

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 20, 2014
TITLE: 3414 Monroe Street – New mixed-use building “The Glen” adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark. 13 th Ald. Dist. Contact: Paul Cuta (35614)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 20, 2014	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Jason Fowler was excused. Rosenblum left during the discussion of 35614 (at 7:25 p.m.).

RECONSIDERATION

SUMMARY:

Levitan explained that reconsideration is a debatable action and public comment will be taken.

John Imes described the physical model that he provided is at 1/8 inch scale. Imes was disappointed by the original presentation and lack of 3D renderings. Once the physical model was completed, he contacted Levitan with the images.

Imes explained that due to construction and age, the landscaping buffer and trees will need to be removed over time which will remove the visual separation of the proposed development and the landmark site.

Gehrig asked if the physical model more accurately represents the project than the renderings.

Imes stated yes.

Slattery asked for more information.

Imes explained the physical model is based on the plans from the annex construction and plans for the proposed development. The physical model is more accurate to mass and scale of the landmark.

Paul Cuta, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and wishing to speak. Cuta explained that their 3D model is digital and that in the practice of architecture, inaccuracy is not productive. The dimensions of the physical model are not accurate. The physical model shows the proposed development 4 feet higher than it should be.

The annex building is actually 18 inches higher than shown in the physical model.

Cuta explained that he has 3D digital bird's eye views to mimic the views provided by Imes. He explained that the digital model can also provide eye level views.

Levitan asked for clarity on the dimensions that are inaccurate. Cuta explained that the articulation of the proposed building is not accurate in physical model form. Cuta explained that they used the Parman Place dimensions to accurately create a digital model of that building in the context.

Gehrig asked if they believe that the Monroe Street elevation is more accurate than the physical model.

Cuta explained the annex building should be shown as 18 inches higher than it is shown in the graphic.

McLean asked about the difference in height between Arbor House annex and proposed development. Cuta explained that the proposed building is 39 feet 6 inches and the annex is 29 feet 6 inches.

Rummel asked if the trees along the property line were to remain. Cuta explained there is not a basement in the proposed building in an effort to retain the trees to the degree it is possible.

Mark Hinrich, registering in opposition and available to answer questions. Hinrich explained that the original drawings show the height that is shown in the physical model. He assumed that the grades on the physical model are accurate. The elevations are copied and glued to foam cone. The physical model is accurate.

Patrick Corcoran, registering in support of the project and available to answer questions and registering in opposition and wishing to speak if reconsideration. Corcoran has been working on this project for over a year. The original project was much different. The neighborhood meeting comments and zoning comments have been reflected in the current design. Corcoran said this project was reviewed favorably at the last Landmarks Commission meeting. The physical model conveniently came out after the last meeting.

Corcoran explained that Hinrich explained he made assumptions to create the physical model. Corcoran stated that their digital model is accurate. The physical model is deceiving and is not accurate next to the landmark site due to the heights and the lack of material color and articulation. The physical model shows a large white box without any detail.

Cathie Imes, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. The last slide that was shown at the October 6 meeting of the elevation from Monroe Street facilitated the need for the physical model. The volume and overall length of the proposed building compared to Parman Place is where the square footage is increased. It was necessary to see the overall 3D of the site. The Landmarks Commission and the Plan Commission are the only places this will be reviewed and where design discussion can happen.

Gehrig asked for the square footage of the two buildings on the landmark site. Imes stated 3000 for the landmark building and 3600 for the annex.

Rummel asked if a less long 4-story building would be better. Imes answered no. Imes said that the landmark site will never see the sun. The residential character of the landmark site should be respected by the upper level step-back. Imes said they are looking for this to be made a better project.

Levitan reminded everyone that the issue before the body at this time is to discuss reconsideration.

Bill White, representing Patrick Properties, registering in opposition and wishing to speak if reconsideration. White explained that a reconsideration of a previous action is unusual. The physical model is not colored appropriately and vegetation is not shown on the project site. This project will go to the Plan Commission where the Landmarks Commission advisory opinion will be reviewed.

White explained that more context in the physical model would be needed for accurate review.

Levitan asked White if the Landmarks Commission should only follow staff recommendations. White replied No, but staff reports should be part of the review.

McLean explained that the unknown information is still unknown. The 3D digital model seemed inaccurate since the architects were not able to confirm the dimensions of the buildings on the landmark site and now the information is conflicting because the physical model seems off.

Jack Imes, registering in opposition but not wishing to speak (changed to wishing to speak). Imes is a resident on the property. He explained the height of the annex is 23 feet 6 inches to grade according to Hinrich. The height of the east elevation is 36 feet 6 inches of proposed building. The ability to portray the accuracy is fair.

Marc Shellpfeffer, representing Patrick Corcoran, registering in support and wishing to speak. Shellpfeffer said that an earlier design showed 4 stories, but 4 stories is not being proposed. The building is skewed to align with the Glenway side of the parallelogram. The conditions have been surveyed and the physical model may be incorrect by 1/2 inch (the equivalent of 4 feet).

Rosenblum asked if the grade on the site would change. Rosenblum asked where the 39 feet 6 inches measurement was taken. It was proposed at 39 feet 6 inches from parapet to sidewalk and 29 feet 6 inches from annex ridge to sidewalk.

Gehrig asked if the drawings are different than what was reviewed at last meeting.

Shellpfeffer said the annex height was increased by 1 foot 6 inches to reflect the accurate height.

Gehrig asked that if the Monroe Street elevation, showing the revised height, is able to be reviewed.

Shellpfeffer stated yes.

Lynn Pitman, registering in support of the motion. Pitman explained the process issues. The Landmarks Commission decision was made on an image that had not been previously submitted. It has since been submitted and says NTS which stands for “not to scale”. In addition, the physical model seems to be not accurate. The City should come up with a way to independently measure and verify the materials that are provided for accuracy.

Gehrig requested the definition of a landmark site.

Rummel asked Stouder if the Plan Commission will discuss the design.

Heather Stouder, Planning Division, explained the Plan Commission will review the Landmarks Commission recommendations. The Plan Commission will review the demolition standards, the consistency with adopted plans, and the normal and orderly development in this part of the City. The Plan Commission will be looking for advice from the Landmarks Commission.

Gehrig asked if the Landmarks Commission can review the design. Levitan said yes, given the “visually intrusive” language. Gehrig confirmed the Landmarks Commission recommended that the Plan Commission oppose demolition of the existing building given the association with two masters.

McLean explained that the 3-story proposed building was easy to accept at the last meeting, but the decision didn't sit well after the meeting.

Gehrig felt very comfortable with the elevation provided at the last meeting.

McLean explained that NTS means one cannot measure it with a scale, but that things are in scale to each other in the drawing.

Slattery explained that there doesn't seem to be accurate information to make a different decision.

McLean said the measurements were taken from sidewalk height versus grade and that measurements seem to be similar.

Cuta explained the sidewalk is at an elevation of 20 which provides a standard datum that all other items are measured to/from.

The elevation of the Monroe Street elevation was shown to the body as previously shown and included in packets.

There was general discussion to clarify the heights and the views of the buildings.

RECONSIDERATION ACTION

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rummel, to reconsider the previous action for 35614. The motion passed by a vote of (3:2). Ayes: Rummel, Gehrig, and McLean. Nos: Slattery and Rosenblum. Levitan does not vote.

SUMMARY:

John Imes explained that the proposed development would place a massive building adjacent to the landmark. Imes suggested the creation of a 10 foot side yard setback to protect trees and provide more visual separation to the landmark. Imes explained that if the landmark site is characterized as a residential district, the proposed adjacent development should reflect those requirements. The proposed development does not work with the landmark site and does not meet the recommendations in the Adopted Plan.

Rosenblum asked if they had discussed meeting with an Arborist.

Imes replied that they intend to speak with an Arborist. Once the trees are pruned to the property line, he is sure there will be less screening and that increasing the setback will help especially if the buffer relies on trees.

Rosenblum wanted to know if the previous motion, with the setback was strong enough. Imes explained that it was not and that the motion should also respond to the step-back at the upper level.

Rummel asked what a good transition might be. Imes replied they have been looking at placement and massing. Parking is not part of the calculation of 22K, but it gives an impression that the building is larger than it is.

Rummel asked where the front door of the Arbor House was. Imes replied that the front door was in the courtyard. Rummel explained that the view from the entrance is key to understanding the impact of the proposed development on the landmark site.

Levitan asked Stouder to clarify zoning and PD standards. Stouder explained that the PD is not a residential district. She said if it was a residential district, a 6 foot setback and third floor step-back at 45° angle at second floor roof would be required, however, the Zoning Code does not require this step-back in this case.

Rummel asked about the design of the rear of the building.

Stouder explained the under-building parking adds to the perceived mass of the building.

Rosenblum asked how the Plan Commission uses the recommendations of the Landmarks Commission. Stouder explained that the Plan Commission would need to make conditions of approval from the recommendations provided by the Landmarks Commission. She cannot guess how the Plan Commission would respond, but the recommendations would be part of their consideration.

Corcoran explained that the original design had a fourth floor so reducing to 3 stories makes a step-back not possible. Parking cannot go underground due to pumping issues.

Corcoran also explained that the Imes fought to have the annex built on the landmark site. If the annex were not in place, the Landmarks Commission would have a different perception of adjacency.

Rummel stated that given the front entry of the Arbor House, the back of the proposed building needs to be considered.

Levitan reminded the Landmarks Commission about the language for adjacency to a landmark site.

Corcoran explained if the buildings are 4-sided then all elevations should be considered. The white physical model does not represent the articulation of the proposed building on any side.

Rummel asked if there was any way to revise the design of the rear. Corcoran explained there is a driveway easement so they are unable to physically screen the entire parking area.

Imes Jr. explained the neighbors have been confused by the massing and scale of the proposed building.

Cuta explained the monumental corner tree on Corcoran's property will remain. The view has a green buffer.

Cuta explained that original neighborhood meeting was not supportive of 4 stories, so 3-story height was designed.

Cuta explained that there are supportive neighbors. At the last neighborhood meeting the comments were largely supportive. The project has been modified to respond to neighborhood comments.

Cuta explained that parking is not needed by Zoning. Corcoran is providing parking to take the burden off of the neighborhood. The open parking area walls could be filled in so that the additional 3,000 square feet allowed by zoning is used for interior commercial space.

Stouder explained that 25K square feet was the threshold for requiring a conditional use.

Pitman said she can appreciate the revisions that the development team has incorporated into the project. Four stories was a concern. Parman's Place is a 3-story building in parts and there should be some flexibility to compare parts.

Rummel said the massing is a puzzle. Adding a fourth story may solve one problem but make another.

Gehrig asked if opposed people were concerned about the landmark or traffic and parking.

Pitman said that many concerns have been discussed including parking, massing effects on Monroe Street and Arboretum, and traffic/parking.

White explained the conversation will range from Plan Commission to Urban Design Commission, but this is the Landmarks Commission. The language for review is straight forward. There have been numerous conversations with neighbors and the neighborhood about the design. The Landmarks Commission's decision should be based on its professional judgments.

Levitan read the ordinance language.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the proposed development is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the landmark or landmark site. The motion failed to pass on a vote of (2:3). Ayes: Slattery and Rosenblum. Nos: Gehrig, McLean, and Rummel. Levitan does not vote.

Rosenblum explained the buffer between the proposed building and the landmark site should be included. Rummel asked what one would suggest for screening the historic entrance. Staff explained there is an easement to drive through the rear parking area of the Corcoran property so screening is difficult.

Gehrig said that the annex helps as a buffer. The physical model shows a large building.

Slattery said the annex is sensitive to the landmark; however, the Plough Inn is the historic resource and is further away from the proposed development.

McLean said the 3-story mass seems fine. The landmark and annex sensitively react with the site. The new building is not as sensitive to the site and seems to be maximizing the site. The increase of the setback will impact the amount of rentable space and will likely make the proposed development unviable. Financial considerations of either business are not part of our review.

Rosenblum said he is comfortable with the previous motion.

Slattery said the proposed building is not intrusive to the landmark, but is intrusive to the site. She explained the annex has already compromised the landmark site.

Rosenblum said the annex muddies the water in the interpretation of the landmark site. The proposed development may affect the landmark site, but not more than the annex.

There were general discussions about the recommendations that could be made.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rummel, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the current size and design of the proposed development is so large and visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the landmark or landmark site, but strongly encourages the developer to increase the setback at the eastern property line and along Monroe Street, and that all parties acknowledge and appreciate the continued historic use of the Plough Inn. The motion passed by a vote of (3:1). Ayes: Rummel, McLean, and Gehrig, Nos: Slattery. Levitan does not vote. Rosenblum and Fowler excused.

There was general discussion of suggestions for appropriate revisions.

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

Gehrig said this is a good design, but it is not appropriate adjacent to a landmark site. She added that less square footage would make it less large.

McLean suggested a more sensitive relationship to the site and the landmark building. For example, 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.