

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> October 6, 2014
TITLE: 3414 Monroe Street – New mixed-use building “The Glen” adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark 13 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. Contact: Paul Cuta (35614)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: October 6, 2014	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Rummel left after the discussion of Item 4 (35575).

### **SUMMARY:**

Paul Cuta, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and wishing to speak. Cuta briefly described the project and explained that the project has been presented to the neighborhood and neighbors numerous times. From these meetings, the design has been revised to respond to as many comments as possible. The proposed building will be a 22,000 square foot mixed use building that is three stories tall with 16 street level parking stalls and 16 residential units on the upper floors. The building will have a storm water collection weir system that terminates with a rain garden near Monroe Street. The first floor commercial space is pulled back from the front property line and the plinth and upper floors are pulled closer to Monroe Street. The design would have a contemporary appearance with materials that are compatible with the neighborhood. The materials include dark masonry with natural cedar siding and stucco. Cuta described some design elements and the views of the proposed building that were included in the submission materials.

Marc Schellpfeffer, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and available to answer questions. Described the design of the building and the need for an open corner at Glenway and Monroe Streets.

McLean asked about HVAC equipment locations. Cuta explained that the condenser units will be located on the roof and there are furnaces in the apartments.

John Imes, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Imes explained that the Plough Inn came before the Commission 20 years ago when they proposed constructing the annex. Imes explained that the proposed building is large and that the space where the cars will be parked are not included in the total square footage of the building. Imes explained that there will be an impact on the landmark site and that a physical model would be helpful in understanding the placement and size relative to the landmark building. The rear portion of the annex is used as the on-site residence. The PUD zoning for the Plough Inn describes that the property should be treated as a residential district. The proposed building is not stepping back the upper levels to relate to the adjacent residential use. The landscaping and tree buffer on the site is not accurately represented in the design drawings and renderings. Imes explained that the proposed building is not visually compatible with the landmark site.

Levitan asked if Imes had conveyed what he thought would be an appropriate development to the developer. Imes explained that he has suggested a two story 13,000 square foot commercial building with green roof set 15-20 feet off the neighboring property which would still allow for views of the Arboretum.

Cathie Imes, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Imes explained that she is on site everyday all day. Imes explained that having the proposed development constructed 6 feet from the lot line is too close to the landmark property. The Arbor House sells sleep, space and tranquility which has been difficult along Monroe Street given the noise, but it has been possible. The proposed development is a threat to their business. Imes explained that the approval process that they experienced 20 years ago was difficult and that this process seems much easier.

Connor Anderson, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Anderson explained that neighborhood parking will be negatively affected by the increased traffic that this development will produce.

Lynn Pitman, representing Dudgeon Monroe Neighborhood Association, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Pitman explained that while the neighborhood had positive things to say about the development at the last neighborhood meeting, the neighborhood association continues to have concerns about the adverse impact that the proposed development will have on the adjacent landmark. Pitman explained that the 6 foot setback is inadequate and the lack of articulation is not compatible with the context. The neighborhood association suggests that the setback be increased and the articulation be improved to mitigate the adverse impacts to the landmark site. Pitman explained that the landscape buffer is misleading in the submission materials and that parking will be negatively impacted. Pitman requested that the developer revise the parking study before moving forward.

Gehrig asked for more information about the zoning differences between commercial uses and residential uses. Pitman explained that the proposed development is treating the Arbor House as a commercial use. The Traditional Shopping Street (TSS) statement of purpose shows that the 6 foot setback requirement is not appropriate.

Patrick Corcoran, registering in support and available to answer questions. Corcoran explained that the development on a landmark site should be more difficult than development adjacent to a landmarks site. Corcoran explained that the Plough Inn annex was built 6 feet from the adjoining property line and was not held further away from the property line to increase the distance to nay neighboring development. Corcoran explained that the PUD considers the landmark site a commercial use.

Susan Pope, registering in opposition but not wishing to speak.

Gehrig asked for images showing a straight on elevation of the proposed development and the buildings on the landmark site.

Levitan asked if the neighborhood association took a position on this proposal. Pitman explained that the DMNA provided a statement that urges the developer to continue to work toward an agreeable outcome on the outstanding issues. There was general discussion about the positive comments of the neighborhood meeting and the statement provided by DMNA.

There was general discussion about the need for elevation images showing the Monroe Street elevation of the block. Cuta showed numerous images to look for an image that would satisfy the request of Gehrig.

Levitan asked if the buffer of trees is sufficient as a visual buffer. McLean explained that the trees are not sufficient and could be removed at any time. There was general discussion about the buffer of trees as a visual break. Gehrig explained that the view from the street is important to understand.

There was general discussion about other developments adjacent to landmarks sites have been approved. Staff explained that every landmark site should be reviewed separately and should not be based on past precedents for other landmark sites.

There was more general discussion about the need for an image that shows the view from across the street looking at the Monroe Street elevation.

There was general discussion about the size of the proposed building related to the size of Parman Place and the treatment of parking. Cuta explained that parking is not required by Zoning and would not need to be provided, but the parking is being proposed to alleviate neighborhood parking concerns.

There was general discussion between Corcoran and Imes related to the easement agreement through the parking area and the overall project concerns.

Levitan asked if visual representations have been shown or if they are still needed. McLean asked for information about the floor to floor dimensions. Schellpfeffer explained that the floor to floor heights are 12-13' for the commercial space and 11' for the residential space.

Slattery explained that the Monroe Street elevation is helpful to understand the placement. She explained that the annex serves as a buffer between the landmark building and the proposed development. The green buffer should not be relied upon for the decision, but does help provide a visual buffer. Gehrig agreed and explained that the massing and size seems appropriate. McLean explained that the street elevation does not seem to overwhelm the adjacent landmark site and that the views to the Arboretum are important. Rosenblum explained that the Commission's purview is not about businesses or parking, but about the impact of the landmark site and he does not believe that the proposed development negatively affects the landmark site. Fowler explained that he agrees with the previous comments.

### **ACTION:**

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Rosenblum, 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 adjoining 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 voice vote/other.