

From: Scanlon, Amy
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 12:39 PM
To: 'Stu Levitan'; joanknoebel@██████████
Cc: Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans@██████████; rtaylor@██████████;
michaeljrosenblum@██████████; christina.slattery@██████████; Erica & Mark Gehrig; Fruhling,
William; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva;; 'Julie Sager'
Subject: RE: 209 N. Prospect

The Sagers submitted materials based on the prescribed timeline to have their proposal heard at a public hearing on February 14th. At this time, there are two ways to have the item referred:

1. The Applicants can request a referral.
2. The Commission can request a referral at the meeting/public hearing.

From: Stu Levitan
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 11:27 AM
To: Scanlon, Amy; joanknoebel@██████████
Cc: Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans@██████████; rtaylor@██████████;
michaeljrosenblum@██████████; christina.slattery@██████████; Erica & Mark Gehrig; Fruhling,
William; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva;
Subject: Re: 209 N. Prospect

I have just heard from Ald. Sidar-Sielaff that she is "absolutely fine" with referral to Feb. 28.
So I upgrade my message from requesting that LC consider referral to requesting that we do refer.
Thanks,
Stu

From: Stu Levitan <
To: "Scanlon, Amy" <joanknoebel@██████████>
Cc: Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans@██████████; rtaylor@██████████;
michaeljrosenblum@██████████; christina.slattery@██████████; Erica & Mark Gehrig; Fruhling,
William; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva;
Sent: Wed, January 26, 2011 9:17:59 AM
Subject: Re: 209 N. Prospect

I think this situation should cause the LC to reconsider its procedure regarding informational presentations, specifically the degree of notice we provide. Representations were made about neighbor support for the project, without the neighbors even knowing about the meeting. In my world, we call that hearsay. I think putting it on the agenda requires us to provide some degree of notice, especially if the LC is going to provide any kind of response (which it did).

The fact that there's neighbor and neighborhood opposition will affect our analysis. It's unfortunate that the Knoebel-Cullenwards are going to be out of the country on Feb. 14; on projects which such huge impact on adjoining parcels, we should always offer the neighbor a meaningful chance to be heard. I'm also going to be away from the city on the 14th. Knowing that neither the Knoebel-Cullenwards nor I can meet on the 14th, I would like to request that the LC consider referring this to meeting of the 28th.

Amy, I don't have email for the applicants. Could you please forward this to them?
thanks,
Stu

From: "Scanlon, Amy"
To: "joanknoebel [REDACTED]"
Cc: Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans [REDACTED]; rtaylor@rest.com; michaelrosenblum [REDACTED]; christina.slattery [REDACTED]; Erica & Mark Gehrig; Fruhling, William; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva;
Sent: Tue, January 25, 2011 3:04:33 PM
Subject: RE: 209 N. Prospect

Ms. Knoebel,

As we discussed in our phone conversation, I will post this email correspondence to the Legistar web-based public access file. I will also include it in the information packets that the Commissioners receive the week before the meeting so that they will be able to review your comments and concerns in advance of the meeting. Please let me know if you would like to have any other comments, letters, or graphic items posted as part of the public record, and included in the Commissioner's packet before the hearing.

Best regards,
Amy

From: Joan Knoebel
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 11:24 AM
To: Scanlon, Amy
Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans [REDACTED]; rtaylor@ [REDACTED]; michaelrosenblum [REDACTED]; christina.slattery [REDACTED]; Erica & Mark Gehrig; Fruhling, William; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva;
Subject: Re: 209 N. Prospect

Dear Ms Scanlon,

We appreciate your reassurance. Two separate January 10 meeting attendees, there for other matters, reported the same conclusion, that the project got informal approval because the Sagers said they didn't want to spend any more money on architect fees if this was not going forward.

As you might imagine, we are deeply concerned about the impact of this project on our historic home and very frustrated that our concerns will not have a fair hearing. Moreover, we understood Landmarks' charge to be the preservation of the historic district, not the minimization of risks and costs to those wishing to build new here.

Thank you

Joan Knoebel and Michael Cullenward
On Jan 25, 2011, at 11:15 AM, Scanlon, Amy wrote:

Ms. Knoebel,

The Landmarks Commission has not yet made any informal or formal decision on the proposed project.

Typically for larger projects or new construction projects, City staff encourages the property owners to provide an informational presentation to the Landmarks Commission. This informational presentation allows the Commissioners to be introduced to the project and allows the property owners to ask questions about the approval process. There is no public hearing notice requirement for these informational discussions, and the Commission does not take any formal or informal action at this time, but does provide comments based on the presentation. The discussion that occurred during this presentation can be found at the following link:

http://legistar.cityofmadison.com/meetings/2011/1/10032_M_LANDMARKS_COMMISSION_11-01-10_Meeting_Minutes.pdf

The Sagers have submitted materials for a public hearing to be held on February 14. Their submission deadline was yesterday, January 24th. I will process the public hearing notice letters to property owners this week and the notice will appear in the newspaper on February 4 and February 11, as per the requirements of the ordinance.

You (or someone representing you) are welcome to make your concerns known at the public hearing through photos and letters, etc. The Commissioners want to hear from all interested parties before they make a decision.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Best regards,

Amy

Amy Loewenstein Scanlon, AIA, LEED® AP

Preservation Planner

City of Madison

Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development

From: Joan Knoebel

Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 10:42 AM

To: Scanlon, Amy

Cc: Maniaci, Bridget; dan.stephans@[REDACTED]; stuartlevitan@[REDACTED]; rtaylor@[REDACTED]; michaeljrosenblum@[REDACTED]; christina.slattery@[REDACTED]; m.gehrig@[REDACTED]

Subject: 209 N. Prospect

Dear Ms Scanlon,

As I mentioned in our phone conversation last week (before the flu descended on our household), we were unaware of the Jan 10 Landmarks meeting at which the Sagers made a presentation on their proposal. We got no notice either from Landmarks or the Sagers.

We have been told by someone who attended the meeting that the Sagers asked for and got informal approval of their project subject to minor tweaking. Is that so? What is the point of any attempt at participation if this has occurred? And how can this be open government if those of us most directly affected have no opportunity to participate?

As I said, we have a longstanding meeting commitment outside the country on Feb 14, the date you told us the formal public hearing would be held, although we as yet to receive official notice from Landmarks. We had planned on submitting a formal letter of opposition and planned to have a representative to present our case at the hearing. If there is an opportunity to be truly heard, we will submit a series of photos from our home demonstrating the impact on our historic property. One example is attached.

However, none of those efforts makes any sense if this is a done deal.

Please advise.

Joan Knoebel and Michael Cullenward

1712 Summit Ave

233-4079