

MINUTES

MADISON LANDMARKS COMMISSION

4:30 p.m., Monday, August 22, 2005
Room LL-130, Madison Municipal Building

I. ROLL CALL

Members present: Ms. Crocker, Ald. Olson, Mr. Page (acting chairperson), Mr. Rosenblum, Mr. Stephans, Ms. Taylor

Guests: Mr. John Freiburger, Ms. Ellen Montei, Mr. Ted Schmidt, Ms. Alice Honeywell, Mr. Ed Sue, Ms. Wendi Sue, Mr. William Patterson, Mr. Trent Nichols, Ms. Ledell Zellers

II. MINUTES

Ms. Taylor noted that she was not at the last meeting. With this correction, the minutes of the August 8, 2005 meeting were ordered approved as written.

III. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

- A. 1920 Arlington Place, University Heights historic district – consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for replacing side deck

Mr. John Freiburger, the construction consultant, said that they proposed to replace an old narrow deck, last remodeled in the 1980s, and add a new deck with design details that will match the details that were recently built on the second floor sleeping porch. Mr. Stephans said that he thought the plans were an excellent improvement over the old remodeled deck. Mr. Rosenblum said that he thought echoing the other porch was a good idea. Mr. Stephans then moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for this project, seconded by Ald. Olson and passed unanimously.

- B. Pres House, 731 State Street, designated Landmark - consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for new lower level restaurant and consideration of advisory opinion to Plan Commission for proposed building adjacent to a Landmark

Ms. Rankin passed out revised drawings that were submitted after the packets were mailed out. One of the architects for this project, Ed Sue, described the major parameters of the design. He noted that an important goal of the clients was to reflect in the new building its spiritual connection with the old. The Pres House organization has reenergized after being nearly defunct in recent years.

They are planning to open the apartment house to students of all faiths, but they hope to have some of the students of their faith come together as a community in the new building. As a result, the design charge includes echoing some of the symbolism of their faith, including verticality, symmetry, a large center window and a roof pitch that would draw the eye upward.

Mr. Sue said that they had worked closely with the UW to fit into its land use and landscape plans and fit in with the scale of nearby university buildings. Mr. Schmidt of the Pres House asked, for the benefit of some of its board members, the rationale behind the original staff recommendation to reduce the Gothic features in the new design. Ms. Rankin explained that the City in general prefers to have modern buildings blend with their surroundings, but not necessarily duplicate older styles, but rather be an architectural statement of its own day. She noted that a large Gothic-arched window in the upper stories of the new building would detract from the beauty and uniqueness of the one in the church since such windows are typically only seen in ecclesiastical structures, not residential ones. To use too many of the major elements of church design would look out of place on a modern residential building. She said that retention of the main gable shape would work to tie the two designs together without actually creating too much duplication in the design of the new building.

Ms. Sue then described the changes to the Pres House, the major changes of which are relandscaping the front corner of the lot with a curvilinear design with improved accessibility. Between State Street and the building, an outdoor eating area would be created at basement level for the current cafe located in the basement. The outdoor cafe would be screened somewhat from the street by a raised planter.

Then Ms. Sue discussed the design of the new building, noting that it was to be all glass on the first level to enhance the sense of life and to create a friendly, open feeling. She showed a color rendering in red brick, which she said was suggested as a good material by the Urban Design staff. She also showed alternate brick colors and the Commission said that they would prefer that the building be in a lighter brick to blend better with the colors of the church building. To a question by Mr. Page, Mr. Sue stated that the patio paving would be concrete, noting that the adjoining building to the east is concrete.

Mr. Stephans said that he was concerned that the anchors into the stonework for the canvas canopy might be a site for movement and harm to the historic stonework. Ms. Montei noted that they were not committed to the canopy and would not be unhappy if it were rejected. Commission members noted that unattached sun protection for the tables, such as umbrellas, might work well in

that location. Mr. Stephans also said that he liked the way they have opened up the basement and said that the grading and landscaping plan would soften the appearance of the building and would work very well.

To a question about signage for the restaurant, the architects said that the signage has not yet been worked on. The Commission members noted that signage will have to come back to the Commission at a later date. Mr. Page noted that the fair amount of detail on the side facing the Catholic Church was initially troubling to him, but the fact that there was a ten foot setback and a courtyard for the Catholic Church in that area were points in favor of more detail. Mr. Page said that he saw the apartment building as a sort of frame for the piece of art that is the church. He and Mr. Stephans said that the design presented was simpler but blended elegantly with the church design without articulating all of its details.

Mr. Stephans then moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remodeling of the church building was approved on the condition that signage come back to the Commission at a later date, that the canopy be omitted from the plans, that the version of the design that shows windows flanking the two basement French doors is the scheme that is approved, and that Ms. Rankin is authorized to approve minor changes that might occur before the building permit is issued. Mr. Rosenblum seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

The Commission then considered their advisory opinion to the Plan Commission on the development adjacent to the Landmark. Ms. Taylor noted that the original roof design was too busy and the one submitted for the meeting was less competitive with the design of the church. Mr. Rosenblum said that a simpler design such as the one submitted for the meeting was a better solution. Mr. Stephans moved that the Landmarks Commission recommend to the Plan Commission that the scale of the proposed building and its design are compatible with the historic character of the adjacent Landmark, the Pres House. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

IV. DISCUSSION

- A. 122 Bascom Place, University Heights historic district – discussion of work undertaken that did not comply with conditions of Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Rankin showed Commission members photos of the project as completed, noting that there was no window on the front as was shown in the plans, nor was there a pent roof over the garage. The Commission agreed to schedule the

issue for the next Landmarks Commission meeting and invite the owner to attend.

B. Madison Comprehensive Plan – consideration of recommendations to Plan Commission

Mr. Stephans moved that the Landmarks Commission recommend adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, second by Mr. Rosenblum. Ald. Olson said that she was not personally ready to endorse the plan, because she wants to see the Conservation District idea given more prominence. The motion to recommend adoption passed unanimously, with one abstention.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine H. Rankin

Secretary