

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 8, 2014

**TITLE:** 627 North Lake Street – Requested Review  
for a Conditional Use Approval for  
Vertical Expansion of the Existing  
Structure. 8<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (32669)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 8, 2014

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton and Lauren Cnare.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 8, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** to review a conditional use approval for vertical expansion of the existing structure located at 627 North Lake Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Steve Harms. Harms described the project which involves a 3-story addition to the building, changing the genre of the lodging house style to suite style apartments. The building was built in 1926 and a small addition was put on in 1950. It is part of the National Historic District (not a local district) and is not a landmark building. They looked at different styles of multi-story expressions before deciding on this current proposal. Building materials will match the existing building. The current wood pitch roof will be changed to a steel stud structure. They would prefer to use stucco but the Zoning Code does not allow for its use in this district. Moped parking will be included.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The idea of the connectivity of the bike path from Picnic Point all the way through to downtown, is this easement resolved on this property?
  - It’s going property by property all the way down the lakefront. That’s more of a land use decision by the Plan Commission.
  - (Harms) At this point to grant a 10-foot easement along the lake, that’s not a deal breaker one way or the other.
- Is this a for-profit entity?
  - Yes it is.

As someone who owns a 1908 that was renovated in 1950 that’s located in a National Landmark District, the new policy, the Governor just upped the tax credits for you, 40% tax credits on the table should the property be treated in a way that would meet those standards. The cornice treatment, don’t try to make it look 100 years old, it isn’t and it’ll probably never be 100 years old. Pick the pieces of this building that have good bones. The change in material in the addition as it goes vertically, they will

never match that brick, ever. The brick is a good thing about this building. By putting up a cheap imitation of what it was essentially disgraces the 2-3 good things you could say about this building. My recommendation would be when you add onto it, accept the fact that you're not going to match and look at it as a 3-story on a 3-story. Honor the division. That stucco addition they did in the 50s, not everything they did in the 50s was right, take it off. If that's the answer. There are good examples out there. Save the pieces of history that are great and move on.

- What about taking the brick off the top floor?
  - That is something we may look at because the top 2-feet has to be tuckpointed.
- Metal and glass are pretty light if you're worrying about weight.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.