



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, July 27, 2009

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room LL-130 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 6 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans; Stuart Levitan; Robin M. Taylor;
Michael J. Rosenblum and Christina Slattery

Absent: 1 -

Erica Fox Gehrig

APPROVAL OF July 13, 2009 MINUTES

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Rosenblum, to Approve the Minutes of the July 13, 2009 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- 15468** 716 Orton Court - Third Lake Ridge Historic District
Consideration of Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for the enclosure of the front porch and replacement of existing flat roof.
Contact: Ganser Company
Dana Bjerke, Ganser Company, gave a brief presentation about the project.

Ms. Taylor asked if the homeowners were keeping the existing railing, and if the new space was to be heated. Ms Bjerke replied that they are keeping the railing and that the new porch would be insulated, but not heated.

Ms Slattery asked if the windows design matches the rest of the house. Ms Bjerke replied that except for the existing leaded glass windows, the remaining house windows were not divided.

Ald. Maniaci asked why the homeowners want to enclose the porch. Ms Bjerke replied that the house is close to the lake and has many problems with spiders, as well as the hope that the space would become more usable for the homeowners.

Ms Slattery asked the Chair what the history of this type of porch enclosure was with the Commission, and noted that she does not believe that it meets the intent of several of the guidelines that refer to rhythm of solids and voids, specifically Section (i)3: Alteration of any existing structure shall retain or be compatible with the original or existing rhythm of masses and spaces. and (i)5: ...retain the original or existing historical proportional relationships of door sizes to window sizes

Mr. Stephans replied that he does not believe that the Commission has approved previous porch enclosures in the Third Lake Ridge District. Mr. Stephans also noted the concern about

the idea that the enclosure could set a precedent for other projects, and that the design, while it has nice details that are appropriate to the design of the house, will obscure the existing leaded glass windows that are on the front facade.

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Rosenblum, to Refer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION'S next meeting in order to allow the homeowner to come and discuss the project further. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

2. [15469](#)

2021 Van Hise Avenue - University Heights Historic District

Consideration of Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for a side yard addition.

Contact: Colin Godding

Mr. Colin Godding, 107 N Hamilton St, gave a brief presentation about the project.

Mr. Stephans asked about the total square footage of the addition. Mr. Godding replied that the new addition will add approximately 1,500 square feet bring the house from currently 2500 square feet to approximately 4,000 square feet after the addition is complete.

Ms Slattery asked if there had been any thought to a rear addition or a detached garage. Mr. Godding replied that the configuration of the lot prevents this from working well, and that the owners want to have an attached garage.

Fred and Sara Jane Osborne, 2021 Van Hise, registered in support and were available to answer questions.

Darsi Foss, 2533 Kendall Ave, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association, register in neither support nor opposition. Mr. Levitan asked Ms Foss about the neighborhood's thoughts on the project. Ms Foss replied that this is really the first time that they have seen it, but the homeowners and the architect have been doing a lot of outreach to the neighbors and the neighborhood association.

Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff mentioned that as of now, she had not heard any worries from neighbors. She also mentioned that this is a very large lot with some large houses around it.

Received an Informational Presentation

3. [15483](#)

Edgewater Redevelopment - 666 Wisconsin Avenue - Mansion Hill Local Historic District.

Contact: Amy Supple, Hammes Company

Bob Dunn and Amy Supple, 22 East Mifflin, gave a brief informational presentation to the Commission.

Mr. Levitan asked to see a view of the project from the Capitol. Mr. Stephans noted that the Commission would like to see several views of the project from different sightlines in order to put the project into a neighborhood context. Mr. Dunn replied that they are working on a virtual model to show these views.

Fred Mohs, 512 Wisconsin Ave, registered in opposition. He discussed the condition of the existing tower and noted that the thought that this project would not have even been considered if the owners had not let the old tower deteriorate.

Harvey Wendell, 531 N Pinckney, registered in support. He noted that the project will bring a first class hotel back to the area, and that this project is an opportunity to improve the shoreline and lake access. He doesn't want blight to expand in the neighborhood.

Mary Mohs, 512 Wisconsin Ave, registered in opposition. She talked about the history of the neighborhood, and noted that the neighborhood is much more stable now than it had been in forty years. She said that if this project is approved, the Mansion Hill Neighborhood would be gone as we know it.

Ruth Wendtlandt, 1 Langdon Street, registered in support. She said that as an employee of the Edgewater and a resident of Kennedy Manor next door, she is very proud of this proposal

to restore the hotel. She wished that we could have the beauty of Monona Terrace on Lake Mendota.

Joe Lusson, 627 E. Gorham St., registered in opposition. He noted his concern about the height of the proposed tower. He said that a historic district designation should provide some assurances to neighbors that a large out-of-scale tower would never be built in an historic district. He noted that from the water, the building is really more like a 15 story tower, and that even though the developer mentioned that they had reduced the tower by 30% in size from a previous design, that even a 30% reduction of an outrageous tower is still outrageous.

Scott Watson, 6217 Piedmont Rd, registered in support. He noted that the Edgewater is in need of a facelift, and that this project will be a boost for economic development in the city. This project would put a lot of people to work and would create a new landmark for the city.

Pat Sheldon, 504 Wisconsin Ave., registered in opposition. She said that while she is not opposed to change or new development, she is worried about the building height and the views to and from the lake. She likes several things about the proposal, but thinks that a lower design, perhaps in the style of Frank Lloyd Wright would be a better fit. She also would like to see the view of the proposal from down Wisconsin Avenue.

Susan Schmitz, DMI, 210 Marinette Trail, registered in support.

Ledell Zellers, 510 N Carroll St., registered in opposition. She noted that Mansion Hill was made a Historic District because of the great architecture in the neighborhood, and that the R6H zoning designation, and the Historic District language were meant to preserve the character of the District. She said that piercing the 50-foot height limit of the District would set a precedent for other redevelopment, and that there would be a lot of vulnerable properties within the District. She also thought that the National Guardian Life building shouldn't be used as part of the visually related area study since it is not a historic building and would not meet the intent of the Historic District language.

Thomas Link, 1111 Willow Lane, registered in opposition, and noted that a 12-story tower is too tall for the Historic District.

Jim Skrentny, 511 E. Main St., registered in opposition, and requested that the developer share additional views of the proposal from different areas within the neighborhood and other important view corridors, i.e. James Madison Park. He is also concerned about the storage/stacking of busses on the drop off area. He said that Historic Districts are meant to protect people who invest in historic neighborhoods, and should provide assurances that the district language would be respected. He is worried that such a proposal would set a precedent for taller buildings in his own First Settlement Historic District. He also mentioned that he was asked to leave a meeting that was listed as a public meeting.

Dan Burke, 2025 Atwood Ave., registered in support, and discussed that this development will greatly help the Madison's economic development, and will draw in over 500 craftsmen during construction not to mention all of the new permanent jobs that will be needed to run the completed hotel.

Gib Docken, 1330 Co. Rd. JG, registered in support, noting that he owns a lot of land in the Mansion Hill District. He said that the tower would help make the rest of the refurbishment of the hotel possible. He noted that the National Guardian Life building really isn't visible unless you are on Gilman Street. He also noted that the student rental market is still strong and that this project would be a gemstone for Madison, and that he liked the idea of adding a marina to the lakefront.

Erik Minton, 21 N Butler St., registered in support, and talked about his love of living downtown. He is worried that with the news of some recent establishments that were closing due to the economy, a project like this could really be helpful for the downtown. He said that he is nothing but excited about this plan and he thinks that it is tragic that another downtown projects have been stalled or stopped because of Historic District issues.

Mr. Levitan asked staff to provide a flow chart of the approvals process for this project, as well as the visually related area study once the submittal is finalized. Mr. Levitan also asked for before and after views from both Pinckney and Langdon Streets, besides the other requests

that he made earlier.

Mr. Stephans asked that the applicants make the trees in the virtual model transparent so that the Commission could get a better idea of the impact of the building on different views during winter.

Ald. Maniaci asked how the design of the building came to be? Ms Supple replied that they wanted the building to have a residential feel; hence the balconies and other design features. She also mentioned that they considered an art moderne design, but it ended up looking like a movie set, so they went with a neo-classical architectural design. She also mentioned that the different architectural styles are meant to convey a sense of a collection of buildings around an open space.

Mr. Stephans asked about the original tower and its restoration/rehabilitation/changes to the old tower. Mr. Dunn and Ms Supple noted that due to the configuration of the old tower, that besides some suites on the upper floors, there will not have very many hotel rooms, but will hold offices, potentially some residential units and other functions. The rehabilitation will include new windows, but will also include an added top floor to the structure, as well as a skywalk to the 1970's addition across the grand staircase.

Mr. Stephans asked if there was any consideration to lowering the public terrace towards the lake. Mr. Dunn replied that they needed the existing programmable space beneath the terrace, and that they were pulling back the overhang of the 1970's addition and are creating a private terrace below the public terrace.

Mr. Stephans noted the need for views down the staircase from Langdon Street. Mr. Stephans also discussed the need for the architecture to maintain a pedestrian scale along the street frontage with building stepbacks at 3 or 4 stories.

Received an Informational Presentation

OTHER BUSINESS

4. [08717](#) Buildings proposed for demolition

The Commission discussed the demolition request from the University of Wisconsin for the UW Practice House and whether or not that it was a historic structure. The Commission expressed the desire to review the proposal and demolition of the house. Ald. Maniaci said that she would talk to the Plan Commission about referring the project to the Landmarks Commission for an advisory opinion.

5. [07804](#) Secretary's Report

There was no secretary's report.

ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Taylor, to Adjourn at 7:30 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**