

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: November 13, 2013

TITLE: 632 Howard Place – Five-Story Apartment Building, 2nd Ald. Dist. (31893)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: November 13, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 13, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an advisory recommendation for a 5-story apartment building located at 632 Howard Place. Appearing on behalf of the project was Mark M. Smith, representing Lake Towne Apartments, LLC. Registered and speaking in opposition were Cheryl Elkinton, representing Vegan Haven Central, Inc.; and Franny Ingebritson. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak was Alicia Lux. Smith introduced the student housing project, noting the basic strategy of having the four-story element of the building correspond to the neighboring buildings on Howard Place and Frances Street. They see this as a fabric/background building of the neighborhood and not a featured piece. However, they are focusing most of the budget (materials) on Howard Court, the two facades that face north and northeast; it will be primarily masonry in light color, with a strong element of brick and masonry on the back of the building, which will complement the nice interior court formed to the south of this site. The balconies are classic French where the patio doors can open with a protection railing. There is a balcony above the fourth floor for the two apartments on the fifth floor, roughly 5-foot wide along the Howard Place side of the building. There is a low pitched, hip roof not really visible from any vantage point in the neighborhood. The stone will be a better quality and more polished than what is represented in the elevations. There is no automobile parking at this location. There will be plenty of bicycle parking in the building’s basement. Designated moped parking spots will be minimal.

Franny Ingebritson spoke in opposition. She stated that last May 13th the Director of the Department of Planning spoke to the Landmarks Commission about issues surrounding the Waterfront Place. He told the Commission that “when it came through the Urban Design Commission for an informational presentation, we as staff stated we really can’t support this project at this time because it is taking down three older buildings. But we also did say that when this project comes in with a really great design that might be a justifiable reason for taking down these three older buildings.” He then added “that was stated at the UDC.” It sounds like Mr. Cover’s statement suggests that this Commission would be comfortable at that time ignoring the newly minted Downtown Plan that took four years and enormous cost. Just to dismiss it all, if the developer comes in with a really great design. She hoped that was not true; that doesn’t reflect the vision of the residents of Madison. As a

result of the Waterfront development three contributing buildings were demolished, now this Howard Place where they want to demolish two more contributing buildings. She showed the contributing buildings that make up part of this historic fabric.

Cheryl Elkinton spoke in opposition. She sees traffic problems and buildings with potential losses. She would like to slow traffic with other options, possibly digital cameras. She would prefer doing work on existing buildings rather than demolishing and replacing them. It's a lot of waste of materials, there's already so much student housing that are still sitting. Reduce construction noise, dust.

Heather Stouder of the Planning Division stated that staff is not recommending approval of this project but want feedback on the design of the proposed building. Specific elements include the idea of four-sided architecture, concerns about the use of fiber cement on most of the interior of the building, the 5th floor and roof element, and consistent color of stone on the base. Smith indicated it is intended to be a darker stone to read as a consistent vertical element down to the ground. Stouder reiterated they would prefer a consistently colored base.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I like the actual way the 5th floor is treated as a setback. It's a play on how you get design on some of the buildings in this area.
- The drawings don't even do justice to how tight this neighborhood is. I would never go down there unless I was a student. Unless you have a reason to go all the way down to the end of this court, nobody is ever going to see this building. I think the design is appropriate because you're never going to get far enough away from it to get any kind of perspective on the building. Except for that middle view, which is what I really noticed when I drove down there, the bases on these buildings are so high. The only way you can experience this building is walking along it. I would recommend dropping the base down a little bit. To me would make the building a little bit less fortress-like. I never realized that any public streets existed like this in Madison.
- I don't know that you need that third material. If you brought the brick all the way down it would unify. I would test that and see if that's enough. I like the contrast of the two façades. I think this building does fit with the rhythm and size of the area.
- The Commission agreed with Heather's concerns stated and within the staff report regarding four-sided architecture.

The Chair noted that staff has said the demolition issues will be decided by the Landmarks Commission and the Plan Commission. He also noted that Mr. Cover is not a member of this Commission and by no means speaks for this Commission.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 26, 2013

TITLE: 632 Howard Place – Langdon Street
National Historic District – Demolish
two buildings and construct a 33-unit
apartment building. 2nd Ald. District.
Contact: Mark Smith (31212)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 26, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Jason Fowler, Christina Slattery, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Erica Fox Gehrig and David McLean excused.

SUMMARY:

Staff explained that this is an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the proposal for the property, but at this time the Landmarks Commission should comment on the historic value of this property and what comments the Commission would like to send to the Plan Commission. Staff explained that it is possible that a Plan Commission member could send the proposal back to the Landmarks Commission for a formal review.

Rebecca Anderson, registering in support and available to answer questions. Ms Anderson explained that she owns many properties in proximity to the properties involved in the proposed development. Anderson explained that the properties are deteriorating, the wiring is poor, and the structural reports show the buildings are sinking. She said the new building is a nice looking building and will replace the buildings at 622 and 632 Howard Place. She explained the property at 635 is going to get new windows will be brought back its original appearance. Anderson has a grand vision for the inclusion of shops along Howard Place. Lazy Jane's has decided that they would like to use one of Anderson's spaces for another café location.

Mark M. Smith, representing Lake Towne Apartments, LLC, registering in support wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Mr. Smith explained that the buildings at 622 and 632 have outlived their useful life. The owners have a commitment to rehabilitate 615 and 635 Howard Place and a strong commitment to construct a new structure that is compatible with the Langdon Street neighborhood as it relates to scale, material and a level of detail and size and detail of openings.

Smith explained the structural report. The main structure of 632 has differential settlement. Foundations were not sufficient with 3 or 4 moving parts to that structure that is now evident with cracking. He explained this was a non-invasive report and that many conditions were not visible. A column or load bearing wall in the center of the building was removed and now the building is sagging. Both structures are in decline. They are scheduled to appear before Plan Commission on October 14, 2013 and are talking with neighborhood next week. They would like feedback on both demolition and individual design elements.

Staff explained that Planning staff toured the buildings proposed for demolition and suggested that a structural engineer provide a structural condition report.

Levitan explained that the Landmarks Commission has great concern about demolition in historic districts especially about demolition of contributing structures. Levitan explained that the loss of 3 contributing structures related to the Waterfront development and potentially 2 contributing structures for this proposal will mark a significant change in the Langdon area.

Levitan explained that it is important to restore and enhance the holdings in the Langdon area or eventually you will lose the historic district if contributing structures continue to be demolished.

Levitan suggests a higher level of investigation of the structural systems to give a better assessment of the condition. Anderson explained that health, safety and welfare are concerns and that the building exits lead right into the road.

Franny Ingebritson, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Ms. Ingebritson expressed her opposition to the demolition. 622 Howard Place is the last bungalow in the area. The Stanley Hanks bungalows were built to house mainly University faculty and have all been demolished. 632 started out as a single-family home designed by Claude & Starck. She believes that everything can be restored and that demolition/neglect should not be rewarded in this way. Ingebritson found the following on the City of Madison's website 2010: "The City of Madison's Comprehensive Plan was adopted in January 2006 since that time several new neighborhood, neighborhood development and special area plans have been adopted or amended as supplements through the Comprehensive Plan but there have been no formal amendments to the plan itself except to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan remains an accurate expression of community goals." She explained that the Downtown Plan and the recommendations for the Langdon Street National Register Historic District will be used by policymakers to review this proposal. She explained that Director Cover came to the Landmarks Commission and he stated that the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Plan had equal weight and that the Neighborhood Plans and the Downtown Plan covers specific areas because they are more detailed versions of the Comprehensive Plan. The Waterfront/Iota Court project is an unfortunate example of what will continue to happen in the Langdon Street National Register Historic District. The renderings of the proposed building show that Langdon will be totally different. You could be anywhere.

ACTION:

No action was taken. This was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION.**



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, August 26, 2013

4:45 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 5 -

Marsha A. Rummel; Stuart Levitan; Jason T. Fowler; Michael J. Rosenblum and Christina Slattery

Excused: 2 -

David W.J. McLean and Erica Fox Gehrig

APPROVAL OF August 12, 2013 MINUTES

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to Approve the Minutes of August 12, 2013. Slattery requested a revision. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Slattery explained that she is a resident of Sunset Hills, but this will not impair her impartial judgment during the discussion of Item #1.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

1. 30377

Adopting the Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval of the Hoyt Park Joint Neighborhood Plan with staff comments/suggested amendments to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

REQUEST FOR ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

2. **31241** 240 West Gilman Street - Designated Madison Landmark - Signage for Side Door Grill. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Jeremy Cynkar, Destree Design Architects, Inc.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to Refer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION for final approval. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. **31295** 1500 Rutledge Street - Marquette Bungalows Historic District - Replace screened porch. 6th Ald. Dist.
Contact: Jim Murphy

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with staff recommendations. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION

4. **31212** 632 Howard Place - Langdon Street National Historic District - Demolish two buildings and construct a 33 unit apartment building. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Mark Smith

No action taken. Received an Informational Presentation.

REGULAR BUSINESS

5. **28640** Buildings Proposed for Demolition - 2013

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to Recommend to the PLAN COMMISSION that the numerous buildings on the 900 Block of East Washington Avenue (939 East Washington Avenue, 925 East Washington Avenue, 905 East Washington Avenue, 910 East Main Street, 924 East Main Street, 922 East Main Street, and 945 East Washington Avenue) have structural integrity, historic value for reuse, and usefulness and relevance as a commercial asset in the Capitol East District; and therefore, the Landmarks Commission opposes demolition until there is a comprehensive proposal for the future use of the site. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the building at 124 North Livingston Street has no known historic value. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 622 and 632 Howard Place are both contributing structures in the Langdon Street National Register Historic

Districts, that one was designed by a master architectural firm, that one is the last bungalow in the area, that this proposal goes against the recommendations for the area in the Downtown Plan, and that the buildings appear to be structurally sound; and therefore, the Landmarks Commission strongly opposes their demolition and the accelerated pace of redevelopment within the historic district. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

6. 07804

Secretary's Report

Communication from Elizabeth Miller. Ms. Miller is looking for our input on any cultural resources, historic resources in the development corridor as noted on the map. Staff will respond.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Fowler, to Adjourn the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

MADISON TRUST



for Historic Preservation



Ginny Way
President

John Martens
Vice President

Michelle Martin
Treasurer

Robin Taylor
Secretary

Sam Breidenbach
Daniel Einstein
Jeri Grogg
Steve Holtzman
Larry Lester
Vicki Siekert
James Thomack
Roman Vetter
Amy Wyatt

Jason Tish
Executive Director

11 November 2013

Comments RE: Urban Design Commission agenda (Nov 13) items #1 and #8

Item #1 - 511 North Carroll Street

We fully support the Alano Society's proposal for alterations to their Landmark house at 511 N. Carroll St. The proposed changes would be more appropriate to the house's style, and would enhance the character of the Mansion Hill Historic District.

We support the use of Façade Improvement Grant funds for this project, and we recognize that the extension of the target areas of this program to include commercially-zoned city Landmarks, while it doesn't benefit all city-designated historic properties, is a step in the right direction for city support of properties it encumbers with the Landmark designation. Many cities offer some type of relief or subsidization in exchange for the requirement that private property owners abide by additional zoning requirements of historic designation which often adds time and/or expense to rehabilitation or maintenance projects on these properties. Madison has taken small steps toward relief for these owners, including this extension of the Façade Improvement Grant program and waiver of encroachment fees for landmark buildings. We encourage Madison officials and commissions to approve further benefits for owners of historically designated properties.

Item #8 - 632-622 Howard Place

We do not support this proposal because it calls for demolition of two Contributing buildings in the federal Langdon Street Historic District.

If these two buildings are demolished the number of Contributing buildings in the Langdon Street historic District will be reduced from 74 to 72 (the recent approval of *The Waterfront* development reduced the number from 77 to 74).

Contributing v. Non-Contributing

Federal guidelines for historic districts require the designation of each property in a historic district to be designated "contributing" or "non-contributing" to the historic significance of the district. A property "contributes" to the district if it adds to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which the historic district is significant. A contributing property must also retain its 'integrity.' In other words, the property must retain enough of its historic physical features to convey its significance as part of the district. Historic districts are analogous to jigsaw puzzles – taken together, the pieces tell a bigger story, but as pieces are removed the picture becomes less clear.

Downtown Plan

This proposal directly contradicts recommendations for the Langdon Neighborhood in the Downtown Plan. Three Recommendations in the Downtown Plan are relevant to this proposal:

Dedicated to the Conservation of Madison's Historic Places

P.O. Box 296 Madison, Wisconsin 53701-0296 608-441-8864 info@madisonpreservation.org

MADISON TRUST



for **Historic Preservation**



- *Recommendation 77:* Encourage preservation and rehabilitation of *contributing* historic buildings.
- *Recommendation 78:* Encourage relatively higher-density infill and redevelopment that is compatible with the historic context in scale and design on *non-landmark locations and sites that are not identified as contributing* to the National Register Historic District.

We would also caution against accepting condition arguments in support of demolition in historic districts. If the poor condition of a historic building can be used to justify demolition by the party who has owned the building for several years, then approval of demolition based on that justification will serve as a reward for those who would prefer demolition over maintenance of historic buildings.

Respectfully,

Jason Tish
Executive Director, Madison Trust for Historic Preservation

Dedicated to the Conservation of Madison's Historic Places

P.O. Box 296 Madison, Wisconsin 53701-0296 608-441-8864 info@madisonpreservation.org

MADISON TRUST



for Historic Preservation



Ginny Way
President

John Martens
Vice President

Michelle Martin
Treasurer

Robin Taylor
Secretary

Sam Breidenbach
Daniel Einstein
Jeri Grogg
Steve Holtzman
Larry Lester
Vicki Siekert
James Thomack
Roman Vetter
Amy Wyatt

Jason Tish
Executive Director

11 November 2013

Comments RE: Plan Commission agenda (Nov 18) item #8

Item #8 – 632-622 Howard Place

This proposal calls for demolition of two Contributing buildings in the federal Langdon Street Historic District. If these two buildings are demolished the number of Contributing buildings in the Langdon Street historic District will be reduced from 74 to 72 (the recent approval of *The Waterfront* development reduced the number from 77 to 74).

Contributing v. Non-Contributing

Federal guidelines for historic districts require the designation of each property in a historic district to be designated “contributing” or “non-contributing” to the historic significance of the district. A property “contributes” to the district if it adds to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which the historic district is significant.. Historic districts are analogous to jigsaw puzzles – taken together, the pieces tell a broader story, but as pieces are removed the picture becomes less clear. The district is the resource that enriches Madison’s (and the UW’s) identity and quality of life. Every demolition degrades the resource.

Downtown Plan

This proposal directly contradicts the objective and recommendations for the Langdon Neighborhood in the Downtown Plan.

- *Objective 4.9:* “[The Langdon neighborhood] should continue to accommodate a limited amount of higher-density development on selected sites while maintaining its historic and architectural integrity.”
- *Recommendation 94:* Encourage preservation and rehabilitation of *contributing* historic buildings.
- *Recommendation 95:* Encourage relatively higher-density infill and redevelopment that is compatible with the historic context in scale and design on *non-landmark locations and sites that are not identified as contributing* to the National Register Historic District.

We caution against accepting condition arguments in support of demolition in historic districts. If the poor condition of a historic building can be used to justify demolition by the party who has owned the building for several years, then approval of demolition based on that justification will serve as a reward for those who would prefer demolition over maintenance of historic buildings.

Respectfully,

Jason Tish
Executive Director, Madison Trust for Historic Preservation

Dedicated to the Conservation of Madison’s Historic Places

Date: November 11th, 2013

From: John Magnino

To: Plan Commissioners and Urban Design Commissioners

As President of the State-Langdon Neighborhood Association, I had the pleasure of sitting on the steering committee for the proposed development at 622 and 632 Howard Place. Below, I have briefly summarized some of the major considerations and concerns that neighborhood residents expressed in regards to the proposed development on Howard Place.

The proposed structure itself is not a major concern to neighborhood residents. The size and façade of the building elicited no major concerns from the committee members. It is the hope of the committee that the development team, with the guidance of city staff, will consider external parking for both bicycles and mopeds to accommodate the increase in residents. The issue of trash removal was also raised, and it is the hope of the committee members that the development team creates a thorough management plan to ensure a clean facility and curtilage. The committee also urges adequate lighting in the common areas of the building, particularly in the underground bicycle parking, as well as around the exterior of the building.

There are, however, deep concerns amongst neighborhood residents of the demolition of two historically contributing structures under the national historic district. A major concern is the precedent that this demolition may set for future developments. Many residents issued concerns over the lack of maintenance of the current structures, which then may lead the property owners to insist on redevelopment as opposed to rehabilitation or other options. Furthermore, there are fears that the continued demolition of contributing buildings in the area may jeopardize the status of the Langdon Street national historical district. Residents suggested the development team investigate the possibility of using the tax credits afforded to rehabilitations within a national historic district as a means of renovating these properties.

Thank you for considering these concerns from our neighborhood's residents in your deliberations regarding the Howard Place development. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Magnino
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Andrew Irving
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2013 4:54 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: 622-632 Howard Place project

Dear Tim,

I cannot attend the Planning Commission meeting on November 18th and hope that you will accept my email comments for your consideration.

While I sympathize with the 'Our Historic Campus' group in regards to their concerns about demolition of these two properties, my biggest concern about the proposed project is street access to the properties at the end of Howard Place, not only for the tenants who live there and employees who work there, but also for Police, Fire and Ambulance. I do not feel that permission should be granted for this project if they cannot guarantee that access to the properties on the end of Howard Place cannot be guaranteed.

Thank you.

Andrew Irving
Director, The French House
█ N Frances St
(parking / deliveries at the end of Howard Place)

From: Poore, Carol Jean
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 10:00 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: oppose demolition of 622 and 632 Howard Place

Dear Mr. Parks,
As a resident of the Langdon Street historic district, I join the Madison Landmarks Commission in strongly opposing the proposed demolition of 622 and 632 Howard Place to build a new apartment building.

622 is the only surviving bungalow in the Historic District, and 632 was designed by the master architects Claude and Stark, who built other notable buildings in Madison.

I hope you can pass along my comment to the Madison Plan Commission meeting on Friday.

Thank you,

Carol Poore

[REDACTED]
Madison, WI [REDACTED]