

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION | PRESENTED: March 14, 2016 |
| TITLE: 722 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Construct a new building. 6 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Lance McGrath, McGrath Property Group, LLC | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary | ADOPTED: 3/14/16 POF: |
| DATED: March 14, 2016 | ID NUMBER: 41937 |

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Lon Hill, Marsha A. Rummel, and Christina Slattery

SUMMARY:

Levitan opened the public hearing.

Marc Schellpfeffer, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Paul Cuta, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Michael Metzger, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Metzger provided a brief description of the proposed project which will include three components: environmental remediation, renovation of the Olds Building, and construction of new building.

Schellpfeffer described the site and locations of proposed elements. He explained that they originally proposed an addition to the Olds Building, but decided not to pursue that improvement. Instead they have chosen to develop a focal point at the center of the site and develop a promenade along the side of the Olds Building to move pedestrians toward the center lantern element. The promenade has two levels – an upper level walkway under shed roof directly adjacent to the building and a lower level walkway at grade.

Schellpfeffer explained the materials and that the proposed materials would not mimic the existing brick of the Olds Building or Harvester Building, but instead would use masonry of complementary colors – an orangey brown iron spot brick on the lantern and new building and a buff color on the new building with two colors of metal panel.

Schellpfeffer explained that there would be new retail openings in the side elevation along the promenade. The promenade would have lightweight steel frame with trusses that correspond to existing haunches on the side elevation. The lantern has a second floor outdoor amenity space. The mass of the lantern does not engage the corner of the Olds Building.

Schellpfeffer explained that the new building along the bike path was designed so that the material placement and material selection helps to break down the visual size and scale. An entry door is provided on the rear elevation to engage the activity on the bike path and provide a connection to the center of the site.

The Olds Building was previously renovated with replacement windows, the alteration of the storefront, and the installation of EIFS on the sides and rear. The original storefront openings will be restored and the existing EIFS will be removed and replaced with a new EIFS system. The existing EIFS system was not installed with a drainage layer and is doing damage to the brick wall. The new EIFS system will be installed with a drainage layer. The masonry of the front elevation will be restored and the glazing of the storefront transoms will be replaced with reeded glass panels. Schellpfeffer and Cuta described where new openings would be created and that the original openings on the front elevation of the Olds Building would be retained and restored.

Rummel asked for clarification on the proposed EIFS replacement, about using reeded glass instead of Luxfer prism glass to replicate the original, and the appearance of the storefront doors. Schellpfeffer explained that the reeded glass provides a similar filtered light quality on the interior and an obscured glass appearance from the exterior as the Luxfer. The openings on the side elevation will be glass paneled garage doors that could be opened to the promenade. He explained that the existing EIFS needs to be repaired and when they removed a portion and found the deterioration of the brick, they decided it would need to be removed and replaced.

Levitan asked Schellpfeffer to comment on the conditions in the staff report. Schellpfeffer explained that the EIFS would have joints to indicate the concrete structure of the wall, that the promenade trusses would engage the existing haunches, and that the materials used on the mass of the rear building break down the visual scale.

Gehrig requested that the applicant investigate more ways to reduce the volume and scale of the rear building. Hill explained that the building is very large and continued efforts to reduce the size would be appreciated.

John Coleman, registering neither in support or opposition, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions. Coleman explained that the report from the MNA Preservation and Development Committee is that the committee supports the project with the following conditions – that it is further set back from the bike path, that the owner commit to leasing only to local businesses, that the owner commit to providing affordable housing, and that the architecture connect to the bike path. He explained that in his personal opinion, the rear elevation needed work and that the door on the rear elevation went directly into the garage; it was not an engaging entrance. Like a lobby that would make it a destination. He explained that setting the project back would allow more space to engage the bike path with outdoor activity spaces and landscaping. He quoted from the East Rail corridor plan about the need for more green space in the area.

Levitan reminded the Commission that they should only consider the elements of the project within their purview of review.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee explained that he is a neighbor and local business owner. He agrees with the staff report and supports the proposed project. He explained that while possibly outside of the purview of the Commission, he wanted the record of the review of the project to include his testimony that another developer provided a written commitment to lease only to local businesses and that chains would change the character of Williamson Street.

Rummel asked Lee for his thoughts about the rear elevation. Lee explained that setting the building back further from the bike path would be better for open space improvements and use, but may be difficult to accommodate with the building footprint.

Levitan closed the public hearing.

There was general discussion about the interpretation of “street facades” and the treatment of E Wilson Street right-of-way as a street with a “street façade”.

There was also discussion about the divisions of the windows on the front elevation and how that gave a similar appearance to the historic appearance, but it was a false historic treatment. The Commission discussed the historic industrial window type and how a double hung had a more residential feel which would be appropriate in an adaptive re-use project where the original windows were previously replaced.

There was discussion about the EIFS and the use of EIFS at grade which would likely be discussed by the Urban Design Commission. Staff suggested that the Commission discuss appropriate materials in lieu of EIFS at the lower level to assist UDC with their discussion. Staff explained that the original building has a concrete frame with brick infill and that the infill was usually soft brick. In many cases that soft brick began to deteriorate and was covered with a parge coat which has a thin “stucco” appearance. The appearance of EIFS is similar to stucco. There was discussion about the need to maintain a stucco or concrete appearance at this level and not introduce brick.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Hill, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction and exterior alteration with the conditions of approval in the staff report.

Slattery suggested an amendment, seconded by Hill, to include the use of one-over-one double hung windows on the front elevation as part of the motion. The amendment to the motion passed on a vote of 3:1.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Hill, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction and exterior alteration with the conditions of approval in the staff report and using one-over-one windows on the front elevation instead of the divided as proposed. The motion passed by voice vote.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Gehrig, to advise the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark site. The motion passed by voice vote.