



Project Name/Address: 3414 Monroe Street

Application Type: New development adjacent to designated landmark site
(Possible reconsideration)

Legistar File ID # [35614](#)

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Issued: October 15, 2014

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Paul Cuta

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting an advisory recommendation for the proposed new development and its impact on the adjacent landmark site. Please refer to the Reconsideration Process on page 2.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on Monroe Street adjacent to the designated landmark Plough Inn.

Previous Actions:

The proposed development was reviewed by the Landmarks Commission on October 6, 2014 and the Commission found that the proposed development at 3414 was not so large or visually intrusive. McLean requested that the Commission reconsider the previously made recommendation.

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

28.144 DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO A LANDMARK OR LANDMARK SITE.

Any development on a zoning lot adjoining a landmark or landmark site for which Plan Commission or Urban Design Commission review is required shall be reviewed by the Landmark Commission to determine whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark or landmark site. Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission.

Analysis and Conclusion

The site of the proposed development is currently the location of a building designed by William Kaeser and constructed by Marshall Erdman. The Landmarks Commission found that the existing building on the site has historic value based on its association with these two men who are considered masters in their respective fields and recommended to the Plan Commission that the demolition request be denied. The Plan Commission will review the demolition request as part of the review of this development proposal.

Adjacent to the development site (3414 Monroe Street), is the designated landmark Plough Inn (3402 Monroe Street) which is a locally designated landmark and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Landmarks Commission is tasked with providing a recommendation to the Plan Commission based on the impact that the proposed development may have on the adjacent landmark site.

Originally the Plough Inn was constructed away from the development of the city and was presumably one of only a few buildings along the early road now known as Monroe Street. The Plough Inn has existed in this location while the corridor developed around it into a dense residential and commercial area.

Like any other landmark building that predates its neighbors, the true historic character and integrity of the Plough Inn has been altered over time through obvious changes to its context including the general growth of the city, the construction of buildings on adjacent lots, the widening of the road, and the construction of a building on the landmark site adjacent to the landmark building.

The three story proposed development is visually separated from the adjacent landmark site by a buffer of trees and other landscaping elements on the landmark property.

Staff believes the proposed development does not impact the integrity of the adjacent landmark site any more than the other developments that have occurred around it over time.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the proposed development is not so large and visually intrusive that it adversely affects the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark.

RECONSIDERATION PROCESS

According to MGO 33.01(9)(b), all boards, commissions, committees and subcommittees are obligated to follow MGO 2.21, and may not modify that rule. MGO 2.21 says:

2.21 RECONSIDERATION OF QUESTION.

It shall be in order for any member who voted in the affirmative on any question which was adopted, or for any member who voted in the negative when the number of affirmative votes was insufficient for adoption to move a reconsideration of such vote, at the same or next succeeding regular meeting of the Council. It shall be in order for any member who was, due to an excused absence, not present at the time the question was considered to move reconsideration of such vote at the next succeeding regular meeting of the Council. A motion to reconsider having been lost shall not be again in order. A motion to reconsider shall not be in order when the same result can be obtained by another motion.

McLean requested that the Landmarks Commission reconsider this issue and the item has been placed on the agenda. The Landmarks Commission shall take up the motion to reconsider by requesting a second and a vote. After an affirmative vote to reconsider, the item would be formally before the Commission for review. The Commission is able to take up the item at the current meeting or at a future meeting. If the vote on the motion to reconsider was not affirmative, the item would not be reconsidered and the recommendation from the October 6 meeting would remain the action of the Landmarks Commission on the item.