

# City of Madison

# Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, November 8, 2010	4:45 PM	215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
		Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

## CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

#### Present: 4 -

Christina Slattery; Daniel J. Stephans; Robin M. Taylor and Erica Fox Gehrig

Excused: 3 -

Stuart Levitan; Bridget R. Maniaci and Michael J. Rosenblum

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Staff suggested that the minutes be clarified regarding the qualification of experience by contractors in the specifications for the Edgewater Hotel redevelopment. Ms. Gehrig suggested that the minutes state that the front entrance proposed design is based on a rendering and was not actually built. Ms. Gehrig also suggested that the minutes state the Common Council actions that required the Landmarks Commission to review the historic issues of the Edgewater project.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Taylor, to APPROVE the October 25, 2010 minutes with revisions listed above. This motion was approved by a voice vote/other.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

#### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS UNDER THE ETHICS CODE

Staff explained that this action will be included on all future agendas pending approval by the Common Council.

#### SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS

1. <u>20331</u> City Development Process Improvement Initiative - 2010

Brad Murphy, Director of the Planning Division, described the documents for review and requested comments from the Landmarks Commission.

There was general discussion about the documents.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Gehrig, to TABLE the discussion on this matter until later in the meeting. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

#### CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

2. <u>20327</u> 110 West Gilman - Mansion Hill Historic District - Exterior alteration involving window replacement

#### Contact: Joe Korb

Joe Korb, 110 West Gilman Street, presented the proposed window replacement project. He explained that the existing windows were no longer adequate for function, security and ventilation. He requested replacement of the existing casement windows with wide double hung units.

Don JAcobson, 7277 South 10th Street, Oak Creek, WI registered in support and was available to answer questions.

Mr. Stephans asked if the Applicant had considered replacement of casements in kind. Mr. Korb explained that he had not because the existing casements open out over the front steps to the building and create a dangerous condition.

Gene Devitt, Chairman of Mansion Hill Neighborhood District, 28 East Gilman Street, registered to speak in support of the project. He explained that the proposed vinyl window is a good product.

Ms. Slattery asked if there were any historic photos of the property to determine if the windows of the second floor had previously been replaced. She stated that the replacement windows should retain the vertical appearance and prefered the 1/3:2/3 division of the sash.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Taylor, to APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work with the following conditions: 1. The Applicant must provide Staff with documents showing double hung windows with simulated divided lights and exterior muntins with a custom wide vertical muntin at the center to simulate the appearance of the existing mullion. The material of the window can be high-quality vinyl, but the Commission strongly encourages the use of wood windows.

2. The Applicant must discuss existing single casement window replacement with Staff.

The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

3. 1138 Jenifer Street - Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Exterior alteration involving change in roof appearance.

Contact: Monte Haufle

Monte Haufle, Contractor, 1117D Jonathon Drive, presented the proposed project. He explained that the changed roof configuration would allow gutters and downspouts to help direct water which would remedy any further water damage to the building and the neighboring building.

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed exterior alteration. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

## **INFORMATIONAL REVIEW**

4. 723 State Street - Development adjacent to a Local Landmark - St. Paul Catholic 20329 Center and Residential College Redevelopment Contact: Robert Shipley, AIA

> Mark Landgraf, 5964 Executive Drive, and Rev. Eric Nielsen, 723 State Street, briefly introduced the proposed project. Bob Shipley, Architect, 2211 Parmenter Street, Middleton, described the location and character of State Street. Matthew Alderman, Designer, 9418 North Green Bay Road, Brown Deer, described the exterior envelope design.

> Scott Hachl, 2223 Montana Avenue, Sun Prairie; Kimberly Burkart, 221 South High Point Road; Nico Fassino, 129 West Gorham Street; and Judy Karofsky, 317 North Pinckney Street registered in support, but did not wish to speak.

Ron Trachtenberg, 33 East Main Street, registered in support and was available to answer auestions.

There was general discussion about the proposed project.

Mr. Stephans and Ms. Gehrig requested additional views from the street and from the Capitol

20330

showing the existing conditions and the proposed design. Ms. Slattery asked how the proposed building related to the Ordinance criteria. Mr. Stephans, Ms. Gehrig, and Ms. Taylor expressed concern about the height of the proposed building in relation to the adjacent Landmark.

#### **Received an Informational Presentation**

#### SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Taylor to take Item 1, ID 20331 off the table for further discussion. This motion passed by a voice vote/other.

1. 2033

20331 City Development Process Improvement Initiative - 2010

The Commission discussed the documents and comments. Due to the deadline for comments, the Commission agreed to have Staff compile their comments into a DRAFT document based on discussions.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Taylor, to APPROVE the following DRAFT comments and have them forwarded to the Economic Development Committee:

1. Keep the Urban Design Commission (UDC) and Landmarks Commission (LC) separate, as they each have specific expertise on different issues.

2. The super-majority requirement for an appeal of a LC decision should be kept as it is similar to several other appeals of commissions, including but not limited to an appeal of a Plan Commission decision on conditional uses.

3. The Landmarks Commission agrees that when projects need to be seen by both the UDC and the LC, that the Landmarks Commission should review a project first.

a. The Landmarks Commission agrees that minor changes made to a project as a result of a subsequent review at the UDC could be approved by staff as long as they are consistent with either the Landmarks Commission Procedures (adopted with revisions July 2010) or with the general discussion from the LC review.

b. The LC agrees that there should be a review and clarification of the
Commissions' roles when projects require review by both LC and UDC. These
clarifications should be added to each Commission's procedure document.
c. City staff should inform applicants that when both LC and UDC review is
required, that applicants should focus their submittals and presentations to

center on issues to which each commission is most concerned.

4. Landmarks Commissioners stressed the importance of re-issuing a handbook that puts the Landmarks Ordinance and Procedures into layman's terms. This booklet should be revised and available to all applicants.

5. Landmarks Commissioners stated the importance of neighborhood participation, noting that their feedback is often critical in helping the Landmarks Commission make decisions.

6. Landmarks Commissioners appreciated the idea that additional training and education for new Commissioners would be very helpful.

a. Commissioners talked about having educational speakers come to meetings with short agendas to hear information on new construction

methods, techniques, and materials to better inform the Commissioners about new solutions and ideas. Topics could include discussion about windows, siding, maintenance, repair methods, among others. Invited speakers could also be experts from the State Historical Society or other groups.

7. Commissioners didn't appreciate the quotes used throughout the document, and if the quotes must remain, the Commissioners would like to add one:

"Tourism does not go to a city that has lost its soul." Arthur Frommer Preservation Forum [1988]

8. Please revise the partial sentences on page 7 of the Development Process Improvement Initiative draft report dated 10-18-10.

9. Please enlarge the maps and flow charts so they are legible.

The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

5. <u>17835</u> Landmarks Ordinance Revisions

Staff explained that the City Attorney's Office has been working on the revisions and in doing so, has found a few more that would help clarify the Ordinance. Staff requested that the Commissioners review section 33.19(6)(a).

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Taylor, to REREFER the discussion to the Landmarks Commission meeting of November 22, 2010. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

6. <u>17150</u> Buildings proposed for demolition - 2010

There was no discussion about the proposed demolitions.

7. 07804 Secretary's Report

Staff explained that the Certified Local Government Historic Preservation sub-grant applications would be mailed later in the week.

The Commissioners reviewed the DRAFT application. Ms. Slattery suggested that there be a sample submission in the Ordinance guideline materials.

Staff reviewed available times to schedule a tour of 517 South Baldwin.

Staff explained that the Downtown Plan draft recommendations would be discussed at the next meeting and reminded the Commissioners to bring their Downtown Plan booklets for the discussion.

There was no action taken.

## ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to ADJOURN at 7:10 P.M. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.