

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**PRESENTED:** March 16, 2015

**TITLE:** 906-910 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolition of existing building and construction of a new 4-story apartment building. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
Contact: Randy Bruce

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** March 16, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

### **SUMMARY:**

Randy Bruce, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Bruce explained that salvaging and relocating the existing residence on the existing site were considered and that Preservation Architect Charles Quagliana provided a condition report for the existing residential structure. It was determined that the existing structure could not remain on the site. Bruce explained that the architectural solution provides a three-story brick element along Williamson with a patio to the east and a four-story element to the rear with an industrial character. The curved roof element relates to the Quonset hut/Trachte building forms in the industrial area.

Bruce explained that the letter from MNA Board is a fair representation of the process to date.

Michael Soref, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak.

Soref explained that the neighborhood prioritized issues related to the proposed development and that the loss of the existing building in the historic context needs to be balanced with the new development. Soref explained that the MNA P&D Committee won't be able to provide a recommendation to the MNA Board before the Landmarks Commission April 13 meeting where this item will be discussed.

Peter Wolff, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak.

Wolff explained that the P&D Committee has really only reviewed the priority list and has not discussed the specifics of this proposal. The existing building on the site is in good condition and relates to the historic district character. Wolff explained that Quagliana's opinion that the historic integrity of the existing building is low because the house is likely a pattern book design instead of the work of an architect is misleading because the majority of the residential structures in the Third Lake Ridge are vernacular structures based on pattern book designs which makes the existing building on this site appropriate in this context. Wolff explained that the presence of vernacular worker housing directly adjacent to a commercial building conveys the purpose and character of this historic district. He explained that the existing building has value in its context.

Louis Fortis, appearing in support and available to answer questions.

Fortis explained that he would be interested in listing it for “sale”/relocation and would provide assistance in providing funding toward relocation.

There was general discussion about the condition of the building. Levitan and Rummel explained that they have toured the existing building. There was general discussion about the demolition of the existing building. Bruce explained that the owner was not going to claim that demolition was being pursued due to poor condition.

Rummel explained the thoughts and feedback of the neighborhood. She explained that there was discussion about moving the patio to Paterson Street, concern about the numerous building styles, and desire for an increase in the step backs from Paterson.

Gehrig explained that this might be the only block where new development is appropriate along Williamson Street. There was general discussion about the patio location and the possible need to have a viewing angle at the corner. There was general discussion about the proposed styles, massing and height.

Scanlon explained that the visually related area (VRA) is relevant in the review of this proposal.

Rummel explained that she starts with no when a demolition is being considered and expects the applicant to prove why their development would be better than retaining the existing building. There was general discussion about the demolition standards. Gehrig explained that while the offer to assist with relocation is generous, the relocation does not satisfy the fact that the historic structure is no longer in its location and providing the character of the historic context

**ACTION:**

The Landmarks Commission received an Informational Presentation. No action taken.