

From: [DAVID MCLEAN](#)
To: [Bailey, Heather](#); [Heiser-Ertel, Lauren](#)
Subject: August 16, 2021 Landmarks Commission Meeting, comments on Legistar File ID #66291
Date: Monday, August 16, 2021 4:40:10 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi Heather and Lauren,

Again, apologies that I cannot make this meeting, as it is the first referral to the last meeting regarding the structure at 101 N. Hamilton Street (Legistar File ID #66291). I have again prepared some late minute comments that I hope can be entered into tonight's meeting.

First and foremost, I'd like to thank the design team for considering and implementing most all of the Commission's comments presented at the last meeting. A very big thank you.

1. Windows: With regards to the most current submission, I do have a few comments I'd like to add to the discussion in my absence. Thank you for down sizing the windows on the Mifflin St. side (secondary elevation). Second floor looks much more respectful to the architectural language of the building. The per City Staff's report, I agree that the 2nd floor window (on the Mifflin St. elevation) proposed closest to Hamilton St. may be a little too close to the primary elevation (Hamilton St.). If this window must stay, care should be taken to keep it far enough away from the primary elevation that it doesn't appear that the store front expression is turning the corner onto Mifflin St. (secondary elevation).
2. Proposed cornice trim on Mifflin elevation; primary structure. Again, as Mifflin has historically been the secondary elevation (as back of house as this building can have) not convinced the cornice should turn the corner. I understand the desire for the continual cornice, if this building was being designed as a new building. However, there is no functional reason for this cornice trim and not adding the trim reinforces the story of the how this building has functioned throughout the history of its existence. Also, I am a little concerned about the "can of worms" that could be opened when trying to strategically demolish a layer of a rubble mass wall structure for the entire length of the wall.
3. Proposed cornice trim on Mifflin elevation; secondary structure. I am even less convinced that the second building (brick building that used to be the smoke house) even needs a horizontal expression. As this secondary structure identifies itself separately (through massing, proportions, and materiality) from the primary structure. The Mifflin St. elevation is almost a perfect square and is void of much detail. These two factors allow it to distinguish itself from the adjacent structures that flank it on both sides. I'd recommend replacing the 2nd floor windows, the first floor door, and brick in the current missing window all as proposed. I would consider looking at the current material expressions on this bumped out building. The façade is about 3/4 brick except for the large concrete form that bumps out and wraps the southwest corner. It looks like this element is being ignored/covered up. I think this element is a part of the building's history, and should be expressed if even subtly, and not ignored in an effort to try to make the elevation look "normal". At the very least, this surface could be the area for signage as opposed to introducing a full length horizontal expression that never existed. I understand this area is being noted as a cementitious parge coating, but I see that it bumps

out fairly significantly at the top of the parge where it rolls back to the brick near the second floor level. Make me wonder if is just a very, very thick coating, or if there is something more structural here (thinking solid concrete); especially since this was a smoke house.

Beyond what is noted above, I agree with City Staff's report and recommendations. Again, apologies for the late input.

Best regards,

David WJ Mc Lean, AIA
City of Madison Landmarks Commission