

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 22, 2011
TITLE: 1001 University Avenue – PUD(SIP), St. Francis Episcopal Student Center Redevelopment – Relocation of the St. Francis House and Construction of a Twelve-Story, 90-Unit Residential Building. 8 th Ald. Dist. (21945)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 22, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, David McLean, Robin Taylor, Michael Rosenblum and Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair.

SUMMARY:

Registered and speaking in support were J. Randy Bruce, representing LZ Ventures; Kevin Delorey, Dave Black, both representing St. Francis House; Rev. Art Lloyd, Noah Van Dam and John Leja. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Steve Silverberg and Bill White, both representing LZ Ventures. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was William H. Dunlop. Registered and speaking in opposition were Gary Brown and Harvey Temkin, both representing Luther Memorial Church; Franklin Wilson, Douglas Swiggum and Brad Pohlman. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Neal Deunk, Marsha Steffen, Robert Steffen and Lynn Washington. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Alder Scott Resnick, 8th District.

Randy Bruce and John Leja provided a brief presentation about the revised project proposal that now consists of a 8-story building with 60-units.

Kevin Delorey explained that there have been numerous meetings between St. Francis and Luther Memorial.

Lynn Washington explained that as a musician, she appreciates the acoustics of the St. Francis 1960s addition that would be lost if this development were to move forward.

Noah Van Dam worships at St. Francis and he stated that the congregation prefers to use the 1920s chapel for services and that the project must move forward to keep the ministry on-site.

Brad Pohlman explained that Luther Memorial continues to be concerned about light and noise issues with the revised proposal because the issues were not addressed. Instead they were moved around on the site. He explained that the increased shadow would foster maintenance issues.

Doug Swiggum provided shadow studies and photos of Luther Memorial as a handout. He explained that the loss of direct natural light would impact the congregation's contemplative experience in the space.

Gary Brown reminded the Landmarks Commission of previous recommendations to Plan Commission. He read the recommendations and explained that the revised proposal has not addressed the concerns.

Art Lloyd explained that he supports the development as a way to keep the ministry of St. Francis on-site in the historic building intended for this purpose. He stated that there is a need for student housing in this area and that the St. Francis development is sensitively placed away from Luther Memorial.

Harvey Temkin explained that the proposed development project was not appropriate next to a landmark.

Dave Black stated that Luther Memorial has offered to purchase St. Francis numerous times. This tactic seems to be a waiting game to deny development so St. Francis has to sell.

William Dunlop explained the importance of the St. Francis connection to the University and keeping the ministry on its appropriate site. This development will allow it to stay and be economically responsible to the City.

Alder Resnick reminded the Commission to sort through all testimony and balance each side.

The Commission discussed the shadow studies provided by Randy Bruce and Doug Swiggum and how they differ. They discussed the light in the nave and the most suitable conditions for viewing stained glass. They discussed the times of the worship services and whether the increased amount of shadow would affect the interior space. They discussed maintenance issues that may relate to increased shade near the Luther Memorial building, since there is potential risk of damage to an exterior if there is a greater shadow cast. They discussed that they appreciate keeping the historic St. Francis building on-site and that the developer has been responsive to their concerns. They discussed the dramatic light and motion as an architectural element that is significant to the building's character and whether the ordinance allows the Commission to address concerns affecting the interior of a landmark.

The Secretary explained that the proposal at hand is what the Commission should address tonight. Compared to other proposals that could come before them; this one is saving a potential landmark (St. Francis), being sensitive to a landmark next door (Luther Memorial) and is trying to work with its context. She noted that the landmark is within an urban environment. Rummel stated that the code says "adversely affect," which is a pretty high standard for the proposed development.

The Commission discussed the recommendations from their review of the project from the meeting of May 9, 2011. These included adversely affecting the natural light, and adversely affecting the Luther Memorial site with increased noise and privacy issues.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to forward the following recommendation to the Plan Commission: While the Landmarks Commission appreciates the developers responsiveness to reducing the height of the development thereby positively improving the shadowing issues at Luther Memorial; keeping St. Francis on site; and locating the new development on the opposite corner from the landmark, the Commission still has concerns about the adverse affect of increased shadowing on the interior and exterior of Luther Memorial. The Commission believes that the increased shadow would affect the contemplative use and enjoyment of the space on the interior and that the increased shadow may cause damage to materials on the exterior. The motion passed by a voice vote/other.