

From: [John Imes](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Cc: [Stouder, Heather](#); [Dailey, Lucas](#); arborhouse@tds.net; [Cornwell, Katherine](#); [Stu Levitan](#); [Jack Imes](#)
Subject: 3414 Monroe St. Setback Comparison is incorrect and misleading
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 2:04:44 PM
Attachments: [3414 Monroe Street - Proposed alternative 2 - 11-7-14.pdf](#)

Amy,

In reviewing the application submittal for 3414 Monroe St. we noted that the Setback Comparison showing the "...View of 4 story building from NE corner of site looking out to Monroe Street..." is incorrect and misleading.

The image shows the height of the first floor wall to be slightly lower than the second floor balcony deck on the Arbor House Annex. The measured height of the balcony deck is 9.5 ft. from grade and that is also supported by the final building plans for the Annex. According to the applicant's submittal, the first floor elevation is 13.4 feet and that sits on top of a 2' foot to 3'+ foot high exposed concrete cast, meaning the actual first floor wall height will be between 15.4' - 16.4+' feet high and 6 ft. to 7+ ft. higher than shown in the Setback Comparison.

Please request that the applicant revise and correct the submittal to show a true Setback Comparison for Commissioners and other stakeholders to consider.

In addition, please request that the applicant show a true Setback Comparison by providing a view from the SE corner of the site (without vegetation) looking towards the back of the property.

Finally, please request that the applicant revise and correct the "Building Images along Monroe St." to include images without vegetation to provide Commissioners and other stakeholders with a correct representation of the current size and design of the proposed development to the landmark site.

If the applicant is unable or unwilling to provide the requested information before the Landmarks Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, March 2nd, I strongly suggest that the matter be referred to a future meeting date when more accurate information can be made available.

Please include this email correspondence and request as part of the official file. Thank you for your attention to this matter and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

-- Best regards,
John

John Imes
[608-712-7898](tel:608-712-7898) cell

Heather,

We attended the neighborhood presentation last Thursday and it was the first opportunity we had to see the new design. Many concerns were expressed by residents about the overall height, mass and scale of the project, the proximity and relationship to the Arbor House site, parking and traffic circulation, impacts to heritage trees, among other issues.

You'll recall from our meetings with city staff that we provided Patrick Corcoran with a proposed alternative last November (see attached) that would increase the side-yard setback to a minimum of ten feet and step-back the building height facing Arbor House. The alternative would require that no tenant roof party terraces overlook the inn. A stepped-back 4th level along Glenway, perhaps incorporating walk-up units from the 3rd floor, would replace any apartment space lost from the building step-back. In addition, we would deal with the current easement agreement so that the development's tenants and residents can park in the lot at night and on weekends while Arbor House has a suitable parking arrangement on its landmark site that replaces an asphalt driveway with green open space. In short, our proposed alternative would be a win-win for the neighborhood, the developer and Arbor House, and one that we could enthusiastically support.

Instead, the building as proposed at the neighborhood presentation would be about 20 percent larger and taller than the previous version and similar to a design previously rejected. The side-yard setback would remain at six feet, undermining efforts to preserve mature lot line trees and any buffering or visual screening effect they might provide. A walk-out roof party terrace facing Arbor House would overlook guest rooms and the inn's sunroom and sauna area. Newly proposed underground parking for 21 cars would negatively impact the Wingra Springs and Arboretum, despite neighborhood concerns raised last year about any groundwater pumping, leading the developer to drop plans for underground parking. The new proposal also ignores possible infringement of our rights under the existing easement agreement and requirements in the Arbor House PUD zoning text that we discussed previously.

Moreover, this proposed larger building design comes after the Landmarks Commission voted that the previous smaller design was "...so large and visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the landmark site..." Minutes from the October 20, 2014 Landmarks Commission meeting note Commissioner suggestions for appropriate revisions, including:

"...an increase in the side yard setbacks and the use of step-backs at upper floors..."

"...a good design, but it is not appropriate adjacent to a landmark site...less square footage

would make it less large...”

“...suggested a more sensitive relationship to the site...the proposed building is mostly paved hard space which does not relate to the adjacent landmark site that has trees and green space and deeper setback in the context of the Arboretum...”

Given the foregoing, it was disingenuous for the developer to claim at the public presentation that the latest design proposal conforms to the attached alternative we provided and shared previously with city staff.

We hope the city will continue to work with the developer to revise the current design to respect the historic landmark setting and residential character of the Arbor House site. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

-- Best regards,
John

John Imes

[608-712-7898](tel:608-712-7898) cell