

**From:** Tucker, Matthew  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2014 3:59 PM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy; Michael Matty  
**Subject:** RE: 739 Williamson Staff Report

Ok, I took a look at the block for a visual perspective and also checked the assessor's records for their information about the levels in the buildings on the block. Here is what I find:

- 731 is a three-story split-level dwelling = 3-story building.
- 735 has two detached dwelling structures, the one facing Williamson Street (735) is an old two story building with an exposed basement, with the basement level exposure appearing to meet the "story" definition = 3-story building. This basement is not finished or occupiable, and is a partial basement.
- 743 appears to have one story atop an exposed basement, which is probably over 50% exposed at the front = 2-story building. This basement is not finished or occupiable, and is a partial basement.
- 747 appears to have two housing stories atop a partially exposed and finished basement. The basement level exposure appears to meet the "story" definition = 3-story building.
- 402 S. Livingston is a two-story building.



**Matt Tucker**

Zoning Administrator  
Building Inspection Division  
Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL-100  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2984  
Telephone: 608 266 4569  
Email: [mtucker@cityofmadison.com](mailto:mtucker@cityofmadison.com)  
[www.cityofmadison.com/bi](http://www.cityofmadison.com/bi)

*In compliance with State public records law, the City of Madison retains copies of ALL email messages to and from this mailbox. Email messages may be released in response to appropriate open record requests.*

---

**From:** Parks, Timothy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2014 8:11 AM  
**To:** Michael Matty  
**Cc:** Tucker, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: 739 Williamson Staff Report

Michael: I spoke with Matt about this yesterday morning and he was going to look into it when he had a chance. I believe he was out of the office yesterday afternoon on City business, so I don't know if he has had an opportunity to look at the heights on the block. However, I believe that the BUILD plan accounted for the exposure of those buildings when it made the height recommendations it did. But since we are unlikely to come to complete accord on this and other issues before the meeting this evening, we

will have the discussion this evening and next Monday and see how it all falls out.  
Cheers, -TIM

TIM PARKS  
Planner, Planning Division  
Dept. of Planning and Community  
& Economic Development  
City of Madison, Wisconsin  
T: 608.261.9632  
F: 608.267.8739

---

**From:** Michael Matty  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 7:32 AM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy  
**Cc:** Cornwell, Katherine; Rummel, Marsha; Cover, Steven; Chris Oddo; William F. White; Tucker, Matthew; Stephen Mar-Pohl; Scanlon, Amy  
**Subject:** Re: 739 Williamson Staff Report

Thank you Tim.

What about the 3 floor building definition per staff on the adjacent properties? Using the same criteria / code that staff is using to define our building as a 4 story from Williamson Street frontage? Any clarification on that before we present to UDC and Plan Commission? I wish to be consistent on what standard definition is being used for us and as well, the adjacent majority of the buildings on that block.

I am using the "50% of the street facing wall as exposed thus defines that area as a floor... " as the standard.

Michael

Michael Matty, President

**RPG**

Renaissance Property Group, llc

██████████ Fordem Ave ██████████

Madison WI 53704

████████████████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████



**Project Name/Address:** 740 Jenifer Street

**Application Type:** PUBLIC HEARING  
Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of existing garage/shed and existing rear addition to the residence and a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration in an historic district.

**Legistar File ID #** 34624

**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

**Summary**

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Stephen Mar-Pohl, InSite Consulting Architects

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of existing garage/shed and existing rear addition to the residence and a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alteration in an historic district.

**Background Information**

**Parcel Location:** The subject site is located in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District

**Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:**

33.19(5)(c)3. Standards. (for Demolition)

In determining whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for any demolition, the Landmarks Commission shall consider and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:

- a. Whether the building or structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State;
- b. Whether the building or structure, although not itself a landmark building, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the District as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State;
- c. Whether demolition of the subject property would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter as set forth in Sec. 33.19 and to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable district as duly adopted by the Common Council;
- d. Whether the building or structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture and/or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense;
- e. Whether retention of the building or structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage;
- f. Whether the building or structure is in such a deteriorated condition that it is not structurally or economically feasible to preserve or restore it, provided that any hardship or difficulty claimed by the owner which is self-created or which is the result of any failure to maintain the property in good repair cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness;
- g. Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the buildings and environment of the district in which the subject property is located.

33.19(1) Purpose and Intent It is hereby declared a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of improvements of special character or special historical interest or value is a public necessity and is required in the interest of health, prosperity, safety and welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:

- (a) Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of such improvements and of districts which represent or reflect elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history.
- (b) Safeguard the City's historic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such landmarks and historic districts.
- (c) Stabilize and improve property values.
- (d) Foster civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the past.
- (e) Protect and enhance the City's attractions to residents, tourists and visitors, and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry.
- (f) Strengthen the economy of the City.
- (g) Promote the use of historic districts and landmarks for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the City.

33.19(11)(i) Guideline Criteria for Exterior Alteration in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Residential Use.

1. Alteration of any existing structure shall be evaluated according to all criteria listed in Sec. 33.19(11)(g).
2. Alteration of the surface material, pattern and texture in the facade(s) of any existing structures shall be compatible with the original or existing historical finishes.
3. Alteration of any existing structure shall retain or be compatible with the original or existing historical rhythm of masses and spaces.
4. Alteration of any existing structure shall retain the existing historical landscape plan or shall develop a new plan which is compatible with the plans of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
5. Alteration of the street facade(s) of any existing structure shall retain the original or existing historical proportional relationships of door sizes to window sizes.

33.19(11)(g) Guideline Criteria for Exterior Alteration in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Commercial Use.

1. Alterations of the height of any existing structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
2. Alterations of the street facade(s) of any existing structure shall retain the original or existing historical rhythm of solids and voids.
3. Alterations of the street facade(s) of any existing structure shall retain the original or existing historical materials.
4. Alterations of the roof of any existing structure shall retain its existing historical appearance.

## **Analysis and Conclusion**

### Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing shed

A discussion of the demolition standards 33.19(5)(c)3. follows:

- a. The shed structure is not of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
- b. The shed structure does not contribute to the historic character of the District. The existence of the shed will not benefit the people of the City and the State.

- c. As an accessory structure of utilitarian use, the demolition of the shed would not be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter or to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable district.
- d. The shed is not of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture and/or material that it could not be reproduced.
- e. The retention of the shed would not promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage;
- f. The applicant is not claiming a hardship based on the condition of the shed, but staff believes the condition of the structure is poor.
- g. A new structure is being proposed to be constructed in this location. The shed exists on the portion of the property related to the proposed development of a multi-family residential building. The Commission has not determined that the proposed building will be compatible with the buildings and environment of the district, but this determination should not affect the review of the demolition of the shed.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing rear addition**

A discussion of the demolition standards 33.19(5)(c)3. follows:

- a. The addition structure is not of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
- b. The addition structure contributes to the historic character of the District as an example of a typical expansion of a vernacular residence. The existence of the addition will not benefit the people of the City and the State. The Sanborn map of 1942 shows the addition was constructed before 1942.
- c. While the addition has historic value as a typical expansion of a vernacular residence in the historic district, the original main residence is the more important cultural resource and existed at one time without the addition. The Ordinance authorizes the Commission to protect improvements of cultural value in historic districts and therefore, the Commission should discuss the possible hierarchy or priority an addition brings to this interpretation.
- d. The addition is not of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture and/or material that it could not be reproduced.
- e. The retention of the addition would not promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage;
- f. The applicant is not claiming a hardship based on the condition of the addition, but staff believes the condition of the addition is poor.
- g. A new structure is not being proposed to be constructed in this location. The main residence without the addition will be compatible with the buildings and environment of the district.

**Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alteration of the residence**

A brief discussion of the criteria of 33.19(11)(i) follows:

- 1. Alteration of any existing structure shall be evaluated according to all criteria listed in Sec. 33.19(11)(g). Those criteria are listed below:
  - 1. The height of the roof is not being changed.
  - 2. The street facades of the building will retain the historical rhythm of solids and voids.
  - 3. The installation of siding and the replacement of windows will alter the existing materials. The siding is being replaced in kind. The windows are proposed to be replaced with double hung windows that are similar in appearance to the existing windows.
  - 4. The widow's walk is being reconstructed in order to restore the historical appearance.

2. The replacement siding and replacement windows will be compatible with the existing historical finishes because the siding is being replaced in kind and the windows will double hung windows to match the existing double hung windows.
3. The proposed alterations is compatible with the historical rhythm of masses and spaces.
4. The original landscape plan is unknown. The alteration of the building should not affect the existing landscape.
5. The proposed alteration of the building will not affect the original or existing historical proportional relationships of door sizes to window sizes.

## **Recommendation**

### **Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing shed**

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing shed are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission.

### **Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the existing rear addition**

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear addition are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission.

### **Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alteration of the residence**

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alteration of the residence may be met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission with the following condition of approval:

1. The applicant shall provide manufacturer information for the replacement window units for review and final approval by staff.

**AGENDA # 2**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

<b>REPORT OF:</b> LANDMARKS COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> July 14, 2014
<b>TITLE:</b> 740 Jenifer Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Demolish an existing shed and the existing rear addition. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald District. Contact: Stephen Mar- Pohl, InSite Consulting Architects (34624)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b>  <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b> Amy Scanlon, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
<b>DATED:</b> July 14, 2014	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Christina Slattery and Michael Rosenblum were excused. Gehrig arrived before Item #4.

**SUMMARY:**

On a consensus of the Landmarks Commission, the public hearing was opened and recessed so that it could be taken up after the bulk of the remainder of the agenda.

Michael Soref, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering neither in support nor opposition but wishing to speak and available to answer questions.

Stephen Mar-Pohl, registering in support and wishing to speak.

**ACTION:**

No action taken. Unanimous consent.

# PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

July 31, 2014

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



**Project Name/Address:** 739 (741) Williamson Street

**Application Type:** Certificate of Appropriateness for new development and advisory recommendation for land division in a historic district

**Legistar File ID #** 34796

**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

## Summary

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Stephen Mar-Pohl, InSite Consulting Architects

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development and an advisory recommendation for the land division.

## Background Information

**Parcel Location:** The subject site is located in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District.

### Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

33.19(5)(i)1. Review proposed land divisions and subdivision plats of landmark sites and properties in Historic Districts to determine whether the proposed lot sizes negatively impact the historic character of significance of a landmark or landmark site and whether the proposed lot sizes are compatible with adjacent lot sizes and maintain the general lot size pattern of the Historic District. The Landmarks Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission.

### 33.19(11)(h) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Residential Use.

1. Any new structure shall be evaluated according to all criteria listed in Sec. 33.19(11)(f).
2. The directional expression of any new structure shall be compatible with those of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
3. The materials, patterns and textures of any new structure shall be compatible with those of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
4. The landscape plan of any new structure shall be compatible with that of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.

### 33.19(11)(f) Guideline Criteria for new Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Commercial Use.

1. Any new structures shall be evaluated according to both of the criteria listed in Sec. 33.01(11)(d); that is, compatibility of gross volume and height.
2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with the buildings within its visually related area.
3. The materials used in the street facade(s) of any new structure shall be compatible with those used in the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
4. The design of the roof of any new structure shall be compatible with those of the buildings and environment within its visually related area.



5. The rhythm of building masses and spaces created by the construction of a new structure shall be compatible with the existing rhythm of masses and spaces for those sites within its visually related area.

33.19 (11)(d) Guideline Criteria for New Development in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Manufacturing Use.

1. The gross volume of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.
2. The height of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment within its visually related area.

## Analysis and Conclusion

The current property is a through-lot with a residence located toward the Jenifer Street side. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the site in order to create a lot for the residence on Jenifer Street (Lot 2) and a lot for the proposed apartment building on Williamson Street (Lot 1). The map of the Third Lake Ridge Historic District is attached for comparison of lot sizes in the historic district.

The Landmarks Commission approved the COA for the building at 740 Jenifer at the meeting on July 14 and received an Informational Presentation for the new development and land division for 739 (741) Williamson at the same meeting.

The applicant is requesting a land division recommendation and a COA for new development in the historic district.

The north side of Williamson Street is zoned Traditional Shopping Street (TSS). The south side of Williamson Street is zoned Traditional Residential (TR-V1). Each side of the street has a specific and consistent character and related scale. Because the proposed development does not meet the TR-V1 zoning district standards, the applicant is proposing to rezone the property to Planned Development (PD).

The visually related area (VRA) map is attached to this report. While the applicant provided information related to the buildings on the shared block face (5 properties), there are numerous other buildings (11 properties) in the VRA that are not addressed in the submission materials.

Based on the need for more information, staff does not feel they can make a full analysis of whether the proposal meets the standards; however, based on the submission materials and staff's knowledge of the area, the following comments are offered for applicant and Commission consideration.

A brief discussion of the new residential development standards 33.19(11)(h) follows:

1. See Sec. 33.19(11)(f) discussion below.
2. The general directional expression of the proposed building massing is compatible with the directional expression of the buildings within its VRA. The material selections also affect the directional expression of the building and in this case the reclaimed wood siding is proposed to be mounted in a vertical orientation which is not appropriate in the historic district and results in the appearance of increased height.
3. The materials, patterns and textures of the proposed building are generally compatible with other buildings on the block face; however, the reclaimed wood siding orientation is not appropriate. In addition, the extensive exposure of poured concrete on the front elevation (at the elevator tower) is not compatible with other buildings. The use of a modern architectural style accentuates the differences between this building and others in the VRA.

4. The compatibility of the landscape plan is difficult to determine in this area. The submission materials indicate that appropriate plantings will be planted.

A brief discussion of standards 33.19(11)(f) follows:

1. See Sec. 33.01(11)(d) discussion below.
2. The rhythm of solids and voids in the street facade(s) of the proposed building is generally compatible with the other buildings in the VRA.
3. See comments above.
4. The design of the roof of the proposed building is generally compatible with those of the buildings in the VRA; however, the roof design is less compatible with the adjacent residential buildings on the south side of the street. The use of a modern architectural style and roof form accentuates the differences between this building and others on the south side of the street. This standard relates to four sides of the building and the typical main roof type of the proposed building is flat compared to the pitched main roofs of the majority of the buildings in the VRA.
5. The submission materials show a graphic where the rhythm of the proposed building masses and spaces is compatible with adjacent buildings in the VRA; however, this relies heavily on the success of the green wall on the concrete elevator tower to visually recede as the 5' set back of that element is minimal. Assuming the green wall is not installed or cannot maintain the desired appearance, the building is not compatible with the rhythm of masses and spaces. This standard relates to four sides of the building and from the rear (east elevation), the building is not compatible with the rhythm of masses and spaces.

A brief discussion of standards 33.19(11)(d) follows:

1. The gross volume of the proposed building is mathematically larger than the buildings in the visually related area (VRA) on the south side of the street. While the articulation and change in materials breaks up the elevations toward a more compatible visual appearance, the building reads as one mass. The proposed green wall system is a good additive solution to disguise the concrete material and provide a visual break, but it should not be relied upon to achieve the standard for gross volume or any other standard.

Staff has suggested that the property owner investigate ways to eliminate the parking so that the building form is not tied to the largest footprint allowed on the site to accommodate turning radiuses and parking clearances. Removing the parking may allow for the first floor level to be used for living space which may allow the volume to be reduced and for the further articulation of the massing.

Staff has also suggested that the property owner consider two "walk up buildings" or two "three flats" which would be compatible with the character of the historic district and provide a space between the individual buildings.

2. The height of the proposed building is taller than the buildings in the VRA on the south side of the street. The height is held back from the street face through the use of step backs and porches. Given a modified volume, the height may be compatible.

## Recommendation

Staff believes the proposed lot sizes are compatible with adjacent lot sizes and maintain the general lot size pattern of the historic district and suggests that the Landmarks Commission provide a similar recommendation to the Plan Commission.

Based on the need for more information to provide an accurate review of the project against the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction in the historic district, staff cannot conclude that the standards are met at this time and recommends that the Commission refer the request to allow the applicant to provide the VRA information and address the issues discussed in this staff report.

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 4, 2014

TITLE: 740 Jenifer/739 (741) Williamson  
Streets – New construction of  
residential building in Third Lake  
Ridge Historic District. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald.  
District. Contact: Stephen Mar-Pohl,  
InSite Consulting Architects (34796)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 4, 2014

ID NUMBER:

---

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

### SUMMARY:

Chris Oddo, representing RPG, registering in support and wishing to speak. Oddo described the need for the land division as previously discussed during the review of the residential project at 740 Jenifer. Oddo explained the project and how the project meets the standards in relation to the Visually Related Area (VRA). He explained the items that were evaluated and analyzed for the submission and the overall design of the proposed building.

Oddo provided updated handouts for review and discussed drawings on presentation boards and on the screen. He explained the volume of the building and how the front elevation reads as two separate buildings separated by a green wall at the elevator tower. He explained that the volume is further reduced by the articulation of the facades. The side and rear elevations have been further reduced by articulation and change in materials.

Oddo explained the proposed materials (fiber cement horizontal siding of varying widths and panels, reclaimed wood siding, concrete) and how the materials are consistent with the other buildings in the VRA. Oddo explained that the vertical siding orientation provides a more narrow appearance and that the concrete is a predominant foundation material in the VRA.

Oddo explained that even though the foundations of the adjacent residential buildings are exposed on the street side, living spaces have been moved to the upper floors to get away from the street noise leaving the lower level for utility spaces not living spaces.

Oddo explained that due to revised accessibility requirements, the building height is able to be reduced by 12". He explained that the building footprint has been revised to be smaller and that any further reduction would negatively affect the quality of the living spaces.

Rummel asked how one would bring in their bike. Oddo explained that they would likely use the garage door, but could use the side door. He pointed out the bike parking provided in the garage and outside the building.

Rosenblum asked for clarification about the plant materials proposed for the green wall. Oddo explained that the Landscape Architect selected a climbing hydrangea for the green wall and provided an image of a hydrangea growing in Madison with a similar orientation. Rummel asked if the hydrangea was a native plant. Oddo explained that the Landscape Architect prefers the use of native plants.

Michael Matty, registering in support and wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Matty explained that the flat roof form allows for green roof options that could relate to storm water management. He explained that the Ott House is the tallest building on the block and the proposed building is not as tall as the Ott House.

Rummel asked if Matty had any further comments that he wanted to share. Matty explained that he wants to construct a quality building and that the design has been modified to respond to the comments made by the neighborhood and the Commissions. Matty also explained that the referral would bump him from the schedule he needs for financing. Rummel asked if he would consider removing the parking. Matty explained that people do not want to live at that level due to the street activity and noise and that the removal of the parking will not change the design of the building.

Michael Soref, representing Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support but not wishing to speak.

Staff explained that other agencies will review neighborhood plans and zoning and the Landmarks Commission shall review the project based on the Ordinance standards. Staff explained that there have been numerous meetings with the applicants about this project and that this project was easier to support when it was a three story building. The three story project went before the Urban Design Commission so the project team received design direction from the Commissions in the incorrect order. In addition, staff explained that the building would be better suited to the north side of the street than the south side given the different characters of the different sides of the street. Staff explained that more information is needed to provide a better analysis for compatibility in the VRA.

Rummel asked if the elevator tower could be relocated. Oddo explained the reasoning for the elevator location.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator, explained the zoning requirements and that the adopted plan recommends 2.5-story building and that this building is a 4-story building. He explained how to calculate a story based on the zoning definition. He also explained that there is not a requirement for the development to provide car parking.

Rummel explained that the plans are frustrating because what works for one development is not appropriate for another development.

Slattery explained that she appreciates the modern architecture and likes the idea of the green wall, but is uncomfortable with how the building relates to the VRA.

Oddo explained that the existing buildings appear to be paired along the street and that the proposed building will continue that massing. Rosenblum explained that the height and appearance of the building reads successfully as two buildings given the green wall element.

There was general discussion about the appearance and materials and how they might be modified to better fit the VRA.

Heidi Radlinger, registering neither in support or opposition.

**ACTION:**

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to advise the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the land division is appropriate. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development with a requirement that the property owner continue to maintain the living wall. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** July 23, 2014

TITLE: 739 Williamson Street – Rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for Construction of a New 12-Unit Apartment Building, 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (34926)      **REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: July 23, 2014      **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Melissa Huggins, Acting Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, and Dawn O’Kroley.

\*Wagner and Slayton recused themselves on this item.\*

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 23, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for construction of a new 12-unit apartment building located at 739 Williamson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Michael Matty and Chris Oddo. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Michael Soref, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association. The building footprint has gotten smaller, although the apartment has gone from an 8-unit to a 12-unit building. They studied the neighborhood very closely. Pedestrian safety was studied in relation to the placement of driveways and entrances. Vines are proposed to grow on the elevator/trellis. Building materials have been simplified to fiber cement siding (3” and 6”), and a flush panel in the same product line. They have moved away from the gable roof form. They are working through criteria from their meeting with the Landmarks Commission. Depending on what kind of system they use, the HVAC louvers could show on the two side elevations, or condensing units could be placed on the roof.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Are the angled supports required structurally?
  - No they aren’t part of the structure. It’s something to add interest and define the corners.
- Is the roof accessible for the residents?
  - No, it’s not. We’re looking at a live roof system, but we’re not sure. You can see the patterning on the roofline that suggests what we’re thinking.
- The breaking down to scale to the more historic lot size is nice. Referring to the property on the right, the treatment, the previous images had some clean modern forms, and this one I’m just curious because of the way the same material is treated across the full façade, that the roof form undulates so much it loses that purity. Balconies that clip on might seem stronger, otherwise the roof form is getting a bit

complex for the façade being taught in all the same material. I don't know if I'm as excited about the panels, going back to the precedent.

- In terms of massing and the appropriateness of the property behind on the rear elevation, how this breaks down nicely to emulate two parcels, that feels like one building. I don't know if the setback is substantial enough or appropriate to the scale of the historic buildings.
- Can you see over the balconies when you're sitting?
  - There's a 4" gap. We did look at having open vertical balusters. I was trying to simplify things. Open up the railing on the upper decks to see out of patio doors.
- My first inkling of seeing a new building, I was expecting more void. In reality that is void behind but we're hiding it.
- I like your idea of the vine. You'll need a vine that grows tall, which is not going to be easy here. If you want to maintain the feeling of that trellis form you'll want to use something really small leafed, and those are more difficult to find.
- I'm curious about the timing of construction because I can recall some other projects that were approved with the modern construction, and seeing that the other properties would be equitably restored. It seems like there's a lag there.
  - This is now a lot standing on its own. But as soon as we get the permission we'll start the restoration on the historic house.

**ACTION:**

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

No rankings were provided for this item.



City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 28, 2014

TITLE: 740 Jenifer Street – Partial Demolition and Rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for the Renovation of a Single-Family House and Construction of a New 7-Unit Apartment Building to front Williamson Street. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (34220)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 28, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton and John Harrington.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 28, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for the partial demolition and rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for the renovation of a single-family house and construction of a new 7-unit apartment building to front Williamson Street located at 740 Jenifer Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Michael Matty and Chris Oddo, representing Renaissance Property Group. Matty explained that they are requesting a rezoning to PD because they cannot meet any of the new Zoning Code conditions given the lot area, unit size, etc. There is no base zoning that exists to fit this development into. The plans call for renovation of an historic home on Jenifer Street, as well as a new building facing Williamson Street. Oddo presented the site plan and described the existing wood frame house, which is in a dilapidated condition, with removal of the later addition planned along with the renovations. Two wood visual screens are proposed for privacy. The now 8-unit apartment building will feature six bicycle racks and six underground parking stalls, with a lobby facing the sidewalk to maintain the pedestrian feel and planters to soften the volume of the building. Gables are proposed along the roofline to keep the building at a smaller volume for the surrounding neighborhood. The building materials are 3” and 6” fiber cement board with trim pieces in response to images seen around the neighborhood. The windows will be aluminum clad wood with some operable and some fixed, and the roof is proposed to be asphalt shingle. Material colors are yet to be determined.

From a staff point of view the Williamson Street façade is still an issue, as it doesn’t address the street at the lower elevation outside of the lobby entrance, there is no presence on that first floor level; it lacks. Do we need to meld the old with the new or do we do something different? The first floor is basically a parking garage, there are no windows, just the lobby. This is quite a structure that is a radical departure from what is there.

Ald. Marsha Rummel, District 6 noted that she has not yet held a neighborhood meeting for this project. Overall a nice infill project at this scale and location works well. She supports fixing up the historic landmark home and doing this infill on an historic block.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I'd like to see it three-dimensionally; it can have traditional roof forms but it doesn't look like a copy of anything. Seeing the entire streetscape reinforces that. There are much larger buildings along Williamson Street further east that are townhouse buildings so I don't think it's out of the question that this somehow needs to take on the character of some of the things you're seeing across the street. I also think that if you really do a great job with these two balconies, I don't know that I'd want to be right down on that street. People are choosing to be up higher off of the sidewalk. To me it doesn't really seem out of place at all.
- There's no masonry at the first floor level, just fiber cement board?
  - Correct. We're proposing an exposed 8-12" on grade to make sure that's a durable surface, up from the sidewalk. Right now there's a small pocket park with a landscape wall, further down there is some masonry and a raised bed. There are four or five different examples of raised beds along that area. I like the idea that the green is cascading over it.

If the fenestration could come down, like on the elevator tower, is there a way of mimicking that connectivity on what would be the eastern face? On that bottom floor you could also bring the fenestration down. Glass low to me is very inviting.

- We changed the look because that's an elevator. We realized it shouldn't look like windows because it's not going to be windows, so we put siding and articulated it to break up that corner a bit.
- Your neighbors have these nice masonry bases. That might be a little bit more durable. It's probably going to be concrete down there anyway.
- I would prefer to see you do some risk taking in terms of architecture and to interpret the historic forms in a more modern way. I think that what Lindsey (Lee's home) has done should set the standard for what happens on this block in terms of architecture. Not mimicking what's there now, he captures the rhythm. That should be where you look for inspiration because then this would become an existing block. When I look at this out of context I think I'm looking at a house out in Fitchburg. Scale is important, but something that is architecturally existing and different, and is interpreted for our age today. Play with roof lines and the balconies.
- You have a fair number of corner windows, which is great. Those work well with flat roofs.
- How far are you from Jane's house?
  - We pulled back that corner so we're 5-feet from the lot line. Her tenant's window would be about 15-feet.
- This is an urban corridor, however.
- Don't be afraid of green roofs. It may not be appropriate but it's certainly something to look at.

### **ACTION:**

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

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 740 Jenifer Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	6	-	-	-	-	5	6

General Comments:

- Add uniqueness to apartment, play off adjacent houses.



Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development

## Planning Division

Katherine Cornwell, Director

---

Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL-100

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard

P.O. Box 2985

Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985

Phone: (608) 266-4635

Fax (608) 267-8739

[www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

August 6, 2014

Mr. Stephen Mar-Pohl  
InSite Consulting Architects  
115 E Main St  
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Certificate of Appropriateness for 739 Williamson Street

Mr. Mar-Pohl,

At its meeting on August 4, 2014 the Madison Landmarks Commission reviewed, in accordance with the Madison General Ordinances pertaining to provisions of the Landmarks Ordinance, your plans to construct a new structure located 739 (741) Williamson Street in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District. The Landmarks Commission voted to approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction with the condition of approval that the property owner continue to maintain the living wall. In addition, the Landmarks Commission voted to provide an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission that the land division is appropriate in the historic district.

This letter will serve as the "Certificate of Appropriateness" for the project. When you apply for a building permit, take this letter with you to the Building Inspection Counter, Department of Planning and Development, Lower Level Suite LL-100, Madison Municipal Building, 215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.

Please note that any major design changes from the plans submitted and the additional information provided to the Landmarks Commission must receive approval by the Landmarks Commission, or staff designee, prior to the issuance of the building permit.

Please also note that failure to comply with the conditions of your approval is subject to a forfeiture of up to \$250 for each day during which a violation of the Landmarks Commission ordinance continues (see Madison General Ordinances Sec. 33.19).

Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Amy Loewenstein Scanlon, Registered Architect  
Preservation Planner  
City of Madison Planning Division

cc: Building Inspection Plan Reviewers  
City preservation file



**Board of Directors**

---

Michael Jacob, President	Carl Durocher
Chris Lukas, Vice President	Colleen Hayes
Cheema, JK, Treasurer	Jack Kear
Mike Soref, Secretary	Ralph Kuehn
Karyn Chacon	Lynn Lee
John Coleman	Anne Walker

---

July 28, 2014

Stuart Levitan, Chair  
City of Madison Landmarks Commission

Dear Chairman Levitan,

The Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) supports Michael Matty's plans for the 740 Jenifer St. property. That includes renovation of the historic building on Jenifer St., division of the property into two lots (one on the Williamson St. side) and the present design for apartment building on the portion of the lot facing Williamson St. Mr. Matty has met with the MNA Preservation and Development Committee and the MNA Board of Directors. The neighborhood association had voted to support the project in May, and voted on the revised design of the apartment building at its July meeting. The Board's vote to support the project was unanimous.

Sincerely,



Michael Jacob  
President, MNA Board of Directors

cc: Alder Marsha Rummel  
Amy Scanlon  
MNA Board  
Michael Matty



August 18, 2014

To whom it may concern,

The Greater Williamson Area Business Association (GWABA) voted unanimously at our August 12 board meeting to join the Marquette Neighborhood Association (MNA) in its also unanimous vote to support Michael Matty's project at 739 Williamson Street and 740 Jenifer Street.

At our board meeting we recognized that the new apartment building proposed by Mr. Matty for Williamson Street at four stories is taller than the two and a half stories recommended by the BUILD II plan. We also recognized that it has a greater density than what is identified for that block in the city's comprehensive plan. But we agree with MNA that its thoughtful design and the plan to refurbish the house at 740 Jenifer Street keeping it as a single family home is a fair trade off for this extra density that is being requested by the developer.

While it is surely a very close call, more density can probably be absorbed on this side of the 700 block. Though, it should be acknowledged that it is the even-numbered side of Williamson Street, which is more open and commercial/industrial in nature than the greener, more residential odd-numbered side, that is clearly more appropriate for "density building."

Nevertheless, we go along with the Marquette Neighborhood Association in urging you to weigh the above in making this close call in favor of allowing this project to go forward.

Thank you for your service to our city,

GWABA Executive Board

August 19, 2014

Dear UDC members,

I am writing to express my opposition to the 740 Jenifer Street/739 Williamson Street proposal submitted to you by Michael Matty, Renaissance Property Group. I am the owner of 734 Jenifer Street and 735 Williamson Street. Previously, in a May 28, 2014 email to you, I expressed opposition to the original seven unit proposal, relative to the proximity of the development to my homes, the negative impact on the value of my properties and the blockage of natural light to both homes.

The new 12-unit proposal is of even greater concern to me and I am strongly opposed to the development for the following reasons:

- The proposal does not meet a number of specific design guidelines and criteria in the "2004 Williamson Street Design Guidelines and Criteria for Preservation-600-1100 Blocks."
- The guidelines recommend the height of the building be limited to 2 ½ stories, which is significantly lower than the 4 story building being proposed.
- The proposal has a 5 foot side yard setback from my property. The guidelines recommend a 6 foot side yard setback.
- The rhythm and scale of the project is incompatible with the rest of the block, which is comprised of primarily two-story houses with gabled roofs, as opposed to a flat roof.
- The proposal does not conform to and is not compatible with the historic character of Williamson Street and the Third Lake Ridge Historic District.
- The building does not reflect the design characteristics encouraged in the guidelines, including the building materials. The guidelines recommend use of masonry and wood clapboards, rather than the exposed concrete and metal panels that are part of the proposal.
- The Comprehensive Plan recommends that "the essentially 'house-like' residential character of the area be retained and any limited infill redevelopment generally should maintain the small-lot rhythm of individual houses on separate lots, and be designed to look like single-family, two flat or three flat homes." I believe that the proposal does not come close to meeting this recommendation.

Finally, concerning the Jenifer Street renovation, since there is no set start date for the project, I question what would bind Mr. Matty to completing the renovation in a timely manner. Also, if the zoning change splits the property, what would prohibit Mr. Matty from simply selling the house as is?

Thank you for taking into consideration my concerns and opposition to the Matty proposal.

Regards,

Jane Pawasarat

**Parks, Timothy**

---

**From:** Craig Eley [mailto:celey@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 12:14 PM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy  
**Subject:** Opposition to the development of 740 Jenifer Street/739 Williamson Street

Dear Planning Commission members,

I am writing to express my opposition to the 740 Jenifer Street/739 Williamson Street renovation and development proposal. I am currently the tenant at 734 Jenifer Street, directly adjacent to this property.

This proposed construction will not only radically alter the character and scale which are the defining characteristics of this neighborhood block, the design also contradicts many of the specific guidelines outlined in the "2004 Williamson Street Design Guidelines and Criteria for Preservation-600-1100 Blocks." Those design guidelines suggest that new developments "be designed to look like single-family, two flat or three flat homes." This 12-unit, 4-story, glass-and-concrete proposal utterly fails in this regard, and is completely out of step with the 2-story residential units that make up the majority of the neighborhood.

Additionally, I'm worried that the unclear timeline of this project will create a prolonged and detrimental noise burden on the surrounding residential properties—both during and after its completion. A variety of recent studies have reached the conclusion that environmental noise, including construction, negatively impacts hearing, disrupts natural sleep patterns, and can increase blood pressure. Though often overlooked in projects of this kind, noise is inherently physiologically stressful on the people who are subjected to it. And the increase in car and foot traffic resulting from this building will add significantly to the ambient noise of this block.

Thank you for taking these concerns into consideration and recognizing my opposition to the proposal.

Regards,

Craig Eley  
ACLS Public Fellow  
Digital Producer, To the Best of Our Knowledge  
Wisconsin Public Radio



**Parks, Timothy**

---

**From:** ssilver chorus.net [redacted]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2014 3:28 PM  
**To:** Martin, Alan; Parks, Timothy  
**Subject:** 739 Williamson Street - Rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for Construction of a New 12-Unit Apartment Building. 6th Ald. Dist

Dear Urban Design & Plan Commission Members,

Regarding the above proposal, it is a great example of small scale urban infill.

I know it has already garnered support, as it works with unique parcels to create a development with many merits.

I hope you will support it and vote to approve it.

Regards,

Steve Silverberg  
[redacted] Rutledge Street  
6th District

**Parks, Timothy**

---

**From:** Heather Ewing [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2014 1:39 PM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy; Martin, Alan  
**Subject:** 739 Williamson Street

Dear Urban Design Commission Members and Plan Commission Members

Regarding 739 Williamson Street PD application:

I strongly support the project, the modern design and the urban infill opportunity.

Last year I moved from Verona into the Constellation on East Washington. I currently work in Madison. No longer do I need to commute to my job. I spend my nights downtown at the restaurants and civic events, my Saturdays at Farmer's Market and love it. We need more quality infill for those of us who wish to work and live downtown - this projects accomplishes that goal.

Please give strong consideration to the PD application, the design, and in the end please support it.

Thank you for your time.

Heather Ewing  
[REDACTED] N Livingston [REDACTED]

**Parks, Timothy**

---

**From:** Mary Schneider [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2014 4:00 PM  
**To:** Parks, Timothy  
**Subject:** Proposal on Jenifer/willy st

My husband Keith Notbohm and I support the Jenifer st project (m Matty) to be discussed tonight.

Thank you

Mary Schneider [REDACTED] Jenifer st.

Sent from my iPhone