

From: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Subject: FW: 3414 Monroe St. - DMNA Zoning Committee Comments
Date: Monday, March 02, 2015 2:16:08 PM

From: Dailey, Lucas
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 2:00 PM
To: Perry Sandstrom; Lynn Pitman; Julia Cattani Billingham; Zachary Madden; Subeck, Lisa; jamesother@gmail.com; stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.com; Scanlon, Amy; michaeljrosenblum@yahoo.com; christina.slattery@meadhunt.com; Rummel, Marsha; jason@c21affiliated.com; efgmadison@gmail.com; davidwjmclean@gmail.com; Coon, Scott F.; Brian Schneider; Holly Gibbs; Schmidt, Christopher
Subject: RE: 3414 Monroe St. - DMNA Zoning Committee Comments

Perry, and members of the Landmarks Commission,

Thank you for your letter, Perry. Let me briefly clarify a couple of points.

First, the four "20-something pro-development skills" from the meeting are all Dudgeon-Monroe neighborhood residents, and one in fact is the homeowner of the *only* residential property directly adjacent to this proposed development. And he supports the project. I don't know what caused you to assume they weren't residents but it might be worth examining.

Second, you and I do live in the same neighborhood, and I do think the project would be a good addition to our neighborhood. I agree with you completely that there are different types of urban character throughout the neighborhood, with those characters sometimes changing within the same block. I think the Monroe-Glenway intersection is one such example where the buildings around the intersection should vary from those deeper into the neighborhood. The neighborhood seemed to endorse that point when they identified the buildings around that intersection as a "commercial node" in the Monroe street development plan. It's both normal and good to treat the edges and primary commercial streets within a neighborhood differently than internal residential streets, particularly major intersections.

Third, as you said I did share my opinion that I thought the previous design would have been approved by the Plan Commission (and ratified by the Common Council). I didn't say it to pre-empt discussion, I said it to honestly share my estimation of the political status of the project. I think it's essential for neighbors to understand the larger political situation so that they can influence the outcome. The idea that anything is possible is strictly speaking true, and very alluring, but understanding what battles need to be fought and with whom is essential if you want to actually move the needle on an issue.

Forth, regarding the Arbor House, it's a business I support and I believe the new proposal is more contextually sensitive than the last and is more than acceptable. That said, I do think the business owners' put themselves in a less than ideal position when they made the decision to build a second building on the historic property, squeezed between the historic Plough Inn and on the other side only 7 feet from the shared property line with the adjoining commercial property.

As I've said previously, I think the Landmarks Commission should focus on the relationship the proposed building would have on the historic Plough Inn, not the new building between them. When a new building is built next to a historic building I don't believe that should automatically anoint the new building to historic status just because it's on the same legal parcel. I think that is a gross misinterpretation of the spirit of the law if not the letter.

I urge the Landmarks Commission to focus on the historic building and it's relationship with the proposed building.

Lucas Dailey

DISTRICT 13 ALDER
CITY OF MADISON
(608) 535-1214

Subscribe to District 13 updates at www.cityofmadison.com/council/district13/
