

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 30, 2012

**TITLE:** 100 Block State Street Development – Proposed Demolition of Designated Landmark at 120 West Mifflin Street (Schubert Building), Exterior Alteration to Landmark at 125 State Street (Castle & Doyle Building), and Proposed New Development Adjacent to Landmarks, 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. Contact: George Austin, AVA Civic Enterprises. (24480)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 30, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

George Austin, 2316 Chamberlain Avenue, representing Block 100 Foundation, 6129 University Avenue, Middleton, WI 53562, registering in support. He handed out a booklet that would follow their presentation. He explained that their presentation will show that this proposal supports efforts to keep the downtown vital and meets the standards of 33.19 (Landmarks Ordinance). It balances public preservation interests and property owner interests and is a rare investment opportunity that will help anchor the business district by reinvesting (preserve and enhance State Street and shopping district), transforming (energize North Fairchild Street by creating a sense of place with a garden and warm-colored stone materials on the building), and supporting civic institutions and the downtown (private funding). This is a philanthropic enterprise that is equivalent to a \$4 to 6 million endowment.

Eric Lawson, 15 Ellis Porter Court, representing Block 100 Foundation, 6129 University Avenue, Middleton, WI 53562, registering in support. The proposal includes two landmarks - Castle and Doyle and Schubert buildings. He noted that this area is not a listed historic district. Discussions with neighborhood over the last few months have resulted in a revised proposal that preserves Castle and Doyle. Overall condition of Castle and Doyle discussed as follows:

- Terra Cotta is in good condition.
- Fairchild brick has been updated through the years.
- Existing windows are both historic and non-historic.

Proposed work will be rehabilitation in nature and will include:

- Reset and repair terra cotta.
- Restore base of State Street elevation.
- Rehabilitate windows/replace two non-original windows.

- Create two new doorways in exterior window openings.
- Eliminate the basement and modify the rear of the first floor.
- Remove chimney and stairwell to the basement. The building will remain intact and the exterior will be restored.

Mr. Lawson stated that the Schubert Building is not a prominent example of the Queen Anne style of architecture. There are other examples of the Queen Anne style on State Street. There are other more prominent Kronenberg buildings represented in the city. He noted that the transom would be removed and reused in the proposed project. Weighing all aspects of the project, which includes enhancing 117 and 119 State Street and restoring Castle and Doyle, the removal of 120 would not be contrary to the purpose and intent of the Ordinance. Since there are other more notable Kronenberg buildings on State Street the removal of 120 would not be a detriment. The bay windows are a common design element – not unusual design. This building is not a prime example of the Queen Anne style. Tile floor is sagging and needs to be replaced. Due to the poor building condition, the economic feasibility is not good. The brick is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. Original interior wood columns are deteriorated. Seven temporary columns have been installed. The stormwater pipe not properly pitched and is a disaster waiting to happen. The financials of this project cannot be realized by a regular rehabilitation project due to projected significant annual operating loss.

121-123 Buell building façade would be retained, windows replaced, doorway modifications to be historically accurate, and a fourth floor would be added.

127-129 Vallender building dates to 1867 and is in poor condition on the exterior façade and interior. Window patterning on second floor is the only existing redeeming value. Two-story building proposed with two levels to align with Castle and Doyle instead of three-story building. This project is proposing a 4-story structure parallel to State and Fairchild with a garden on the corner. The project team does not believe this proposal is too large or visually intrusive to the adjacent landmark.

Levitan asked who was the moving force in the project and would Austin have been involved in and aware of the property acquisitions. Mr. Austin said the Frautchis are the force behind the proposal which started in 2002 with the acquisition of property. Mr. Austin stated that the open space between Fairchild and Mifflin was first discussed in 2006. Mr. Levitan complimented the project team on the exceptional presentation. Levitan asked about “deteriorated condition” and wanted a further description. Austin said they were deteriorating when acquired and they needed maintenance to keep them from falling apart. How many properties were for sale when you acquired them and what was the concern about inappropriate development? 120 West was for sale. The construction of the Overture Center and other civic development created possible speculation in this area. The sponsors saw an opportunity to invest and strengthen the block. Maintenance and management of property has cost \$67,000. It would cost \$480,000 to repair and renovate. Levitan asked how much it would cost to reconstruct the Schubert Building. Austin estimated \$1M.

McLean asked about fire code and windows located on party walls. Lawson explained all buildings will be rezoned as one property which will allow for window placement as shown in the proposal.

Potter Lawson work began in 2010.

Gehrig asked about Castle and Doyle restoration and wanted confirmation that the wood panels will be retained since they are not shown in some elevation drawings and that the prism glass would be retained. Lawson confirmed that the proposal would keep all in place. Ms. Gehrig thanked them for the historic window restoration in the proposal.

Rosenblum asked about the painted over window on interior in the Schubert building. Mr. Lawson said it appears to be art glass and will be preserved. Rosenblum asked in the flooring was in bad condition when purchased in 2002? Mr. Lawson affirmed that it was. Rosenblum wanted to know if they would preserve sections or keep sections of the flooring if demolished. Mr. Lawson said they could probably save some portions.

Levitan asked if the view of one illustration actually exists. Mr. Lawson said it is viewed from the interior of the Overture lobby.

Mr. Austin said the view of capitol is not primary motivation of proposal.

Slattery asked about the setback and the upper addition to Buell Building? Mr. Lawson clarified 4 feet.

Taylor asked how the Castle and Doyle building would be protected during construction. Mr. Lawson said care would be taken to protect the building. He explained that temporary structures would protect the party walls. Mr. Austin noted that the contractor is quite experienced in similar work.

Jason Tish, 2714 Lafollette Avenue, representing Madison Trust for Historic Preservation, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. The district was deemed eligible as a National Register Historic District and the nomination was not formalized because it was opposed by property owners. His organization is opposed to this proposal based on the fact that State Street is downtown historic commercial district. It is equivalent to Bourbon Street/French Quarter in New Orleans. This proposal would take another gouge out of the historic character of the street. The construction of the Overture Center took the first chunk out of the 200 Block. The proposal is claiming to create a sense of place, but an authentic sense of place already exists. The proposal treats the streetscapes as two separate identities when the view from the street engages both sides. The proposal creates a disingenuous phoniness. A preservation/rehabilitation approach would achieve the goals of the proposed project as outlined in the Letter of Intent. He asked that the Landmarks Commission consider what State Street should be moving forward. Allowed removal of character on 200 block already. Is this practice what we want to perpetuate?

Levitan said he understood about the interrelatedness of the streetscapes of State and Fairchild. What is it about the work proposed on State Street? Mr. Tish said the treatment of Buell building is a facadectomy. [He endorses the staff report about the back being visually intrusive.]

Levitan asked about Vallender. Mr. Tish said he does not have full technical understanding of the condition of the existing materials. The building is connected to the German Romanesque Revival style and German heritage as it relates to the development of Madison. The demolition would sacrifice authentic materials that are connected to German heritage and construction methods.

Rummel asked if there is ever any value to the practice of facadectomy. Mr. Tish said keeping the building envelope is largely what keeps it from being a facadectomy. It is a practice that was done in the past and is not presently favorable. The historic character of a building is primarily on the outside.

Rummel asked Mr. Tish about the brick condition of Vallender building and how much could be repaired before authenticity is lost. Mr. Tish said that is a very difficult question to answer and the answer would need careful consideration.

Grant Frautschi, 1801 Laurel Crest, representing Block 100 Foundation, registering in support He has attended many meetings and appreciates the hard work of all parties reviewing the project. Mr. Frautschi noted that there

was an attempt to make State Street a historic district but it was never formalized. Mr. Frautschi explained that his family has been in Madison since 1869. He explained that the Frautschi family owned the Schubert for six years prior to it becoming a landmark and that when they purchased the Castle and Doyle building they knew it was a landmark and treated it as such. He noted that there is a provision in the Ordinance that allows for the demolition of landmark buildings. He stated that this is a unique project that will create a new vision for Fairchild/Mifflin Street and be an asset to the City and be built by private funds.

Levitan asked why no one came to Common Council to stand up against landmark designation of Schubert to explain this development plan. Mr. Frautschi explained that Mr. Rifken submitted a letter. Mr. Frautschi stated that a restoration option is not a vision of the Block 100 Foundation.

Rosenblum asked if there was any public involvement when coming up with the proposal in 2006? Mr. Frautschi said that this question should be directed to George Austin.

Ald. Rummel asked if this proposal was the original design from Pelli. Mr. Frautschi said this was probably so and to ask George Austin.

Joe Lusson, 627 East Gorham Street, registering in opposition. Mr. Lusson explained that there is a uniqueness of place in Madison. The history is embodied in historic buildings. He stated that it is important to protect iconic places like State Street with its triangular buildings and fire escapes. Mr. Lusson noted that the Overture Center was placed on a block of State Street and should respect its context. He stated that Madison is a small City with few historic buildings and even fewer landmarks and all historic elements should be respected. Regarding the historic district, he noted that land use decisions are based on the values of the day and that 20 years ago, the State Street historic district was not established, but that there are different values now. A glass wall and private garden could be constructed in any City. History matters. Take a stand to protect historic assets.

Levitan asked if there was anything in proposal that is supportable. Mr. Lusson said that \$10M would complete a restoration project and that he is glad they are preserving Castle and Doyle.

Stephen Fleischman, 227 State Street, registering in support. Mr. Fleischman defines State Street as “eclectic.” He said it is defined by a sense of scale and its interaction with the street. He stated that this proposal continues this vibrancy. Mr. Fleischman noted that he toured the buildings and noted deterioration, awkward interior spaces, and varying floor levels. He stated that the Castle and Doyle building is a gem and worth saving. He questioned how many other opportunities there may be for the City of Madison to preserve the Castle and Doyle and to enhance State Street as a whole. He stated that the park will unite the civic buildings and that the Madison Museum of Contemporary Art will not receive any of the funding.

Edward Kuharski, 405 Sidney Street, registering in opposition. The Glass Bank is successful as a contemporary building because the Exchange Bank and the Capitol are reflected in the glass façade. Overture owes some recompense to the context with the original part that is not terribly successful as the overall assembly relates to State Street. Mr. Kuharski stated that metaphorically, buildings are people and the proposal does not respect its neighbors. As people and buildings get older they acquire character. He concluded that the Overture Center was an unsolicited, well-intentioned gift, but the 100 block is special and should be respected.

Mary M. Kolar, 333 West Mifflin Street #9020, registering in support. Resident of Metropolitan Place and president of board of directors of the condo association. She supports the proposal because it continues to make the downtown attractive. State Street has changed over the last 100 years and the proposal retains that history. Many people in Metropolitan Place polled show 92% in support (of 27% of total respondents).

Beth Kubly, 711 East Gorham Street, registering in opposition. She lives in the 700 Block of East Gorham Street and is concerned about vitality of downtown. The project destroys landmarks, reduces the square footage, creates dead space, the park is private which will leave space empty at night, and the block is important this close to the square. She prefers the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation rehabilitation proposal. She states that we must retain the heritage and a human scale of the built environment.

Donald Sanford, 1211 Garfield Street, registering in support. He feels that the proposal is a thoughtful upgrade. He stated that he likes open space on Mifflin/Fairchild and that the community should grab the opportunity that may be large asset to the City. Gehrig asked if he supported demolition of landmarks. Mr. Sanford told story about an old cabin cruiser that he was going to restore. He noted that the best use of this landmark building would be as an organ donor since previous owners have not taken care of it.

David Waugh, 1213 East Mifflin, registering in opposition. He is a small business owner and wants to promote the small business community. He noted that funky creative spaces are needed. Overture is not successful because it is a new building that was not allowed to be new. The design team should go back to preserve all existing buildings to keep the area full of local tenants. There should be a marriage of old and new architecture so that both are successful.

Curt Brink, 701 East Washington Avenue, registering in support. Mr. Brink explained some of the financial issues related to having some other owner do this work compared to this unique opportunity where finances are not an issue. He stated that the proposal is making State Street functional. He noted that people are fearful to go up Fairchild and Mifflin Streets because they are dark and that this proposal will save businesses on State Street. Rosenblum asked if there was a higher crime rate on Fairchild. Mr. Brink said no one currently stops on Fairchild and the proposed open space will solicit more pedestrian traffic.

Bob Klebba, 1213 East Mifflin Street, registering in opposition. Mr. Klebba described an experience in Amsterdam. While in Amsterdam he visited a 20 foot wide retail shop from the 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> Century that had been a repurposed building, as had many other buildings in the area. This building had an ambience and it worked in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. This story could translate to the Vallender building because it tells a story about German immigration and history. Its character is unique and it is integral to the character of State Street and history of Madison. Tourists do not visit the bombed City of Rotterdam. It has been rebuilt in concrete, steel, and glass. It is not an attractive city. Madison has good architectural character that should not be discarded.

Henry Doane, 523 East Gorham, registering in opposition. Mr. Doane said he is a downtown resident and business owner. All of his businesses are in historic buildings. Just because it hasn't been designated doesn't mean it is not historic. Hovde has allowed Mifflin Street and Fairchild to go dark across from the site described in the proposal. The proposal is an attempt to sterilize urban environment and will result in the loss sense of place and authenticity. Cities need spaces like this block to provide ecosystem to survive. Replacing existing buildings with facsimiles equals the loss of charm. This proposal will attempt to sterilize downtown. Overture has already claimed an entire block of other historic structures with its previous creation. Office space is not needed downtown. Developers create blight to come in with a grand solution. They built the Overture in a forest and now want to cut down trees for a view. These structures are some of the oldest remaining commercial structures in our small downtown. These buildings were built with local materials and historic construction methods and they cannot be replaced.

Tom Link, 1111 Willow Lane, registering in opposition. Mr. Link noted that these buildings can be restored. He requested that the proposal be viewed for what it is and that the Madison Trust proposal be taken seriously.

Maria C. Milsted, 106 West Mifflin Street, registering neither in support nor opposition. Ms. Milsted explained that she and her husband own the landmark Willet S. Main building on the opposite corner of the block and that they support preservation. She stated that she would like to be able to support the project and that she likes the park, but she is tired of living in the blight that has been created with the property acquisition over the last 15 years. Ms. Milsted explained that with the future construction at the Central Library, the vacancies in the Hovde-owned properties across from Mifflin, and the treatment of this block, she is concerned about how to keep tenants profitable and in the rented spaces.

She noted that there are positive issues in this proposal and requested that all parties find a way to move forward to resolve the issues of blight. She concludes that had the proposal been handled differently in the beginning, we would all have a different outlook today. Rummel asked about loss of residential spaces and if that is a problem. Ms. Milsted said a City needs mixed uses to create urban vibrancy. Quoted a note by George Austin from 1997 that discussed cooperating with the business owners on State Street regarding the attempt to formalize the National Register Historic District.

Scott Kolar, 333 West Mifflin Street #9020, representing Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc., registering in neither support nor opposition. Mr. Kolar is a neighborhood resident and member of the CNI Steering Committee. Mr. Kolar explained that two themes have emerged as primary goals of the neighborhood. First, the character of State Street should be maintained. Second, Fairchild Street should be made more attractive by eliminating back door appearance.

More specifically, he noted the State Street proposal which preserves the Castle and Doyle, retains the Buell façade, and reconstructs the Haswell appearance has satisfied residents concerns that character is maintained with the following caveats:

- Historically accurate appearance
- High quality materials
- Attention to accurate details.

He also described the committee views of the Fairchild side. He noted that the views are divided. Some feel the civic node will achieve the goal of improving the appearance of Fairchild and that the potential building losses are balanced by what is gained. He explained that others want to retain the Fairchild and Schubert buildings for their historic significance. He concludes by stating that he is complementary of the professional manner in which the design team engaged the neighborhood and how constructive participation results in positive project delivery.

Gary Tipler, 807 Jenifer Street, registering in opposition. Mr. Tipler explained that the State Street historic district nomination was not handled well due to campaign of misinformation. He explained that an eligible historic building can utilize tax credits and this may also be true for buildings in eligible historic districts. This would mean that the health of the historic district may be alive even though the district was not formalized. Mr. Tipler provided some historic information about the Vallender building and associated family. This information shows the cultural connection of German immigrants and their influence to the development of Madison.

Mr. Tipler also provided some historic information about the Stark building. It was the first building built by a real estate company for its specific use. This elevated the industry and was given national attention at the time of construction. Gehrig asked about the landmark nomination and significance of the Stark building. Mr. Tipler said its strength is its social significance.

Gehrig asked what percentage of walls would need to be replaced at the Vallender building. Mr. Tipler said humidity is trapped in the wall and that rain splash and weather at the Fairchild Street side of the building

exacerbates the problem. He stated that if an imperfect final solution was allowed then there would be 20% replacement. Gehrig asked if the coating should not be removed due to the delicate condition of brick. Mr. Tipler said it can be restored.

Rummel asked about the details of National Register Historic District status. Mr. Tipler stated that he doesn't know for sure and that this should be investigated.

Levitan asked Mr. Tipler to speak on Kronenberg and Queen Anne buildings. Mr. Tipler explained that we must look at the entire body of work for any architect. Iron spot brick is a trademark of Kronenberg work. Architectural characteristics combined within buildings and make buildings unique.

Daniel L. Milsted, 106 West Mifflin Street, registering neither in support nor opposition and did not wish to speak.

Carole Schaffer, 282 Alpine Meadow Circle, representing Smart Growth Greater Madison, 701 East Washington, Madison, 53703, registering in support but did not wish to speak.

Sarah Frautschi, 1801 Laurel Crest, registering in support but did not wish to speak.

Patricia Heiser, 360 West Washington, registering in support but did not wish to speak.

Paul Heiser, 360 West Washington, registering in support but did not wish to speak.

Barbara Irvin, 178 Talmadge Street, registering in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Eileen Kolbach, 542 Evergreen, registering in opposition, but did not wish to speak.

Franny Ingebritson, 516 Wisconsin Avenue #1, registering in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Larry Lester, 2657 Milwaukee Street, registering in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Ruth Sandor, 125 North Hamilton #806, registering in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Nick Schroeder, 213 South Baldwin Street, registering in opposition but did not wish to speak.

John Rolling 641 Orchard Drive, registering in opposition and wishing to speak but did not stay to speak.

Michael Bridgeman, 106 South Franklin Street, registering in opposition and wishing to speak but did not stay to speak.

Peter Wolff, 945 Jenifer Street, registering in opposition and wishing to speak but did not stay to speak.

Mike Huffman, N3970 West Cedar Road, Cambridge, WI, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Doug Hursh, 15 Ellis Porter Court, representing Block 100 Foundation, 6129 University Avenue, Middleton, WI 53562, registering in support and not wishing to speak but available to answer questions.

Kevin Delorey, 33 East Main Street, Suite 900, representing Block 100 Foundation, 6129 University Avenue, Middleton, WI 53562, registering in support and available to answer questions.

George Austin and Eric Lawson were asked numerous questions.

Levitan asked if any market studies were done to show the need for additional office space. Mr. Austin said no. This is a very small amount of office space in relation to overall market. These will be Class A amenities without parking, etc. Office spaces will be attractive due to location, have views, and desirable layout. He stated that they did not see the need for a market study.

Levitan asked Mr. Austin and Mr. Lawson if they could address the issues of the plaza? The new area, outdoor space, how it will work, work with outdoor eating area, criteria would be opened vs. closed?

The project team feels the outdoor garden space at the corner of Fairchild and Mifflin is the most important aspect of the project, explained pages 17-23 of the letter of intent. To summarize: the garden space would be on private property, privately owned. Not a public park. Public access to it, it is pathway to reach the retail space at the corner of Fairchild and Mifflin, directly north of steps to it. There's also handicapped accessibility from W. Mifflin St. to that doorway.

Levitan asked about the Fairchild entrance, is that the main entrance?

Mr. Lawson said this is the entrance to the restaurant – 3 ½ foot difference between the grade elevation and the floor of State St. We're making that up with two sets of stairs at this location and then there's still a 3 ½ difference as you climb, the actual street goes up – there's a ramp here that provides access to that.

Levitan said that when we've talked, the critical sentence is the last line on page 19, first two lines on page 20: "It is the desire of the foundation to allow the public to sit within the garden on these benches we've provided as long as they do not become a management, operational, or use issue."

Levitan asked if there was any chance there will be a fence there.

Mr. Austin stated that there were no current plans to put fence on the edge. The garden is being designed as an entry. It is a meeting place, not a public park. It will have an inviting look and feel.

Levitan wondered that he was not completely sure how you keep the public out without a fence.

Mr. Austin said they were not trying to keep people out.

Levitan said that at some point you're reserving the right to remove the benches.

Mr. Austin stated that most property owners would use language that allows the property owner to readdress the issue if it becomes a problem.

Rosenblum asked how much public input was given to retaining the buildings and prior to the proposal coming out last Fall.

Mr. Austin said there was not any public input. It's not public space. Project was changed in a number of ways as a result of CNI Steering Committee comments.

Levitan asked if Mr. Austin and Mr. Lawson could address the issue of retro-fitting the Fairchild Building to make the roof usable.

Mr. Lawson stated that the roof structure is a wood frame structure and is under-designed for current code for snow-loading. To make it occupiable you would need to upgrade the structure, make it accessible by adding an elevator and additional points of egress, and relocate mechanical equipment.

Mr. Austin said we've been advised by restaurant experts that rooftop restaurants are not viable in Madison.

Levitan asked about the possibility of a different location for outdoor open space. Maybe utilizing space mid-block at the back of Buell and Haswell?

Mr. Austin said they wanted the focal point of open space at corner of Mifflin and Fairchild as a priority. The project team and sponsors identify the open space at the corner as a project priority.

Slattery noted that there are numerous examples of successful rooftop restaurants. She also noted that the owners spent \$6,000 a year in improvements on Schubert building in 9 years. Why weren't more improvements made if it obviously needs \$480K to rehab?

Mr. Austin said investments were made to maintain the basic integrity of building. Significant investment would have to be made to bring in a new tenant and the owners were not willing to make that investment.

Slattery asked if the maintenance was enough to protect structure from further damage.

Mr. Austin said yes.

McLean asked about the outdoor dining area and the door to the restaurant off the open space. The busy character of Fairchild Street is already not pedestrian-friendly. Can one access State Street through the open space? Mr. Austin said the restaurant can be entered through Fairchild entry or State Street entry.

Levitan asked why is open space better than Fairchild building. He believes a vibrant revitalized building is greater activity generator than private open space.

Mr. Austin explained the context of the corner and how the open space sits at the hypotenuse of the triangle formed by three civic elements.

Levitan said the project will cost \$17M, \$200-300K donated annually to Overture. Revenue stream will be 85 years to generate amount of money to recoup cost?

Mr. Austin said creating best project and optimizing all pieces of the project. It is not duplicatable as a typical development project.

Rummel asked what original Pelli ideas were brought forward in this proposal. Mr. Austin said that Pelli brought a sense of scale and offered a general concept for how the edge may relate to civic elements. Rummell said it seems like the context of the Overture is the focus of the proposal and not historic buildings in the context. Mr. Austin said that State Street is our "main street" and the proposal is attempting to retain that. Fairchild is not State Street. It has evolved and developed differently than State Street.

Rummel noted that the Mifflin Street elevation is the loser in the proposal. Why not include the neighboring Piano Bar to do something to really improve that elevation of the block? Mr. Austin said they were not here to talk about an expanded project.

Mr. Lawson said the design provides a new space in a new architectural expression. The form is unique and marks the arrival in a special place.

Gehrig asked how did they respond to letter from Steve Cover?

Mr. Austin said priorities vary from person to person. He does not believe that the open space breaks the street presence. Block 100 Foundation thinks this is the best solution looking at all issues.

McLean asked if they have studied contemporary-styled buildings at Vallender and Haswell?

Mr. Lawson said that was a comment from the UDC/LC joint meeting. CNI Steering Committee also requested these studies. The steering committee found the best approach was to retain the historic character.

Levitan referred to the staff report Page 3, Castle & Doyle, Certificate of Appropriateness conditions and asked if the project team has gone through the staff comments and if they are acceptable?

Mr. Austin said that they are prepared to work with Landmarks Commission and staff to resolve the issues.

There was discussion about the rear of new Buell and how it is visually intrusive and transitions to landmark buildings.

Rummel asked if there is any flexibility in width of open space.

Lawson said it is based on economics of restaurant and on egress requirements.

Rummel asked if it were not a restaurant, what could it be.

Mr. Austin stated it could be retail or office space.

### **ACTION:**

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, to close the public hearing. The motion was passed on a voice vote/other.

Ald. Verveer appeared in support of the State Street treatment in the proposal. He feels it is a good compromise and appreciates the vision to retain the character of State Street. He does not support the demolition of the Schubert building and he is not supportive of the demolition of the Fairchild as it may meet criteria for landmark status. He is not supportive of the proposed new building or of the open space when looking at the trade off of what is lost in light of what is gained. He would like to see the Landmarks refer the matter to allow more time for the design team to consider altering the vision. He cannot support the proposal tonight, but he feels there is room for compromise.

Discussion about how to proceed with meeting actions.

### **Castle and Doyle Building**

Taylor is thrilled that the project team decided to preserve the Castle and Doyle building. She wants to be certain that staff comments will be incorporated. Rummel noted that there are changes proposed for the back of the building.

- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations to the Castle and Doyle Building at 125 State Street subject to terms of staff report of January 27. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

### **Vallender Building**

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rosenblum, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the new building at 127-129 State is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark and include staff comment. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

There was discussion about the condition of the existing building and discussion about the appropriateness of the style of the proposed building.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Taylor, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the Vallender building has social and architectural historic value. If the existing building at 127-129 State is demolished, the Landmarks Commission requests it be replaced with a building in a historically appropriate style. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

### **Buell Building**

There was discussion about the setback at the fourth floor not being adequate, that the color of the proposed building does not relate to base middle and top, and the overall view/perspective coming up State Street.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the current iteration of the 4<sup>th</sup> story and the Fairchild elevations of the building at 121 State is visually intrusive and adversely affects the character and integrity of the adjacent landmark. Specifically, the Landmarks Commission notes the adverse affect of the minimal setbacks, proposed material color, and overall perspective when coming up State Street. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

There was discussion about the loss of the unique interior character of the Buell building, the loss of the historic mixed use, and the uniqueness of the craftsman style.

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by McLean, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the Buell Building has historic value based on the Craftsman style and historic mixed use. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

### **Haswell Building**

The interior is original and unique, but out of Landmarks Commission purview.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by McLean, to report to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds the historic value of the Haswell Building has been largely lost to exterior alterations. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.

## **Schubert Building**

Mr. Austin requested that the Landmarks Commission vote on this matter at this meeting.

Levitan said he would like to refer the remaining matters to the next meeting due to the new information that was brought forward tonight. He explained that there were further discussion to be had and more compromises to be reached. This is a very important decision and the Commission needs more than one meeting to make this right. Asked if the project team would take comments into consideration and come back with a compromise; the project team responded "probably not."

Gehrig said the Schubert Building is a landmark. Did Block 89 have approval to demolish the Opera House while it still had landmarks status? There was general discussion about ordinance issues.

Rummel said the Schubert Building was purchased in 2002 and had many years to address problems but the owners did nothing.

There was general discussion about if the project team had considered rescission of Landmark status for the Schubert Building.

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel, to refer the consideration of the issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the Schubert Building at 120 West Mifflin and discussions about historic value of 122-124 West Mifflin to next Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote/other.