



<b>Agenda Item #:</b>	6
<b>Project Title:</b>	5534 Medical Circle - Consideration of a demolition permit to demolish a commercial building (District 19)
<b>Legistar File ID #:</b>	91459
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner
<b>Members:</b>	Present: Richard Arnesen, Ald. John Duncan, Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, Katie Kaliszewski, Jacob Morrison, and Maurice Taylor Excused: None

## Summary

*Anna Andrzejewski, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak*

*Jim Lottridge, registering in opposition and available to answer questions*

*Laura Kvalheim, registering in opposition and available to answer questions*

*Diana Weng, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak*

*Alison Eng, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak*

*Margaret Porco, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak*

Bailey said that staff recommended a finding of (b) for historic value related to the vernacular context of Madison. This medical building was a part of original design of Medical Circle, with the buildings designed by noted Madison architect, Marshall Erdman. There are still other Erdman medical office buildings on this street. It is a loss of these types of resources, but the building itself is not significant enough on its own to have a historic designation.

Anna Andrzejewski presented her research on this building, which is part of a larger cluster of buildings on Medical Circle. She discussed architect Marshall Erdman's path to creating Doctor's Parks, which became a national business deeply linked to Madison's history. She mentioned other Erdman Doctor's Parks in the Madison area, of which many buildings have been demolished.

Harris asked if this rises to the level of a category (a) finding because of the idea of this being a cluster of buildings in a Doctor's Park. Arnesen agreed that he didn't know why it wouldn't meet the (a) criteria. Bailey said her rationale was to look at whether the individual building was historically or architecturally significant, and she didn't think it rose to the level of a landmark. She said that it is part of the larger medical park that has had changes over time. There are other places to tell the story of Erdman, and this is not a rare remaining resource in Madison. For Erdman's history and legacy, we would talk about it as a district, which is why she recommended a (b) finding for the building itself with additional details regarding Erdman's medical parks.

Morrison said he thought this fit category (b) as a contributing building in a group, similar to how they might think of a building in a historic district to be significant within a relevant cluster of its neighbors. Taylor agreed.

Kaliszewski asked if the loss of this building would impact the potential listing of the entire district or group of buildings. If losing this building would impact the potential listing of the remaining buildings, then she would argue that it would move up to category (a). Bailey said she did a virtual walkaround through medical park, and there are other buildings there. Yes, it would be better for historic context of a potential district if it stayed, but there are contiguous buildings even if this is lost, so it should not destroy the potential for a future district. Andrzejewski said this is the textbook example of a slippery slope. This building is on the edge of the cluster, so it would not create a hole, but if looking from a National Register perspective, she pointed out that the site planning was integral to these parks and this retained

integrity in site. She said that it may not be eligible for its architecture but for its historic value. She thought that a loss of one building would affect the park concept. Arnesen said the concept of it being a park was intrinsic to why it might be historic in the first place, and it's not a medical park if there is one building left. Andrzejewski said there are currently three buildings, and there were originally four.

Duncan thought it fit category (b) as a building with historic value, but the building itself is not historically or architecturally significant.

## **Action**

**A motion was made by Ely-Ledesma, seconded by Arnesen, to recommend a finding of (a) for historic value as the work/product of an architect of note, Marshall Erdman, and because the medical building would be contributing to a potential Historic District for Medical Circle. The loss of one of the buildings that currently comprise a potential district would negatively impact the likelihood of creating that Historic District in the future. The motion passed by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** 4 - Richard Arnesen, Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, and Katie Kaliszewski

**Noes:** 3 - John Duncan, Jacob Morrison, and Maurice Taylor