



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Amended LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, November 25, 2013

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

Marsha A. Rummel; David W.J. McLean; Stuart Levitan; Jason T. Fowler;
Michael J. Rosenblum; Christina Slattery and Erica Fox Gehrig

Fowler left during the discussion of Item 3.

APPROVAL OF November 11, 2013 MINUTES

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the Minutes of November 11, 2013. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Levitan explained that he serves on the Board of Directors for the Madison Development Committee/Housing Committee for development on South Park Street.

REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Items Taken out of Order

3. [32025](#) 857 South Shore Drive - Replace windows. 13th Ald. Dist.
Contact: Sindhu Raju

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the replacement of windows with review and final approval by staff and at staff's discretion may be returned to the Landmarks Commission and that one window be retained on the premises for future restoration and reconstruction, that the windows not be a slider type, and that the applicant find a window with horizontal muntins. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

4. [32024](#) 734 Jenifer Street - Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Replace windows.
6th Ald. Dist.
Contact: Ben Prosch

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by McLean, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of 5 windows. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. [32027](#) 121, 123, 127 West Gilman Street - Mansion Hill Historic District -
Construct new apartment buildings. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Dan Seeley

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the building located at 121 West Gilman Street giving significant weight to standards 33.19(5)(c)3.a - f in the Ordinance. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

The Commission discussed the condition issues regarding 127. Rummel wanted clarification that the structural reports were professional given that the findings were based on visual inspections. Gehrig noted that property owners in historic districts that have rehabilitated their properties are asking for consistency and that she cannot excuse the past 20 years of neglect.

McLean and Rosenblum agreed that the condition of the building and the lack of maintenance is a major consideration.

Slattery explained that the building is still contributing and the lack of maintenance is troubling.

Rummel explained that the owner of a single-family residence has a "use value" relationship with their property where they use it and live in it and care for it along the way while a commercial property owner has an "exchange value" relationship. This presents an unfair perspective when applying the Ordinance for a small property owner compared to a large property owner. Rummel explained that the proposal does not meet Standard f.

Levitan asked that the Commission discuss the relocation of 123 to 113 West Gorham and if the site at 113 is an acceptable receiver site.

Rummel asked how the Steensland relocation issue is different than this issue. There was discussion about whether the receiver site should be discussed before the appropriateness of the relocation.

McLean explained that the receiver site seems appropriate for new development especially if it is a residential structure that is appropriate to the context.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rosenblum, to approve the site at 113 West Gorham Street as an appropriate location for the existing structure located at 123 West Gilman Street with the staff report conditions. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

There was little discussion related to the relocation of 123.

Rosenblum explained that he could be agreeable to relocation for the right development proposal.

Levitan suggested that the Commission discuss what constitutes a compatible building volume in the VRA, if the average volume in the VRA is 65,000 cubic square feet.

John Martens clarified how his calculations were prepared.

McLean explained that 3 buildings side by side will be perceived as larger mass than one of those building which will impact the area negatively.

Gehrig asked about height in feet compared to measurement in stories and how the zoning related to this proposal.

Staff explained that the proposed development does not require a rezoning and is submitted in compliance with zoning. There was general discussion about the heights of stories allowed by Zoning and appropriate heights in feet.

There was general discussion about volume and how the current proposal seems too tall and large related to the VRA.

McLean explained that the buildings seem wide and that the resulting proportion and rhythm is problematic.

Related to the adjacency of the new development to the landmark site at 120 West Gorham Street, staff explained there is a 30 foot rear yard behind the proposed building and a 40+ rear yard behind the landmark building.

A motion as made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the character of the adjacent landmark. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Staff explained that there are architectural issues that need to be addressed by the project team to respond to the Ordinance and provide an architectural response that is coherent.

McLean explained that the side and rear elevations need material treatments similar to the front elevations, the scale of the entrance elements seem too large, the window proportions need work and the overall massing and scale is large compared to other building in the VRA.

Rummel asked if the sliding doors at the balconies are appropriate. Fry noted that the doors would not be sliders.

Staff explained that the construction method could be changed to reduce the overall height. Fry noted that the associated costs of a different construction method would not be feasible and are typically not feasible for other similarly sized projects around the City.

Zellers asked if the project team researched entering the garage from Gorham Street instead of Gilman Street. Fry noted that previous schemes had reviewed that option.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to Refer the additional items (demolition of 127, new development on West Gilman, land division, and relocation of 123) to the meeting of December 9. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

2. [32076](#)

123 West Gilman/113 West Gorham Street - Mansion Hill Historic District
- Relocation of an existing structure. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Dan Seeley

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rosenblum, to approve the site at 113 West Gorham Street as an appropriate location for a building like that of 123 West Gilman Street with the staff report conditions that the demolition permit cannot be obtained until the entire redevelopment project on West Gilman and West Gorham Streets has obtained all other necessary approvals. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to refer the additional

items (demolition of 127, new development on West Gilman, land division, and relocation of 123) to the meeting of December 9. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

ADVISORY OPINION

- 5. [31119](#) 17, 19, 25 North Webster and 201 East Mifflin Streets - Construction adjacent to Landmark - deconstruct 4 homes and construct 6-story, 58-unit apartment building. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Fred Rouse, Rouse Management

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to Refer this review to the December 9 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 6. [17835](#) Landmarks Ordinance Revisions

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by McLean, to Refer the discussion of Ordinance issues to the next meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

REGULAR BUSINESS

- 7. [28640](#) Buildings Proposed for Demolition - 2013

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, that the Landmarks Commission notes with concern the continuing loss of railroad related properties in regard to 304 Dow Court and that there is no known historic value related to the properties at 580 Toepfer Avenue and 2029 and 2037 South Park Street. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

- 8. [07804](#) Secretary's Report

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Gehrig, to Adjourn the meeting at 11:30 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.