

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION                      **PRESENTED:** March 3, 2014

TITLE:            17, 19, 25 North Webster and 201 East            **REFERRED:**  
                    Mifflin Streets – Construction adjacent            **REREFERRED:**  
                    to Landmark – deconstruct 4 homes  
                    and construct 6-story, 58-unit  
                    apartment building. 2nd Ald. District.            **REPORTED BACK:**  
                    Contact: Fred Rouse, Rouse  
                    Management (31119)

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary                      **ADOPTED:**                      **POF:**

DATED: March 3, 2014                                      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

Randy Bruce, representing Fred Rouse/Rouse Management, registering in support and wishing to speak. Bruce described the proposed project and how the proposal has been revised based on the Lamp House Block Ad Hoc Report recommendations and previous Commission comments. Bruce described that the building mass has been broken into two parts with a circulation link between them above the first floor; there is a gap at the circulation link on the first floor level to allow a pedestrian view of the Lamp House along Webster Street; the rear and front setbacks have been maintained; the upper stories are stepped back to reduce the building scale and height; the submerged parking allows for landscaping between proposed building and Lamp House.

Rummel explained that the excavation of the parking structure is in very close proximity to the landmark building and requested that Bruce provide confirmation that this will be addressed.

Bruce explained that they will likely be advised by a City agency to provide a shoring plan.

Rosenblum requested more information about the proposed landscape buffer. Bruce explained that larger trees would need to be pushed to either side of the foundation, but that smaller elements would be able to be planted on top of the underground structure.

Michael Bridgeman, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak. Bridgeman explained that he greatly appreciates the development team's design response to the Plan recommendations because the resulting design is an improvement to the previous proposal. He suggested further refinement of the colors and materials.

Jack Holzhueter, representing Frank Lloyd Wright Wisconsin and Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy, and himself registering neither in support no opposition and wishing to speak. Holzhueter explained that the

proposal provides an inappropriate dominant back drop to the Lamp House. Holzhueter explained the importance of understanding how that may impact the original design intention.

Levitan asked about views from Lamp House and how the proposed development impacts the views. Holzhueter explained the construction of Capitol Point damaged the views to the west and other developments damaged views to Lake Monona.

William Gates, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Gates explained that he prepared a shadow study for the Ad Hoc Committee from his residence and was surprised by the amount of sunlight that reached the roof of the Lamp House and explained the study is part of the public record from work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Jessica Thompson, representing Fred Rouse, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Fred Rouse, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Bill White, representing Fred Rouse, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Levitan asked Bruce to address the height measurement and the shadow studies. Bruce explained that the Zoning Code measures the height from the highest point of the site along the primary street façade which means it is a 6-story building.

Bruce also showed shadow studies related to the proposed development.

Bruce also showed a graphic related to the development adjacent to Fire Station #4 and how it is similar to this development adjacent to the Lamp House.

Bruce explained that the owner would be willing to provide a conservation easement for the open space that provides a buffer for the Lamp House.

Bruce showed the existing building placement compared to the proposed building placement and the resulting view corridor near the corner of Mifflin Street.

Gehrig asked how the Lamp House relates directly (building height and floor-to-floor heights) to the proposed development.

Bruce explained the grade of the proposed development is slightly above the grade of the Lamp House.

Staff explained that given the submission materials in conjunction with the provided perspectives, she would recommend that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive due to the step backs and building articulation that reduces the mass adjacent to the landmark.

Alder Zellers explained that she appreciates that the proposal relates to the Report recommendations, but is saddened by the loss of the existing structures as they are the appropriate context for the Lamp House.

The Commission discussed the proposed materials and the location of the proposed roof terrace.

Rummel asked about the possibility of relocating the existing structures. Bruce explained Mr. Rouse would be willing to donate the demolition costs toward the relocation expenses within project time constraints.

Gehrig explained that there is not anything other than the existing structures that would not be visually intrusive to the Lamp House.

Slattery explained that the context is forever changed.

Zellers explained that there are views to the house along the different street frontages. The views from the house toward Lake Mendota would be unchanged.

McLean explained that the revised proposal is improved, but that he would suggest that darker colors on the proposed building would allow the Lamp House to contrast and stand out. McLean also suggested that there be landscaping along property edge to further define the Lamp House as the focal point.

There was discussion about the articulation of the mass to reduce the scale.

**ACTION:**

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Fowler, to advise the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the proposal is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the character and integrity of the adjacent landmark with the following suggestions:

1. Use of darker exterior building materials to create contrast with the Lamp House.
2. Further discuss Rouse offer to provide conservation easement for green space adjacent to Lamp House.
3. Provide interpretive display for public viewing regarding the history of the Lamp House.

The motion passed by (5-1) voice vote. Gehrig voted No. Levitan does not vote.