

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 02 October 2017

TITLE: Buildings proposed for demolition - 2017

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5 October 2017

ID NUMBER: 45700

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Marsha A. Rummel, Richard Arnesen, Lon Hill, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused were David WJ McLean and Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair.

SUMMARY:

Gary Tipler, registering in opposition and wishing to speak regarding 506 E Washington and 7 N Franklin.

Rick McKy, registering neither in opposition nor support and wishing to speak regarding the demolitions on E Washington.

Tipler provided historical documents related to 506 E Washington and 7 N Franklin structures. He spoke to their historic value and urged the Commission to consider the details provided.

McKy indicated that he thought the brick building (502 E Washington) warranted saving and had historic value. He commented on the issue of parking and the lack of setback with the proposed development. He feels more research may need to be done regarding the historic value of the homes.

There was general discussion and consensus about 506 E Washington and the early date of construction and the historic significance of being associated with a Wisconsin governor.

Rummel felt that 11 N Franklin has historic value based on architectural significance, and as the work/product of an architect of note.

Arnesen felt that 502 E Washington has historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, or as the work/product of an architect of note, but the building itself is not historically, architecturally or culturally significant.

Rummel asked about the integrity/"salvageability" of the YWCA building (122 State Street). Staff confirmed that the historic material appears to be so far gone that it's no longer viable. While the building is historically significant, it doesn't currently have the requisite integrity to justify discouraging a demolition.

Kaliszewski confirmed that since the front of 118 was being retained, the demolition request was for the back (Carroll Street) side.

There was general discussion regarding the historic value of the additional proposed demolitions.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the building at 11 N Franklin has historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, or as the work/product of an architect of note, but the building itself is not historically, architecturally or culturally significant. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the buildings at 502 E Washington, 506 E Washington, and 7 N Franklin have historic value based on architectural significance, cultural significance, historic significance, as the work/product of an architect of note, and/or as an intact or rare example of a certain architectural style or method of construction, and recommend further research. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Hill to recommend to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the building at 529 Woodward has no known historic value. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the rear of the building at 118 State Street has historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, or as the work/product of an architect of note, but the building itself is not historically, architecturally, or culturally significant. The motion passed on a voice vote.

A motion was made by Rummel and seconded by Kaliszewski to recommend to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the building at 122 State Street has historic value based on its cultural and historic significance, but does not have the architectural integrity to merit preservation. The motion passed on a voice vote.