

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

TITLE: 101 N Hamilton St - Exterior Alterations to
a Designated Madison Landmark
(Draper Brothers Block); 4th Ald.
Dist.

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

DATED: 8/17/21

PRESENTED: 8/16/21

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

ADOPTED:

POF:

ID NUMBER: 66291

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

SUMMARY:

Emily Mader-Kiley, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey explained that this item was referred from the last Landmarks Commission meeting, and staff has been working with the applicant on a revised proposal. In looking at the proposed modifications, she pointed out that on the front of the building, the basement window appears to be enclosed. She also mentioned the front deck area, which will become a planter of largely the same size and form. On the E Mifflin Street façade of the stone structure, the applicant is proposing to repair an existing window and modify a former doorway on the 2nd floor to be a window opening, in addition to punching two additional window openings on the 2nd floor and two storefront windows on the first floor of the stone structure. She pointed out the belt band that wraps around the side of the building and the limestone base course that matches the proposed color of the structure and is now located below the sill of the proposed new windows. For the brick portion of the structure, she pointed out the belt band and signage band area, as well as the existing concrete area on the corner. The applicant is proposing to introduce additional cementitious coating across the rest of the brick portion of the building to make it appear continuous. She said the applicant will replace the existing windows on the upper floor, punch a new window on the first floor, and brick in the window currently covered in wood. She said they will replace the nonhistoric doors with new doors that are more period appropriate to the structure. She mentioned the proposed signage locations and noted that final signage will depend upon the tenants of the building. She discussed the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards and said that staff recommends approval with the condition that the final sign package be submitted to the Landmarks Commission for approval. She said that while she did not include it in her recommended conditions, she did call out the new window opening proposed on the west end of the 2nd floor on the E Mifflin Street façade. She said that it may not be stepped back enough to retain the character-defining elements of the primary façade; it may be too close and create a continuous pattern of windows that wrap around the side of the structure.

Andrzejewski said that this is a complicated project and reminded the group that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are the guiding standards they must use, not any personal aesthetic reactions.

Kaliszewski asked what the new windows are made of.

Arnesen said that this is a huge improvement over the first iteration they reviewed at the last meeting. He referenced Commissioner McLean's written comments regarding the cornice trim on the E Mifflin Street side of the building and asked why staff thought it could be approved. Bailey said that it is of a style of signage band

for a storefront that one would find on a 19th c. commercial structure. She said that with rehabilitation, there is some latitude for including a period-appropriate form that is obviously new because it will read as new as opposed to creating a false sense of history. She referenced the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines and said that if one is introducing a new element, it should be simple and not overly ornate, and what is proposed is a simplified form. She said that this is a simple structure, and we don't know what was on it historically. She said that this was on the line, along with a lot of aspects of this project, in terms of whether it meets the standards or goes too far. She said that her analysis was that it was not overly ornate and was period appropriate for the existing historic structure.

Mader-Kiley said that the existing basement window will not be touched, it was simply missed in the renderings. In response to Kaliszewski's earlier question, she said they are proposing aluminum storefront windows for the first floor and the other new windows will be single width double-hung aluminum windows by Gerkin, though they are open to suggestions. Kaliszewski said that she was concerned about the original openings having the same aluminum windows as the windows going in the new punched in window openings. She said that it looks like the existing front windows are wood and suggested they be replaced with wood. Mader-Kiley said that it is not ideal to put wood windows in a commercial building and suggested a fiberglass line from Pella that looks like wood. Andrzejewski referenced the false sense of history created by making the windows appear they are all of one era. Bailey said that it is also about the compatibility with the character of the existing structure. Kaliszewski explained that when the commission reviews window replacement projects, they typically direct applicants to replace windows with something similar to what is existing. She said that in this case, it is taking a lot of the character out of what is currently there and was wondering if there was a way to differentiate the original window openings from the non-original openings. Arnesen pointed out that the original window openings on the front are arched as opposed to rectangular like the new windows on the side. Kaliszewski pointed out the rectangular historic window openings on the E Mifflin Street side.

Arnesen asked if the applicant was amenable to rearranging the new window openings on the E Mifflin Street side, in response to comments from staff and Commissioner McLean that the far west window is too close to the front façade. Mader-Kiley said the owner would like to keep the window for tenant desirability. Arnesen asked if they could reconfigure and pull it away from the corner rather than eliminate it. Mader-Kiley said she didn't want the space between the windows to be too narrow in order to maintain the structural integrity of the building, so the only way to pull it back from the front would be to eliminate it. Andrzejewski asked if staff had a suggestion on pulling it back or making it smaller. Bailey said that she was talking about removing it. She pointed out that this space has a window on the front façade, so it won't be a windowless room. She said that if the window is removed, the window pattern of having a larger window below and narrow window centered above will continue over from the primary façade, with new windows significantly set back from the primary façade. Arnesen agreed that it is a small space, and there are still plenty of windows on the 2nd floor if they eliminate the one in question.

Bailey read Commissioner McLean's written comments that he submitted in his absence.

Regarding the parged area, Mader-Kiley said that she couldn't speak to whether it was fully concrete, as McLean suggested, and she assumed it was just parge coating. She said they are happy to leave it as is, but the owner of the building would like it to look nicer. She said there is a balance in leaving some messiness that is historical while also making this a rentable, nice-looking building. She said they are also happy to eliminate the band. She explained that their original intention was to use it to separate the two different paint colors; now that they have changed the color scheme, the band still adds pedestrian scale to that side and breaks up the façade. She said that it is not ideal to remove the new window opening on the first floor of the brick structure because it is dark in the back area and they want to add light.

A motion was made by Taylor to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the final sign package be submitted to the Landmarks Commission for approval. Arnesen suggested a friendly amendment to add conditions regarding the removal of the window opening on the west end of the 2nd floor on the E Mifflin Street elevation and for the parged area on the E Mifflin Street elevation to remain as it is and not be extended, per Commissioner McLean's comments.

Bailey asked if Arnesen was okay with punching in a new window opening on the first floor of the brick building to the left of the door, and Arnesen confirmed that window was okay.

Taylor did not agree to Arnesen's suggested amendments to the motion. He said that he liked the additional window on the 2nd floor. He said that the applicants are doing this work to lease the space, and he understood they wanted more natural light and Capitol views in order to keep interest and keep the space leased.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

A motion was made by Arnesen to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the final sign package be submitted to the Landmarks Commission for approval and the window opening shown in plans on the west end of the 2nd floor on the E Mifflin Street elevation be eliminated.

Bailey asked about retaining the parged area as is. Arnesen said that he would not include that in the motion.

Kaliszewski said that she did not think that windows punched into the first floor met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and therefore did not believe the proposal met the standards.

Andrzejewski said that she was on the fence, specifically due to standards 2 & 9 relating to historic materials. She said that the staff report helped her when considering whether punching windows affects essential character-defining features.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Taylor asked staff to speak to why they recommended approval of the project. Bailey said that the standards are for rehabilitation of a property, as opposed to preservation, and rehabilitation looks to allow appropriate changes that are not to the detriment of the historic character of the existing structure. In this case, she said that means minimal changes to the primary façade, which is where the most decorative detail tends to be, along with the essential character of the structure. She said that on the side, there is precedence for making alterations to the structure as long as they are significantly stepped back from the primary façade in order to mitigate effects to the character-defining part of the structure. Taylor echoed Bailey's point that this is rehabilitation and changes are acceptable. Arnesen said that the process shouldn't be so onerous for a historic building to be an income-producing property so that owners can invest in, maintain, and ensure a future for historic buildings. He said that isn't part of the standards, but they should find a way to make this project viable. Andrzejewski said that it is a complicated project, particularly because of the secondary façade on E Mifflin Street that was probably never meant to be a façade. She said that the commission's jurisdiction is clear, and they are trying to follow the standards.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Taylor, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that the final sign package be submitted to the Landmarks Commission for approval and the window opening shown in plans on the west end of the 2nd floor on the E Mifflin Street elevation be eliminated. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 - Arvina Martin; Maurice D. Taylor and Richard B. Arnesen

Noes: 1 - Katherine N. Kaliszewski

Excused: 1 - David W.J. McLean

Non Voting: 1 - Anna Andrzejewski