

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: 6/1/20	
TITLE: Buildings Proposed for Demolition - 2020	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: 6/5/20	ID NUMBER: 58738	

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, Arvina Martin, and David McLean. Excused were: Betty Banks and Maurice Taylor.

SUMMARY:

Carolyn Freiwald, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak

Bailey began discussion of the property at 817 Williamson Street, and said that staff recommends a finding of no known historic value.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the building at 817 Williamson Street has no known historic value. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Regarding 202-208, 210, and 212 S Baldwin Street, Bailey said that the properties are owned by City Parks, which intends to convert the site to turf. At 202-208 S Baldwin Street, she pointed out the series of early Trachte buildings with shed roof extensions that are sited parallel to the former railroad spur and existing rail line. She said that they appear on a 1950 Sanborn map and 1955 aerial and appear to have been constructed by the railroad on this site. Regarding 210 S Baldwin Street, Bailey said that it appears in a 1937 aerial and 1942 Sanborn map. She said that it was part of a bulk oil station for the railroad and was also where vehicles servicing the railroad would come in and service the oil station. She said that 212 S Baldwin Street appears on a 1908 Sanborn map as the office and scales for Conklin & Sons Coal and Wood and by 1950, as the office of Lumberman's Supply.

Bailey said that she would recommend demolition criterion B for these properties as they relate to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, particularly to the more industrial railroad heritage. She said that there aren't a lot of properties that convey that particular history, which is not the pretty railroad history one sees in passenger depots, but a more functional type of resource of which not many remain. She continued that the buildings themselves retain integrity to be able to convey those historic associations and their orientation to the existing rail line and former spur that ran between the buildings. She said that to an extent, they are a rare remaining resource, but they don't reach the level of significance for demolition criterion C.

Andrzejewski asked Bailey if they could provide additional guidance such as requesting photographic documentation. Bailey said they could recommend documentation and exploration of salvage or relocation, as they've done in the past. She said that these properties were not included in previous surveys of the area, so we don't have a lot of information or documentation related to their history.

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Kaliszewski, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 202-208 S Baldwin Street, 210 S Baldwin Street, and 212 S Baldwin Street have historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment and industrial character, and the applicants should document the buildings prior to demolition and explore salvage or relocation. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Bailey said that the properties at 504 W Washington Avenue, 506 W Washington Avenue, 510 W Washington Avenue, 512 W Washington Avenue, 514 W Washington Avenue, 516 W Washington Avenue, 8 N Bassett Street, 10 N Bassett Street, and 14 N Bassett Street were being demolished for a mixed-use development. She said that of the properties, there are preservation files for three of them, including 510 W Washington Avenue which was a Claude and Starck design. She said that 10 N Bassett Street and 14 N Bassett Street also have preservation files and speak to a period of time where working class professionals were able to afford residences of this style. She said that the collection of buildings have had a variety of interventions over time and speak to a period of time when the middle and working classes were able to construct buildings of this size, though we have limited documentation and information related to these properties. She said that staff recommends a finding of demolition criterion B for these properties that are related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment and are representative as a group of the turn of the century development of Madison and the working and middle class neighborhoods that were constructed at that time.

Kaliszewski asked if there was a potential historic district or properties surveyed in the Historic Preservation Plan nearby. Bailey said that she was not familiar with a potential historic district in the area, and mentioned that there are some existing landmarks in the vicinity. She suggested that Kaliszewski might be thinking of the Mifflandia Neighborhood Plan, which the Landmarks Commission reviewed. Kaliszewski confirmed that was correct, and Bailey said that the proposed redevelopment is in line with the Mifflandia Plan recommendations. She explained that the plan didn't necessarily recommend that the area be designated as a local historic district or conservation district, and instead it was looking at ways of doing sensitive infill.

Kaliszewski said the Landmarks Commission has recently reviewed many projects similar to this and her comments remain the same in that they are slowly allowing developers to take these small vernacular areas and turn them into one big building. She said that this fits at least demolition criterion B, and while she doesn't think any of the individual buildings rise to the level of C, this is getting frustrating. Andrzejewski said that overall, there appears to be a loss of integrity to quite a few of the buildings and asked if Kaliszewski would say that as a group, the collection of buildings is what makes them significant. Kaliszewski agreed and said that they don't necessarily individually rise as landmarks by themselves, however the Landmarks Commission has slowly been reviewing these nodes of small vernacular houses and approving their demolition. She said that they may not retain architectural significance individually, but one could argue that they retain integrity as a group. She said that without looking at the buildings more closely, it is hard to say. Andrzejewski agreed and referenced Bailey's comments that there was not a lot of information on these properties.

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by McLean, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 504 W Washington Avenue, 506 W Washington Avenue, 510 W Washington Avenue, 512 W Washington Avenue, 514 W Washington Avenue, 516 W Washington Avenue, 8 N Bassett Street, 10 N Bassett Street, and 14 N Bassett Street have historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, but the buildings themselves are not historically, architecturally, or culturally significant. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the building at 817 Williamson Street has no known historic value. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Kaliszewski, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 202-208 S Baldwin Street, 210 S Baldwin Street, and 212 S Baldwin Street have historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment and industrial character, and the applicants should document the buildings prior to demolition and explore salvage or relocation. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by McLean, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 504 W Washington Avenue, 506 W Washington Avenue, 510 W Washington Avenue, 512 W Washington Avenue, 514 W Washington Avenue, 516 W Washington Avenue, 8 N Bassett Street, 10 N Bassett Street, and 14 N Bassett Street have historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison's built environment, but the buildings themselves are not historically, architecturally, or culturally significant. The motion passed by voice vote/other.