

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** March 2, 2015

TITLE: 3414 Monroe Street – New mixed-use **REFERRED:**
 building “The Glen” adjacent to a **REREFERRED:**
 Designated Madison Landmark. 13th **REPORTED BACK:**
 Ald. District. Contact: Paul Cuta
 (35614)

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: March 2, 2015 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Michael Rosenblum and Christina Slattery were excused.

SUMMARY:

Levitan explained the Landmarks Commission is only able to review the project based on the ordinance language and the public comments should relate to the pertinent language before the Commission.

Patrick Corcoran, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and wishing to speak. Corcoran explained that he chose to redesign the project based on the comments from DMNA representatives, Arbor House owners, and city staff which suggested that the massing be stepped taller toward the corner.

Paul Cuta, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and wishing to speak. Cuta explained the new design and that the size of the building (square footage and height) triggered the conditional use standards.

Marc Schellpfeffer, representing Patrick Properties, registering in support and wishing to speak. Schellpfeffer explained the more specific changes in the design related to the calculation of heights and a comparison between the 3-story and 4-story designs showing step backs and shadow studies.

John Imes, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Imes explained that this proposal is too large and negatively affects the landmark site. He said that he believes the dimensions have been misrepresented by the Applicant and suggested that a referral might be necessary to allow the neighborhood association to provide a formal position. Imes explained that a smaller building with fewer units may reduce the need for underground parking. Imes also explained that some of the public comments were not in the public record.

Staff explained that the comments addressed to Landmarks issues were in the Landmarks Legistar file (35614) and that the comments addressed to Plan Commission issues were in the Plan Commission Legistar file (35641).

Heather Stouder, Planning Division staff was in attendance and available to answer questions. Levitan asked Stouder to explain how the need for underground parking was triggered on this project. Stouder explained that underground parking is not required but that the conditional use standards trigger a parking ratio requirement

and that the project team designed the building to accommodate the parking underground. Stouder explained that any building over 24,000 square feet or over 3 stories or 44 feet tall will trigger the conditional use standards.

Gehrig asked Imes if the redesigned proposal is better for the landmark site. Imes explained that the 9 foot setback is an improvement and the step backs are preferable to the 3-story wall of the original design.

Lynn Pitman, representing DMNA Zoning Committee, registering neither in support nor opposition, wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Pitman explained that the Dudgeon-Monroe Neighborhood Association (DMNA) had not been able to formally provide a position on the redesigned project because of the timing of meeting dates. She explained that there is not a consistent message coming from the DMNA. Pitman explained that DMNA had been open to exploring and reviewing a design with a 4th story and that a spreadsheet had been prepared which showed the comparable sizes of newer buildings along Monroe Street.

Gehrig asked if the changes to the design satisfy the comments that were provided to the developer. Pitman explained that it would not be appropriate for her to answer.

Rummel asked the development team if the southwestern corner element could be removed. Schellpfeffer explained the massing and that the building mass at the first floor would have to remain.

Gehrig asked for clarification about the dimensions from the property line and the proposed building compared to the existing building.

McLean asked about the masonry size. Schellpfeffer explained that the masonry would be a 16 x 8 dark bronze colored burnished face concrete block with similarly colored mortar to create a monolithic masonry base.

Shawn Schey, registering neither in support nor opposition and not wishing to speak. Schey did note on the registration form that a fitness center on the fourth floor with an outdoor terrace big enough for large numbers of people on east side of the building will diminish the quality of life for adjacent Arbor House.

Lynn Pitman representing herself. Pitman explained that the stepbacks improve the design. She explained that the volume of the building was discussed at a previous meeting as having an adverse affect on the landmark site and that the footprint of the building had not changed.

Gehrig explained her review of the visual intrusiveness given the size of the building and the comparable size and placement of the buildings on the landmark site and the related green space.

McLean explained that the size of the building does not provide for large growth trees or a significant amount of green space.

There was general discussion about how the redesigned building was more successful than the previous design. There was general discussion about the appreciation for the stepbacks and how the design was less visually intrusive.

Gehrig explained that the demolition of the existing building is an issue that is still before the Plan Commission and that it is still the feeling of the Commission that due to its historic value, the existing building should be retained.

Cuta explained that the TSS zoning and adopted area plan specify that the building have a certain relationship with the street.

Pitman explained that the adopted plan recommends 2-4 stories and maintaining the natural characteristics of the context including the Arboretum and the Plough Inn.

There was general discussion about the pertinent ordinance sections and how the language can be addressed.

There was general discussion about how this small commercial area on Monroe Street differs from the other end of Monroe and why the different areas were treated so similarly in the adopted plan and zoning. Rummel requested that the Plan Commission review all pertinent elements of the design, the zoning requirements, and the adopted plan to determine the best treatment of this unique parcel.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Rummel, to recommend to the Plan Commission that the development is so large as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark site; however, the stepbacks lessen the visual intrusiveness. The motion passed by voice vote/other.