LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING REPORT

July 1, 2024

Agenda Item #:	3 and 4
Project Title:	619-699 W Mifflin Street - Land Division on a Designated Madison Landmark Site (Wiedenbeck-Dobelin Warehouse - 619 W Mifflin) (District 4) 619-699 W Mifflin Street - Development Adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark (Wiedenbeck-Dobelin Warehouse - 619 W Mifflin; Milwaukee Road Depot - 640 W Washington) (District 4)
Legistar File ID #:	84153 and 84154
Prepared By:	Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner
Members:	Present: Edna Ely-Ledesma, Molly Harris, Katie Kaliszewski, Ald. Amani Latimer Burris, Jacob Morrison, and Maurice Taylor Excused: Richard Arnesen

Summary

Linda Irving, registering in support and wishing to speak
Joseph Mayer, registering in support and available to answer questions
Nathan Wautier, registering in support and available to answer questions
Sandra Ward, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak
Patrick McDonnell, registering in opposition and not wishing to speak
Burt Coffin, registering in support and wishing to speak
Neil Reardon, registering neither in support nor in opposition and available to answer questions

Bailey provided background information on the project. The proposed work is to demolish the nonhistoric structure, complete a land combination/division with 699 W Mifflin Street, and amend the landmark designation for 619 W Mifflin Street to reflect that boundary change so that it only contains the landmark and not the new, larger development. She explained that no matter what, this will be an adjacency review for development adjacent to a landmark because of the Wiedenbeck-Dobelin Warehouse at 619 W Mifflin Street and the Milwaukee Road Depot at 640 W Washington Avenue. She then discussed the applicable standards for each component of the project.

The project team, Linda Irving and Burt Coffin, gave a presentation on their proposal.

Ely-Ledesma said that in future submittals, it would be helpful to see where the applicant made decisions about the setback or separation between the buildings, and she would like to see building sections. She said this was extreme for a 10-story building.

Kaliszewski said that this is incredibly close to the existing building, and it is being given a five-foot surround. She asked if it needed to be that close.

Burt Coffin said the separation between the historic and nonhistoric buildings is very similar in their current condition. He said that Trinitas will keep and preserve the existing building to retain the housing there, and it wouldn't be a negative to have it end up functioning as one property alongside the new building. He said that many late 19th and early 20th c. industrial buildings like this would have been put close together, but this one happened to not have had many neighbors.

Ely-Ledesma said that she understood the adjacency, but there is a difference in compatibility when looking at Sanborn maps and what was a smaller warehouse in contrast to a 10-story building, and the commission needs to see the whole

picture. Kaliszewski agreed and said there was a difference between a lumber yard, which is an industrial feature that continually changes because of lumber moving in and out, and the proposal to have a static, very large building next door. She said that while the current building is close, it at least seems to complement the massing and setup of the existing building.

Kaliszewski said that leaving five feet is very narrow, and she would prefer to see the land division stepped back more. She said that if the parcel remains as is with no land division, and they are reviewing this as new construction on a landmark site, that might be different, and they should discuss that possibility as well.

Linda Irving said the lower section of the proposed building is set at no less than its current separation from the nonhistoric building, so they are maintaining that separation on the section that directly relates to the historic, and they are approximately 45 feet off the historic building to where they go up in height to the total of ten stories.

Morrison said the treatment of the base is an intelligent way to handle the building so it relates more kindly to its neighbors, with a simple, 2-3 story base. He personally had no problem with the current separation of the two buildings. He liked the courtyard on the back to give space there so it isn't just an alley. The biggest issue for the commission is how it impacts the warehouse and depot next door, so seeing images that relate to those relationships will be most helpful. The stepbacks on the third floor help a lot. In the context of the neighborhood, there is a building across the street that is the same size. There wasn't much shown regarding the relationship to the depot. There is a big presence. This is part of the larger urban fabric and a good addition to the neighborhood, but they need more detail. He said that it felt like a good set of moves to respect the warehouse and they were moving in a good direction, but he was a little concerned about the corner near the rail depot and relationship to that building.

Linda Irving said that the City's goal was to have high-density residential in this area, so the applicants were trying to marry the two objectives of respecting the historic buildings and heading in a more high-density direction with this project. Morrison said that it wasn't an issue of height or density but the detail in how it was articulated, and it would be beneficial to see something closer up rather than the large-scale views.

Kaliszewski said that if the applicants want to split the parcel, she wants to see the buildings further apart, maybe ten feet property line setback between the buildings. She said that five feet around the building is very 1960s preservation. Putting something this close is creeping toward that definition of adverse effect, and she would feel more comfortable with the land division if the building were backed up. What is currently there is complementary, with the same size and massing, while what is being proposed is 3x larger, so even moving the base back a little bit would be helpful.

Action

No action was taken.