

LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING REPORT

June 2, 2025



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 501 E Washington Avenue - Development Adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark (Mattermore-Malaney House - 512 E Main Street) (District 6)

Legistar File ID #: 88188

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

Members: Present: Ald. John Duncan, Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, Katie Kaliszewski, Jacob Morrison, and Maurice Taylor
Excused: Richard Arnesen

Summary

Kurt Stege, registering in opposition and wishing to speak
Steven Rosandich, registering in support and available to answer questions
Nick Orthmann, registering in support and available to answer questions
Adam Templer, registering in support and available to answer questions
Marc Ott, registering in support and available to answer questions
John Barac, registering in support and available to answer questions

Kurt Stege spoke in opposition. Members of the project team were available to answer questions.

Bailey provided background information on the project.

Morrison asked if the applicant had considered having some of the upper stories set back. Nick Orthmann said they did that in certain locations, and the upper floor on Blair is set back a few feet. They tried to create other ins and outs with the building in order to pull it back as best they could. They initially had the u-shaped courtyard facing E Washington Avenue, and they flipped it to limit the impact on the historic district. They have an additional setback at the precast level above the parking garage, which goes up to level two. They didn't do a wholesale step back at the upper levels, but they tried to bake in those elements, specifically along the façade facing the landmark. They removed balconies or tried to bias them so they were not facing directly over the landmark to give it some relief.

Morrison said that because the principal façade is on E Washington Avenue and it is essentially the back of the building facing the back of the landmark, he did not think it was overwhelming the size of it. He added that the trees in the backyard of the historic houses will help to smooth out the height. He recognized that it was a unique situation with the location of the historic houses and building.

Harris agreed that this being adjacent to the back of the landmark site makes it more palatable in terms of size and overwhelming the landmark, as does the deep lot of the landmark. She was less comfortable talking about the trees because they are not considered permanent features of the landmark site and are generally not part of the commission's consideration. She didn't think that they could use that for justification on whether the building is intrusive to the landmark site. She did agree that in their current state, the trees do provide a boundary and distinction for the site.

Harris asked about the u-shaped courtyard, pointing out that it is offset from the landmark. She asked about possibilities for providing more relief directly behind the landmark. Marc Ott said that to move the courtyard left or right would

mean a significant loss to the units on either side, so it wasn't a possibility due to the way the building is laid out and its orientation with the site.

Action

A motion was made by Morrison, seconded by Duncan, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the proposed work will not be so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark. The motion passed by voice vote/other.