

3. [31120](#) 1025-7 Jenifer Street - Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Replace siding. 6th Ald. Dist.
Contact: Dan Ramsey

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to Approve. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 -
Michael J. Rosenblum; Christina Slattery and Erica Fox Gehrig

Noes: 1 -
David W.J. McLean

Excused: 2 -
Marsha A. Rummel and Jason T. Fowler

Non Voting: 1 -
Stuart Levitan

INFORMATIONAL

4. [31119](#) 17, 19, 25 North Webster and 201 East Mifflin Streets - Construction adjacent to Landmark - deconstruct 4 homes and construct 6-story, 58-unit apartment building. 2nd Ald. Dist.
Contact: Fred Rouse, Rouse Management

The Landmarks Commission Received an Informational Presentation

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. [17835](#) Landmarks Ordinance Revisions

This Item was Discussed and will Continue

REGULAR BUSINESS

6. [28640](#) Buildings Proposed for Demolition - 2013

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by McLean, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 17, 19, 25 North Webster Street and 201 East Mifflin Street do have historical value. The Commission deeply regrets the continued threatened loss of the historical fabric, especially given the architectural consistency and contemporaneous construction of the properties. The Commission is further deeply concerned about the demolition in light of the proposed major project adjoining the historic landmark site which was originally constructed in light of its land context.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by McLean, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the neighborhood has requested a gathering space and Dorschner and Associates is going to put together numerous options for what that gathering space may become (1206 Northport Drive). One of those options could be the retention of the foundation, then the foundation and exterior walls become this "thing" that is interpreted in the landscape. It sits into the hill so it would need a decent handrail, but there is some way to retain the building in a smaller, lower form as part of this garden outdoor gathering space. We note with concern that the proposed demolition of a contributing structure in a

historic district and urge that if the demolition is approved that the gathering space and interpretive use preserves the historical existence of the structure into the gathering space. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the building at 425 West Washington Avenue has no known historic value and no known preservation file. The Commission further welcomes the more intensive use and redevelopment of the property. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by McLean, to Recommend to the PLAN COMMISSION that the buildings at 17, 19, 25 North Webster Street and 210 East Mifflin Street do have historical value. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

7. [07804](#) Secretary's Report

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to Adjourn at 7:00 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

401 Woodward Drive

Single family residence constructed in 1929



Google aerial view image

Applicant: John Thompson, Thompson Custom Builders, llc

Applicant's Comments: The intent is to demolish the existing house structure with the intention of constructing a new, single family home in the same general location.

Staff findings: A preservation file does not exist for this property.

1206 Northport Drive

Lakeview Sanatorium Nurses' Dormitory constructed around 1930 and listed on the National Register of Historic Places with the other buildings on the Sanatorium site.



Google aerial view image

Applicant's Comments: None provided.

Staff findings: A nomination was prepared for Landmarks Commission review and the Landmarks Commission determined that it was not significant enough for landmarking.

425 West Washington Avenue

Commercial building date of construction unknown.



Google aerial view image

Applicant: John Sutton, Sutton Architecture

Applicant's Comments: One story 2800 square foot building to be replaced by a five story mixed use structure with 50 apartments, 8,000 square feet of commercial and two underground levels of parking.

Staff findings: A preservation file does not exist for this property.

City of Madison Planning Commission
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. Room 260

18 November 2013

Subject: Agenda Item No. ~~8~~ ¹ Consideration of a demolition permit to allow a former dormitory in Lake View Hill Park to be demolished to create additional open space; 1206 Northport Drive; 18th Ald. Dist.

Dear Commissioners:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment tonight, despite the October 30 cutoff for written public comment.

During service as a director and past-Board President of the Friends of Lake View Hill Park, I was the main proponent for the 2009 master plan.

That plan calls for preservation of the former Nurses Dormitory, which has historic value.

This essential fact should not be overlooked in tonight's discussion, even though the master plan does indeed also prohibit covered shelters, and does indeed also call for any public gathering area to be located in front of the building now hosting offices for Dane County Health & Human Needs (the former tuberculosis Sanatorium).

In my view, tonight you should refer this issue, pending provisions of answers to the following questions:

- 1) Who was responsible for letting the building deteriorate during consideration of its re-use, such that the roof reportedly separated from a wall?
- 2) Why did the consultant hired to research re-use of the building pursue functions that had already been rejected by participants in previous public planning processes?
- 3) Why were potential redevelopers and the public told that asbestos removal would cost in the millions? What was the actual cost of the asbestos mitigation action that has since been completed, apparently at a modest cost?
- 4) Why were potential redevelopers and the public given the impression that a costly elevator would be necessary for any type of re-use?
- 5) Why didn't the consultant interview citizens who wanted to offer alternative uses that were congruent with prior public input?
- 6) Why was the responsibility of fundraising for re-use of the building given to citizens who were known to be opposed to fundraising for Lake View Hill Park?
- 7) Why hasn't the post-demolition landscape plan been integrated with planning for replacement of the nearby water tower, as requested by citizens?
- 8) Why hasn't the post-demolition landscape plan been integrated with planning for a proposed eco-community landbridge to south, as requested by citizens?

The building should be stabilized to protect it from further damage, until the above questions have been answered.

Thank you for your consideration.

πSincerely



Jon Becker