AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

9, 2011
POF:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Robin Taylor and David McLean were excused. Marsha Rummel left before the discussion of Item #3.

SUMMARY:

Jason Tish and Elizabeth Cwik representing the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation and providing an alternative approach to the Block 100 Foundation proposal for this block. In the 1850s and 1860s State Street was sparsely populated primarily with residential development along this corridor. In the 1860s to 1900s the block was being converted from residential to commercial corridor. A photo from 1907 shows there was a mix of residential and commercial. By the end of the 1920s the conversion to commercial was largely complete. The Orpheum and Capital Theatre were built. State Street exists as an 8 block district that shows the integrity of the early 20th century character. The 100 Block of State Street is a contributing block in the proposed National Historic District. This District runs the entire length of State Street and a block on either side. The district was not officially listed in the National Register of Historic Places but was deemed eligible by the State Office in 1994. It was not forwarded to the Park Service for listing in the National Register due to owner opposition at the time. State Street is our downtown historical district and serves as a pedestrian mall. Tish gave examples of other communities that have successful cohesive historic commercial districts. The Block 100 Foundation proposal will retain the 30 feet frontage of Castle and Doyle and might include a true facadectomy on the Buell building next to it. Green aspects of construction is green wash and should not be given consideration. They believe 100 Block Foundation proposal is heavy handed. It creates a dishonest and undignified streetscape on State Street. He proposed that what is needed is an urban historic rehabilitation project that is cohesive, creates spaces for shops and rooftop dining, and retains the integrity of the architecture on the block and extends the historic character that you find on State Street down to Fairchild Street to what is being billed as a cultural node with the Overture Center, the new library, the potential new Historical Museum. The cultural plan that is in its final stages of approval defines culture to include historic buildings and architecture.

Ms. Cwik said the Stark Building needs to be advocated for. Strip away all of the fire escapes, condenser units, badly placed improvements, bad window replacements you have solid buildings. Ms. Cwik provided illustrations showing the buildings rehabilitated and restored. She feels it is important that Castle and Doyle Building and flat iron building (Vallender Building) be preserved because of their unique character. She proposed a roof garden on top of Stark Building. The removal of the Stark Building results in the loss of 39,000 square feet of usable space. Schubert building is not mentioned at all in the Block 100 Foundation plan and should not be disposed of. Levitan asked about fenestration on buildings. Ms. Cwik stated that in her drawings,

the Stark Building had no changes or embellishments; the Haswell Building has been restored to its original appearance; the Buell Building has no changes, only removed fire escapes, air conditioners, unsightly stuff; Castle and Doyle shows exact fenestration pattern as existing; Vallender Building brick openings had been bricked over and she has tried to restore the original appearance. She has not been in Vallender Building but Gary Tipler has and said it is salvageable. Ms. Cwik said she has spoken with George Austin and he said that the Buell Building and Castle and Doyle Building were both in good condition. Demolition was to accommodate the more corporate office footprint on the second and third floors. The Haswell and Stark buildings were used as office space until vacated and she assumes they are in good condition on the interior. She feels that with the same budget proposed to demolish half of the buildings and build a new glass building, a beautiful restoration project would be an example for success with retail on ground floor and residential or office space above.

Michael Bridgeman, 106 S. Franklin Street, registering in support and wishing to speak. He passed on opportunity to speak.

John Schlaefer, 1814 Kendall Avenue, registering in support but not wishing to speak.

ACTION:

Levitan said the Commission could make and pass a motion that would encourage that the 100 Block Foundation incorporate adaptive reuse as opposed to demolition in their proposal. Adaptive reuse recognizes the historic nature of buildings proposed for demolition while encouraging economic development. A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rosenblum, that the Landmarks Commission recommends the Madison Trust Alternative vision for Block 76 to the Block 100 Foundation as an example of an adaptive reuse which preserves designated landmarks and other historic buildings while allowing for appropriate economic development. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.