wishing to speak. Coleman was asked by MNA to convey their concerns. Affordable housing is important to the neighborhood. A viable building should only be demolished under extreme circumstances and the house proposed for demolition is in better condition than many houses and was recently assessed at \$250,000. Fundamentally there is nothing wrong with the house. The house at 912 would be orphaned by the demolition of 906 Williamson Street. The proposed is not an exceptional project that would justify the demolition in a historic district. The proposed project does not allow affordable housing or green space. The MNA voted to oppose demolition of this building because it has historic significance and contributes to the fabric of the neighborhood. Coleman explained that he served on the BUILD Committee and from his understanding of the plan, the proposed project would need more than one floor of parking to be qualified for bonus stories (page 33 of the BUILD plan). It could also qualify if it provided affordable housing or if it preserved a historic structure within the immediate neighborhood.

David Lohrentz, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lohrentz stated that he is the co-owner of Madison Sourdough which is located two buildings over from the proposed site. He explained that a previously proposed project was not supported for this location and that this design has improved since the first iteration. The house is not a strong addition to the neighborhood. If this project isn't approved, this property may remain in disrepair.

Anne Walker, registering in opposition of the demolition.

Linda Lehnertz, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Lehnertz referred to her written statement to the Commission. She explained that under the ordinances, demolition of this building is not appropriate. The BUILD plan relates to areas where buildings could be improved and improvement does not mean redevelopment. Carey Court named after the Carey family that were long time residents of the house proposed for demolition. Sanborn maps show that there has always been open space on the block related to this residence. Condition issues have been raised and repair costs are unknown, but related to other single-family residences, this property has a low assessment so there is room to invest in needed improvements. Lehnertz explained that the brick portion of the proposed building is twice as large as the neighboring property. The mass is too far forward and the BUILD plan shows the height must be pushed back. She explained that previous demolition decisions before the Landmarks Commission have related to specific needs – not just a developer wanting to make money.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee explained that he supports the proposed project. He explained that the Landmarks Commission is supposed to protect historic properties, but the City also needs more density to support mass transit. This property is not remarkable and does not relate to a grouping of historic buildings. He also explained that other precedents at 731 Williamson Street were supported and did not follow the BUILD plan. Lee explained that the addition of more brick is an improvement and that the curved roof is a nice design.

Peter Wolff, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Wolff said he strongly supports the recommendations of the Landmarks staff report as well as the MNA Board to deny the demolition. Only four residential structures remain on the block. The existing building is seen as a detraction because it is different when it is historically appropriate. Wolff explained that the development pressure on Williamson Street is intense and the Landmarks Commission is the first line of defense. If values continue to rise, then other commercial assessments will rise and affect existing businesses and local/new businesses. It is important to hold the line on these buildings in the historic district. Large multi-unit developments have been created and many more may be allowed by the BUILD plan. If buildings continue to be demolished, there would be no historic district left to preserve.

Steve Silverberg, registering in support and wishing to speak. Silverberg stated he is in favor of the proposed project. He explained that the house does not greatly affect the feel of the historic district. The proposed project made great accommodations for the parking situation at Cha Cha and made a significant effort for improved architectural design on the street.

John Rolfsmeyer, registering in support and wishing to speak. Rolfsmeyer has had a view of the happenings at 936 Williamson Street for 40 years. He served as the President of Williamson Street Business Association for 12 to 15 years and has been a strong supporter of building up Williamson Street and increasing its viability and value. He explained that he strongly supports the proposed project. As a merchant on the street, he has found that a new development like this will attract people to the area and continue to strengthen the retail impact and keep our restaurants viable and strong. Also the added living space would do the same. He explained that he is not impressed by architectural uniqueness of the house.

Gehrig closed the public hearing.

Rummel explained that she toured the building and it is in good condition. She noted that all old houses need work, but the large lot containing this house is interesting to developers. She explained that demolition standard g allows the commission to consider the compatibility of the proposed building. The development team has not made a case for demolition under f. and cannot show that it is not the fault of the owner.

Rosenblum explained that he feels similarly. He explained that this is the Landmarks Commission. An existing historic building can be a vernacular example and it is the purpose of this commission to weigh the new development against the loss of a building in a historic district.

Slattery explained that she has a similar feeling. She explained that the Commission can give decisive weight to any or all. She explained that while she will consider standard g, she cannot put all weight on standard g.

Fowler explained that the proposed building is interesting, but demolition of the existing building does not seem warranted.

Gehrig explained that she reviewed the report by Quagliana and MNA memo and remembers previous meetings where the commercial/residential differences on either side of the street have been discussed.

Bruce requested clear direction for how to meet the standards and requested referral to have time to reevaluate the proposed project.

Rummel explained that the proposed mass is much wider than its neighbors and the rhythm isn't similar; it's a larger piece than what surrounds it.

Saiki explained that he is confident the street trees can be saved.

Rosenblum explained that exceptional design is not being provided and that the lack of window alignment was bothersome and did not relate to the context.

There was general discussion of compatibility of massing, roof form, and window alignment.

Rummel explained that she is interested in seeing an option with a patio in middle would possibly work.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to refer to a future meeting.
Motion passed by voice vote.

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 16, 2015
TITLE: 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Randy Bruce	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 16, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Randy Bruce, registering in support and wishing to speak. Bruce explained that salvaging and relocating the existing residence on the existing site were considered and that Preservation Architect Charles Quagliana provided a condition report for the existing residential structure. It was determined that the existing structure could not remain on the site. Bruce explained that the architectural solution provides a three-story brick element along Williamson with a patio to the east and a four-story element to the rear with an industrial character. The curved roof element relates to the Quonset hut/Trachte building forms in the industrial area.

Bruce explained that the letter from MNA Board is a fair representation of the process to date.

Michael Soref, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak. Soref explained that the neighborhood prioritized issues related to the proposed development and that the loss of the existing building in the historic context needs to be balanced with the new development. Soref explained that the MNA P&D Committee won't be able to provide a recommendation to the MNA Board before the Landmarks Commission April 13 meeting where this item will be discussed.

Peter Wolff, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak. Wolff explained that the P&D Committee has really only reviewed the priority list and has not discussed the specifics of this proposal. The existing building on the site is in good condition and relates to the historic district character. Wolff explained that Quagliana's opinion that the historic integrity of the existing building is low because the house is likely a pattern book design instead of the work of an architect is misleading because the majority of the residential structures in the Third Lake Ridge are vernacular structures based on pattern book designs which makes the existing building on this site appropriate in this context. Wolff explained that the presence of vernacular worker housing directly adjacent to a commercial building conveys the purpose and character of this historic district. He explained that the existing building has value in its context.

Louis Fortis, appearing in support and available to answer questions.

Fortis explained that he would be interested in listing it for "sale"/relocation and would provide assistance in providing funding toward relocation.

There was general discussion about the condition of the building. Levitan and Rummel explained that they have toured the existing building. There was general discussion about the demolition of the existing building. Bruce explained that the owner was not going to claim that demolition was being pursued due to poor condition.

Rummel explained the thoughts and feedback of the neighborhood. She explained that there was discussion about moving the patio to Paterson Street, concern about the numerous building styles, and desire for an increase in the step backs from Paterson.

Gehrig explained that this might be the only block where new development is appropriate along Williamson Street. There was general discussion about the patio location and the possible need to have a viewing angle at the corner. There was general discussion about the proposed styles, massing and height.

Scanlon explained that the visually related area (VRA) is relevant in the review of this proposal.

Rummel explained that she starts with no when a demolition is being considered and expects the applicant to prove why their development would be better than retaining the existing building. There was general discussion about the demolition standards. Gehrig explained that while the offer to assist with relocation is generous, the relocation does not satisfy the fact that the historic structure is no longer in its location and providing the character of the historic context

ACTION:

The Landmarks Commission received an Informational Presentation. No action taken.

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

July 6, 2015

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



Project Name/Address: 906-910 Williamson
Application Type: Demolition of existing building and new development in historic district
(POSSIBLE RECONSIDERATION)
Legistar File ID # 37499
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared: July 1, 2015

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Randy Bruce
Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition and new development in a historic district.

Previous Actions:

This request was initially reviewed by the Landmarks Commission on April 27, 2015. At that meeting, the applicant requested referral to a future meeting. The proposal was reviewed by the Landmarks Commission on June 15, 2015 and the Commission denied the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the building at 906-910 Williamson. The applicant filed for an appeal of the Landmarks Commission denial on June 17, 2015. The appeal will be introduced on July 7, 2015 and will be before the Common Council on July 21, 2015. Alder Rummel requested that the Commission reconsider the previously made recommendation. Please refer to the Reconsideration Process on page 4.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on Williamson Street in the Third Lake Ridge 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(11)(f) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Commercial Use.

- 1. Any new structures shall be evaluated according to both of the criteria listed in Sec. 33.01(11)(d); that is, compatibility of gross volume and height.
- 2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with the buildings within its visually related area.
- 3. The materials used in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with those used in the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
- 4. The design of the roof of any new structure shall be compatible with those of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
- 5. The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the construction of a new structure shall be compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces for those sites within its visually related area.

33.19 (11)(d) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Manufacturing Use.

- 1. The gross volume of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
- 2. The height of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.

Analysis and Conclusion

This request requires two Certificates of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission. The first Certificate of Appropriateness relates to the demolition of the existing building. The second relates to the construction of the new development. The Visually Related Area map is attached to this report.

Demolition

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

- a. This specific structure is not of such architectural or historic significance that it meets standards for landmark designation as the language of this standard suggests. Instead, with the other vernacular structures in the district, this structure represents vernacular working class housing intermixed with commercial structures along Williamson Street that establishes the historic character and significance of the historic district.
- b. The vernacular building contributes to the distinctive architectural and 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;
- c. The Landmarks Commission is charged with protecting and enhancing the perpetuation of historic districts and the City's cultural heritage. The demolition of any period appropriate structure would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this Ordinance and the objectives of the preservation plan for the district. The Third Lake Ridge Historic District Plan states, "The Third Lake Ridge is a study in diversity, an agglomeration of many themes: ethnic settlement, railroad development, urbanization, civic improvement. Its architecture reflects this diversity of development and change."
- d. The existing building does not meet the intent of this standard, though it is a vernacular structure. The structure could be repaired or reconstructed using common materials and market rate costs.
- e. The building does not meet the intent of this standard. However, the general welfare of the public is promoted by the retention of the City's cultural resources and historic identity.
- f. A property owner in a historic district is charged with keeping their property in good repair. The intent of this provision is to maintain the building stock in good condition so that demolition by neglect cannot be used to damage the essence of the historic district. The current owner has owned the property since 1989. Given the recent submission of the home inspection and the cost estimate, it seems the applicant is claiming that the building condition is the reason for the demolition request. In the previous review, the applicant was only claiming that the maintenance issues may "be financially significant." (see discussion below.)
- g. The compatibility of the proposed new structure is discussed in more detail in the next section.

A home inspection is different than a condition assessment. The most common use of a home inspection is to provide a potential property owner with knowledge of all of the deficiencies and defects in the building and is often used to negotiate the terms of the sale. The home inspector does not necessarily have experience in historic preservation or construction methods. On the other hand, a condition assessment is an analysis of the condition of the systems of a building performed by professionals in the industry (historic preservation consultants, architects, engineers, etc.). The submission materials include a brief condition assessment report by architect Charles Quagliana. The condition assessment report is the preferred document to evaluate a historic building.

The cost estimate that was provided in the submission materials was based on the home inspection report and claims that "every building component has reached its useful life and is in desperate need of replacement." The cost estimate also indicates that the figures are based on the removal and replacement of all interior finishes and the replacement of all mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems. The cost estimate does not provide information about assumptions made or the scope of the work involved.

Every building requires maintenance. Routine maintenance and system upgrades are the responsibility of the property owner. Numerous houses of the same age as the existing building require maintenance and system upgrades. This situation is not unique to this existing building.

New Construction

If demolition is approved, please refer to the discussion of the standards for new construction 33.19(11)(f) that follows:

1. Any new structures shall be evaluated according to both of the criteria listed in Sec. 33.01(11)(d) which follow:
 1. The gross volume of the proposed development is mathematically larger than the gross volume of the majority of the other buildings in the visually related area; however, the massing of that volume has been visually reduced by changes in material and step backs which make the building's gross volume visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
 2. The actual height of the proposed development is taller than the actual height of the buildings in the immediate context and may be taller than the buildings in the visually related area; however, the building height varies related to the massing, step backs and material changes which makes the height visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the Williamson Street facade of the new development is compatible with the buildings within its visually related area; however, the rhythm of solids and voids in the Paterson Street facade of the new development is not compatible. Aligning the windows of the western most portion of the Paterson Street facade would make the rhythm compatible.
3. The exterior materials of the proposed development will include cast stone base, brick, horizontal metal siding and vertical metal panels. The proposed street facade materials may be compatible with materials used in the buildings and environment within its visually related area; however, the material use could be simplified to be more compatible with the buildings in the visually related area.
4. The Applicant has previously explained that the curved roof elements speak to the Quonset hut/Trachte building curved roofs that existed in the industrial corridor, but those structures are not in the visually related area. A curved roof is a striking form that is not compatible with the flat and pitched roofs of the buildings in the visually related area.
5. The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the new development is generally compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces for those sites within its visually related area. The majority of the buildings in the visually related area have a smaller scale and establish a pattern of "building-space-building-space" that a larger building does not allow.

Recommendation

RECONSIDERATION PROCESS

According to MGO 33.01(9)(b), all boards, commissions, committees and subcommittees are obligated to follow MGO 2.21, and may not modify that rule. MGO 2.21 says:

2.21 RECONSIDERATION OF QUESTION.

It shall be in order for any member who voted in the affirmative on any question which was adopted, or for any member who voted in the negative when the number of affirmative votes was insufficient for adoption to move a reconsideration of such vote, at the same or next succeeding regular meeting of the Council. It shall be in order for any member who was, due to an excused absence, not present at the time the question was considered to move reconsideration of such vote at the next succeeding regular

meeting of the Council. A motion to reconsider having been lost shall not be again in order. A motion to reconsider shall not be in order when the same result can be obtained by another motion.

Alder Rummel requested that the Landmarks Commission reconsider this issue and the item has been placed on the agenda. The Landmarks Commission may take up the motion to reconsider by requesting a second and a vote. After an affirmative vote to reconsider, the item would be formally before the Commission for review. The Commission is able to take up the item at the current meeting or at a future meeting. If the vote on the motion to reconsider was not affirmative, the item would not be reconsidered and the recommendation from the June 15, 2015 meeting would remain the action of the Landmarks Commission on the item.

Revisions to the proposed project have not been submitted so the staff recommendation remains as previously stated.

Demolition

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness are not met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission deny the request for demolition.

New Construction

If the Landmarks Commission finds that the demolition standards are met, staff believes the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development may be met and recommends approval with the following conditions of approval:

1. Align windows on Paterson Street façade (south elevation) and then follow that same design vocabulary to the west and north elevations.
2. Simplify the materials.
3. Remove the curved roof elements and provide new roof design for staff review.

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

April 27, 2015

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



Project Name/Address: 906-910 Williamson
Application Type: Demolition of existing building and new development in historic district
Legistar File ID # 37499
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared: April 20, 2015

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Randy Bruce
Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition and new development in a historic district.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on Williamson Street in the Third Lake Ridge 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(11)(f) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Commercial Use.

1. Any new structures shall be evaluated according to both of the criteria listed in Sec. 33.01(11)(d); that is, compatibility of gross volume and height.
2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with the buildings within its visually related area.
3. The materials used in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with those used in the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
4. The design of the roof of any new structure shall be compatible with those of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
5. The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the construction of a new structure shall be compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces for those sites within its visually related area.

33.19 (11)(d) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Manufacturing Use.

1. The gross volume of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
2. The height of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.

Analysis and Conclusion

This request requires two Certificates of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission. The first Certificate of Appropriateness relates to the demolition of the existing building. The second relates to the construction of the new development. The Visually Related Area map is attached to this report.

Demolition

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

- a. This specific structure is not of such architectural or historic significance that it meets standards for landmark designation as the language of this standard suggests. Instead, with the other vernacular structures in the district, this structure represents vernacular working class housing intermixed with commercial structures along Williamson Street that establishes the historic character and significance of the historic district.

- b. The vernacular building contributes to the distinctive architectural and 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;
- c. The Landmarks Commission is charged with protecting and enhancing the perpetuation of historic districts and the City's cultural heritage. The demolition of any period appropriate structure would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this Ordinance and the objectives of the preservation plan for the district. The Third Lake Ridge Historic District Plan states, "The Third Lake Ridge is a study in diversity, an agglomeration of many themes: ethnic settlement, railroad development, urbanization, civic improvement. Its architecture reflects this diversity of development and change. "
- d. The building does not meet the intent of this standard, though it is a vernacular structure. The structure could be repaired or reconstructed using common materials and market rate costs.
- e. The building does not meet the intent of this standard. However, the general welfare of the public is promoted by the retention of the City's cultural resources and historic identity.
- f. A property owner in a historic district is charged with keeping their property in good repair. The intent of this provision is to maintain the building stock in good condition so that demolition by neglect cannot be used to damage the essence of the historic district. According to the document submitted by the applicant that describes architectural integrity and significance, the building exhibits conditions typical with its age and use. The current owner has owned the property since 1989. The Applicant is not claiming that the building condition is the reason for the demolition request, but is claiming that the maintenance issues may "be financially significant."
- g. The compatibility of the proposed new structure is discussed in more detail in the next section.

New Construction

If demolition is approved, please refer to the discussion of the standards for new construction 33.19(11)(f) that follows:

1. Any new structures shall be evaluated according to both of the criteria listed in Sec. 33.01(11)(d) which follow:
 1. The gross volume of the proposed development is mathematically larger than the gross volume of the majority of the other buildings in the visually related area; however, the massing of that volume has been visually reduced by changes in material and step backs which make the building's gross volume visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
 2. The actual height of the proposed development is taller than the actual height of the buildings in the immediate context and may be taller than the buildings in the visually related area; however, the building height varies related to the massing, step backs and material changes which makes the height visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the Williamson Street facade of the new development is compatible with the buildings within its visually related area; however, the rhythm of solids and voids in the Paterson Street facade of the new development is not compatible. Aligning the windows of the western most portion of the Paterson Street facade would make the rhythm compatible.
3. The exterior materials of the proposed development will include cast stone base, brick, horizontal metal siding and vertical metal panels. The proposed street facade materials may be compatible with materials used in the buildings and environment within its visually related area; however, the material use could be simplified to be more compatible with the buildings in the visually related area.
4. The Applicant has previously explained that the curved roof elements speak to the Quonset hut/Trachte building curved roofs that existed in the industrial corridor, but those structures are not in the visually related area. A curved roof is a striking form that is not compatible with the flat and pitched roofs of the buildings in the visually related area.

5. The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the new development is generally compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces for those sites within its visually related area. The majority of the buildings in the visually related area have a smaller scale and establish a pattern of "building-space-building-space" that a larger building does not allow.

Recommendation

Demolition

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness are not met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission deny the request for demolition.

New Construction

If the Landmarks Commission finds that the demolition standards are met, staff believes the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development may be met and recommends approval with the following conditions of approval:

1. Align windows on Paterson Street façade (south elevation) and then follow that same design vocabulary to the west and north elevations.
2. Simplify the materials.
3. Remove the curved roof elements and provide new roof design for staff review.

Stouder, Heather

From: Lynn Lee [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 4:47 PM
To: Stouder, Heather; Tucker, Matthew; Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Agreement between MNA and Louis Fortis

Agreement between Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) and Louis Fortis

First, Louis Fortis will provide two affordable housing units. One unit will be an affordable unit for an individual at 60% of the Dane County median income (DCMI) and the second unit will be an affordable unit for a person at 80% of the Dane County median income (DCMI).

Second, Louis Fortis agrees that the commercial space in the 906/910 Williamson Street property will not be leased to any national corporate retail or franchise chains.

First priority will be given to qualified businesses identified by Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA), local nonprofit, and other organizations or individuals in the Marquette Neighborhood Association area. Second priority will be given to qualified businesses whose ownership is within the City of Madison.

If any exceptions are made to the specific requirements of this agreement, the exception shall only be done in consultation and collaboration with Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA), and after the other local options have been exhausted.

As you know, I have a track record. I have owned the Gateway at 600 Williamson St. for 23 years and have never leased to a national corporate franchise at the Gateway.

Thanks
Louis Fortis

Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA)
Lynn Lee
MNA President