

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 20, 2016

TITLE: 109 South Fair Oaks Avenue - Historic Landmark - Revised redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill building. 6th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 20, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Lon Hill, David WJ McLean, Marsha A. Rummel, and Christina Slattery.

SUMMARY:

Bryant Moroder, registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions. Moroder explained that the revisions to the Garver proposed redevelopment plan include the relocation of the storage building and the reconfiguration of the mini houses. Moroder also explained that this project is dependent on historic tax credits and the project is currently going through that process.

Lou Host-Jablonski, registering in support and wishing to speak. Host-Jablonski explained that windows have also been surveyed and further detailed and entrance features have been revised.

There was general discussion about the revisions. The Commission explained that they were neutral on the additional train car location since it can be removed from the site.

Host-Jablonski explained that the UDC requested that a different metal siding be used on the storage building and Parks requested that windows be added to the garage doors. There was general discussion about these issues. There was general consensus that the Landmarks Commission is interested in having the storage building be as unobtrusive as possible and speak to the character of the out buildings that previously existed on the site. There was general discussion about using translucent panels in the roof in lieu of windows in the garage doors, but generally the Commission did not have a strong recommendation on this issue.

There was general discussion about the treatment of equipment on the roof of the Garver building. There general consensus that the Landmarks Commission understands that equipment was historically located on the roof and may be visible. Staff explained that mechanical equipment is usually screened due to related noise and appearance, but in this case, the screen to improve appearance is not necessary.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rummel, that subject to noise considerations, the mechanicals on the roof do not need to be screened. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Gehrig, to reaffirm the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the additional comments related to mechanicals.