

Landmarks Commission:

We reside at 1602 Summit Ave, in the University Heights District. We have seen proposed designs for a residence in a newly subdivided lot at 209 Prospect. The information provided by the Sagers is insufficient for understanding the full effect of the house on the neighborhood.

Nevertheless, we are strongly opposed to the construction at 209 Prospect for several reasons.

- 1) The house proposed does not fit into the neighborhood in terms of design and roof. The contemporary style, small size and lack of bold design are not fitting for this historic neighborhood.
- 2) The house sits too far back in the lot and should sit similar to the other houses near the street. By locating in the back of the lot it destroys significant large trees and ruins the viewshed of a number of residences on Summit.
- 3) It will create more runoff both during and after construction by increasing more impermeable surfaces in the area.
- 4) The subdivision of the lot was completed and approved under false pretenses.

If small contemporary houses can be built on subdivided lots in a historic district. What is the point of designating the district as such? Why all the regulations around what can and can't be done to existing houses?

Sincerely,

James and Mary Yockey  
1602 Summit Avenue  
Madison, WI 53726

2/28/2011

Landmark Commission Public Hearing Questions about 209 N. Prospect Ave. new house construction

1. What information does the LC (Landmarks Commission) require at the time of submission of a request for new construction in University Heights Historical District (UHHD)?
  - a. When using the term elevations is it just showing the different sides of the house (as staff has said to our alderperson) or are elevations showing how the new home is visually compatible with the adjacent buildings required? Are we talking about adjacent only in the front or also in the rear?

**“The LC application indicates: any other information that may be helpful in communicating the details of the project and how it complies with the Landmark Ordinance, including impacts on existing structures on the site or on nearby properties.”**

2. I asked the applicant at the second coffee on 2/4/11 if he would prepare such information as it would be most helpful for the neighborhood to arrive at an informed opinion. He had stated during our discussion that the roof, height and siting were done to minimize impact on rear properties but there is nothing in the submissions to substantiate that. As Reagan said: trust but verify! I also asked Amy Scanlon and then the alder that before the neighborhood meeting this would be helpful. Indeed, there were requests at the meeting for this type of visual. I believe that such requests were appropriate.

In sum, it would be helpful to all parties to this type of new construction request if the LC would clarify the required information for submittals and the optional information. Right now, we are told that the information on the Planning Division web site is five years out of date and is no longer applicable. Therefore, those of us who understood this information to be correct were only advised last Friday that we were not correct.

Lynn Gilchrist

P.S. If you proceed to today to take action, I would strongly advise that #4 in the staff comments etc. be changed to language that required submittal for city approval of rain/storm water runoff plans.

I also am of the opinion that the cedar wood color might pop just too much but that is my personal aesthetic.