

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** October 6, 2021

**TITLE:** 101 N. Hamilton Street – Exterior Façade Updates in a Downtown Core (DC)-Zoned Property. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (67493)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Kevin Firchow, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** October 6, 2021

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Shane Bernau, Rafeeq Asad, Christian Harper, Russell Knudson and Jessica Klehr.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 6, 2021, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of exterior façade updates to 101 N. Hamilton Street. Registered and speaking in support was Emily Mader-Kiley, representing Angus Young Associates.

The existing sandstone building has been painted and neglected for many years. Plans include updates to the façade and interior improvements to bring life back to the East Mifflin Street façade where there is heavy pedestrian traffic, as well as its prominence on the Capitol Square. New windows will add more natural light, new paint will mimic the natural sandstone and should be similar to what it is now. It would be impossible to remove the existing paint without damaging the building. They are keeping the original opening on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor as it is original to the building. All other windows have been replaced previously and will be upgraded. The southeast opening will be filled in with brick so as to see there was once a window there, replacing the existing plywood.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Are you intending to do any awnings? The examples you have around the Square have awnings for signage.
  - No not at this time. We have to resubmit signage when we know the tenants. The Landmarks Commission liked the blade sign renderings and wanted to keep the building to its time; they felt the blade sign fits in to the area while also being a nod to the historic nature, which had a protruding sign originally. We are proposing the blade sign at the front and another on E. Mifflin Street above the door.
- Are you replacing the headers in the sills with a cast stone element or just painting a slightly different color?
  - We are not replacing any original headers, simply repainting them on the front and East Mifflin façades. The new windows will have new cast stone to match. There is an existing opening on

the second floor for a door with a header there original to the building that we will reuse for one of the new windows.

- The brick infill of the one window is an improvement over boarded up wood, acknowledging the staircase behind it, it can be a neat detail in front of the stairs but it comes with maintenance. How does everyone feel about the brick infill?
- I think windows with a stair behind is more interesting than boarded up brick, but because it's taller than the window, things don't line up anyway, it's an oddity on its own. I question making the header and sill a different color if it's not going to be a window.
  - The owner is happy to add a window there. But painting the header and sill was something the Landmarks Commission requested. In its historical nature it would have been differentiated and should stand out as a previous opening.
- The strip where it says signage, is that material or paint?
  - We are proposing a composite material there that would wrap that area and to match the color of the paint. It is a typical signage backer, but instead of it being part of the signage package we're submitting it as part of the exterior improvements.
- Could it wrap around?
  - We did have that originally, but the Landmarks Commission removed that. They wanted to differentiate the two areas and have it mimic what would have been a wood band added to the exterior of the building.
- I don't agree with the value of the historical context of that window. Aesthetically it rubs me the wrong way.
- What are we going to see with this window? It may make sense to have it spandrel glass.
  - That window would look into the staircase to the basement used as storage. There's no glamour there.
- I'd endorse the window, the molding trim should wrap around.
- All the other windows are detailed with additional mullions, these two are just one piece of glass. I would request you continue that horizontal mullion on the other two windows where the arch springs.
  - These windows are remaining as is, that's what is currently there.
- (Staff) Regarding the Landmarks approval, this could run counter to their motion. Would this Commission have a different motion if this was found to be not consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness?

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).

The motion requested a window in place of brick infill, with possibility for spandrel glass or sympathetic blinds. This condition could be amended if there are significant objections with regard to the window and stairwell relative to the Landmarks Commission's decision, which should be final.