



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

---

Monday, November 2, 2009

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

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

### APPROVAL OF October 19, 2009 MINUTES

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the Minutes from the October 19, 2009 Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

### PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

### CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- 15894** 1252 Williamson Street - Third Lake Ridge Local Historic District, Proposal for a new three story mixed-use building on a former service station site at the corner of Williamson Street and South Baldwin Street.  
Contact: J. Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects

J. Randy Bruce, 7601 University Ave, and Scott Lewis, 1252 Williamson Street, gave a brief presentation about proposed changes to the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bruce specifically mentioned that the protruding bays are now design to be canted outwards, several bay windows are to be altered to an 'ABA' Chicago style window pattern, and new third floor window and awning option for the corner entry are included. Mr. Bruce said that there has been some disagreement between the neighborhood association and the Urban Design Commission about the corner window treatment, and that he would like the Landmarks Commission to approve both options as the project moves forward to the Plan Commission.

Alder Marsha Rummel registered in support. She said that this is an important corner in the neighborhood and that the neighborhood very much supports the project.

Scott Thornton, 1104 Jenifer Street, registered in support on behalf of the Marquette Neighborhood Association, and said that the canted bays and the new window and awning treatment on the corner are important to the neighborhood.

Lindsey Lee, 731 Williamson Street, registered in support, and stated that the neighborhood doesn't want this building to be bland, and that the preservation and development sub-committee within the neighborhood association wants this building to have a positive impact on the neighborhood.

**A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Levitan, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for either design option, strongly encouraging**

**the Plan Commission approval of the more modern corner design, and asked that the applicant work with staff on the restoration of the bay windows on the house at 1246 Williamson Street. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

2. [16406](#)

120 West Johnson Street/129 West Gorham Street - Mansion Hill Historic District and Landmark site. Proposal for a new 5-story apartment building on the site of the Holy Redeemer R.C. Church and School.

Contact: J. Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC

J. Randy Bruce, 7601 University Ave, Mark Landgraff, and Tom Sather, 7447 University Ave registered in support and gave a presentation on the project. Mr. Bruce said that this is an affordable work force housing tax credit project to be built within an existing parking lot. The church would like it to be able to house many of the parishioners. The building falls within the 50-foot R6H height limit and the fifth floor is setback from the Gorham Street façade. Using a physical model that was brought to the meeting, he described the building and said that the rear facade is purposefully left basic so that it creates a backdrop for the church and school. He added that there is a notched corner closest to the sanctuary. He said that they are only asking for a General Development Plan approval at this point so that they can apply for the tax credits. If the tax credits are approved, then they will return with more specific drawings.

Mr. Levitan asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Bruce replied that it will primarily be a masonry building with some other durable materials for the upper floor and some accents. The masonry will match the tone and scale of the adjacent landmark buildings.

Mr. Levitan asked if the building could be moved any further away from the nun's house and the sanctuary. Mr. Bruce said that it could possibly be moved a foot or two, if a smaller driveway were to be approved by the City Traffic Engineer.

Ms Slattery asked about the height of the nun's house. Mr. Bruce replied that it is about 43-45 feet high. Mr. Levitan asked about the volume of the new building. Mr. Bruce replied that it is a little less than 50,000 square feet in gross floor area.

Mr. Landgraff said that he was there to represent the Catholic Diocese of Madison. He said that the Diocese is in support of this project, and that they are aware of and trying to be sensitive to the opinions of the individual parish and some parishioners. He added that there is a public parking ramp across the street from the church, and that on all but three Sundays a year, there is ample parking available in the ramp. On those three Sundays, the ramps generally do not fill up until after noon.

Mr. Levitan asked if the Section 42 tax credits allow for any limitation of future tenants of the building, as Mr. Bruce mentioned that this will be geared towards housing parishioners. Mr. Sather replied that this project would be subject to all fair housing laws and available to anyone who fits the section 42 tax credit guidelines. Mr. Bruce added that the church parishioners will be closer to the project and will have easy access to know when there are vacancies.

Eugene Devitt, 28 East Gilman Street, registered in opposition. He said that this proposal will not enhance the landmark church and school as it is only 15 feet from the nun's house and 12 feet front the sanctuary, imperiling the view of the landmark buildings. He added that while he is happy that they have stuck to the 50-foot R6H height limit, it is still too large for the site and the neighborhood. Mr. Devitt said that this was the second Catholic Church to be built in Madison, and is important to both the downtown and the whole community. There will not be enough parking left over for the church and the lack of parking could hurt the parish.

Mr. Levitan asked how the project imperils the view from Johnson Street. Mr. Devitt replied that it is too close to the beautiful stained glass windows. Mr. Levitan asked if he knows how the church was involved in the project. Mr. Devitt replied that while the larger Diocese has been involved, he believes that many of the church's parishioners are against the project.

Mr. Levitan asked about how the parking issue is related to the Landmarks Ordinance. Mr. Devitt replied that the lot was made for the church and that the rounded sanctuary and stone will be obscured by the new building.

Anne Weiner, 502 Glenway Street, registered in opposition. She asked if the developer would be taking precautions to make sure that the adjacent landmarks would not be harmed during the construction. She said that many of the parishioners are worried that the church and school could be irreparably damaged during excavation. She added that the Church is a very busy place on Sundays, and restricting the parking will make it difficult to maintain the sense of community that happens when people meet and talk in the lot before and after church events. She also said that this project is located between two busy streets and she doesn't see people wanting to live there.

Mr. Landgraff and Mr. Bruce said that there could be equipment on site to monitor the motion of foundation walls during construction.

Mercedes Pozo, 3117 Todd Drive, registered in opposition and represents many of the Hispanic parishioners. She said they are worried about the loss of the parking lot, since the public parking ramp costs are not affordable for many of the parishioners.

Gail Geib, 1120 Chandler Street, registered in opposition. As a member of the church, she discussed the church's history, and displayed some historic photos of the buildings. She said that she is very interested in the relationship between architecture and the community, and that the church remains on the same footprint as it did when it was first built. She added that the buildings are built in harmony with each other, and described many of the community events that take place inside and outside of the church, in the parking lot. She is also worried about the fact that the parishioners will have to cross the very busy Johnson Street if they are forced to park in the public ramp.

Milton Pozo, MD, 3117 Todd Dr registered in opposition. He said that of a survey done with the parishioners, only a few parishioners would be willing to move into this building.

Victor Kelly, 133 Nautilus Dr, registered in opposition. He said this is all about the financial needs of the Diocese, and that no final decision with the church has been made about this project. This proposal is not what many of the parishioners want. He added that the parking lot is open air space that is necessary for the community. He added that the monsignor said that he would put up a website to see what the parishioners want to happen with the site.

Mr. Levitan asked what the status was between the Diocese and the parish in regards to this project. Mr. Landgraff said that the Diocese is in support. The parish may be separate. Ald Maniaci stated that it sounds like the parish may feel different than the Diocese.

John Sheean, 25 Langdon Street, registered in opposition, but did not speak. Timothy Rookey, 2040 Allen Blvd, registered in opposition, but did not speak. Ann Rookey, 2040 Allen Blvd, registered in opposition, but did not speak. Jean Edwards, 2777 Marshall Parkway, registered in opposition, but did not speak.

Mr. Levitan asked staff about which buildings are in the visually related area. Staff stated that generally buildings on the zoning lot are not considered to be a part of the visually related area, as seen in previous visually related area maps. Mr. Levitan replied that if they cannot consider the church and the school, then the new proposal doesn't meet the guidelines.

Mr. Bruce stated that once the project is completed, it will have to be on a separate lot for tax purposes. Staff replied that if the project was indeed on a separate lot, then the Church and School could be considered as buildings in the visually related area.

Mr. Levitan stated that he is concerned about the crowding between the church and the new building. He added that Gorham Street is one-way in the opposite of the view of the church across the open space, so that this project will not block vehicular views from Gorham Street.

Mr. Stephans added that the open space, or empty space between buildings is just as important as the building space in terms of the perception of the landmark buildings. He said that he would like the mass of the building generally reduced in order to avoid crowding the church, nun's house and school.

Mr. Levitan added that he thinks a total of four stories would be better; a three story base with a fourth story that was set back from Gorham Street.

Alder Maniaci stated that due to the chain link fence, the Gorham street side of the block is kind of dead space. Ms Gehrig added that she is happy that this proposal doesn't tear down any buildings.

Ms Taylor agreed that the scale of the Johnson Street side is okay in relationship with the church and school, but that the Gorham Street side seems to be much larger than the adjacent buildings in the historic district.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Rosenblum, to Approve an apartment building on this part of the Holy Redeemer Church site as generally appropriate taking into consideration the following outstanding issues and conditions:**

1. The overall gross volume of the proposal is too large.
2. There should be an increase of air space between the new building and both the nun's house and the Church Sanctuary.
3. The Gorham Street façade should be more sensitive to the scale of the smaller buildings on Gorham Street.
4. The apartment must be built on a separate lot.
5. The proposal must return to the Landmarks Commission to resolve the above issues as well as more detailed design and architectural details in order to receive approval for a final Certificate of Appropriateness.

**The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

3. [16138](#)

933 Spaight Street - Third Lake Ridge Local Historic District - Front porch alteration.  
Contact: Sam Reid

Sam Reid, 511 W. Doty Street, presented to the Commission a proposal to remove the front porch and replace with a wooden porch design.

Mr. Levitan said that while he appreciates the removal of the upper enclosed glass area, that the existing porch is a defining feature of the house.

Ms Gehrig said that the existing stucco porch is a great and unique, and asked the applicant to clarify if the whole house is stucco. Mr. Reid replied that the rest of the house is stucco.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the second story glass enclosed porch, and that all repairs and/or restoration of the entire porch should match the existing design and materials. In addition, the applicant should work with staff to develop an appropriate railing design for the upper porch. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

### SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS

4. [16368](#)

617 - 619 Mendota Court - Advisory report to Plan Commission on the demolition of two existing buildings, and construction of an 8 story apartment building within the Langdon National Register Historic District.

Contact: Gary Brink

At the request of the applicant, there was a motion to refer the project to a future Landmarks Commission Meeting in order to receive feedback from the Urban Design Commission. On the motion to refer, Mr. Levitan made the statement that he hopes the applicants return with a building that is more suited to its location within a National Register Historic District and that the building should take architectural clues from the adjacent historic buildings within the district.

**A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Maniaci, to Rerefer the project to a future LANDMARKS COMMISSION meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

**OTHER BUSINESS - DISCUSSION****5. [08717](#) Buildings proposed for demolition**

There were no additional structures that came through the demolition notification system. There was no discussion.

**6. [07804](#) Secretary's Report**

Ms Slattery moved for reconsideration of the proposal for 2021 Van Hise Avenue on the grounds that the applicant has made some additional changes beyond their previous discussion. She added that this does not necessarily mean that she has changed her mind on her final vote; only that she believes it merits additional discussion. The motion was seconded by Maniaci.

Mr. Levitan asked if anything had changed. Ms Slattery replied that she doesn't know what the changes are, only that they would like to return for a further discussion.

Mr. Stephans added that he had been uneasy about the previous discussion and feels that the Commission could have been more constructive in its criticism of the project, as discussed in the ordinance. Mr. Stephans asked staff to read the section of the ordinance that the applicant was referring to. Staff quoted the ordinance: "*Section 33.19(5)(b)(5) which states: '... If the Commission fails to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission shall, at the request of the applicant, cooperate and work with the applicant in an attempt to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness within the guidelines of this ordinance.'*"

Mr. Levitan added that he believes that there is not always an architectural solution to a problem.

Ms Gehrig said that she is uncomfortable giving out architectural advice, considering that many of the Commissioners are not architects, and the idea that we have to give them specific advice to get their project approved doesn't seem like a very good idea. She thinks that their guidance should be more general.

Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff stated that the applicant felt like they didn't get good feedback at the first informational meeting due to the fact that the Edgewater Hotel redevelopment presentation was at the same meeting. She thinks that it is a process issue and that we should allow them to return.

Mr. Stephans asked staff to put together an informational sheet of the specific references that the Commission will have to consider for the 2021 Van Hise proposal in advance of the meeting so that they can study the specific ordinance language before the next meeting.

Mr. Levitan asked if there were any other large projects slated for the November 16th meeting, like the Edgewater, so that this project could have ample time for discussion. Staff replied that they had not received an application for the Edgewater as of today's (11/2/09) deadline.

**A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Maniaci, to reconsider 2021 Van Hise Avenue. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Rosenblum, to Adjourn at 7:20 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**