

Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c. P.O. Box 2018 Madison, WI 53701-2018

22 East Mifflin Street Suite 600 Madison, WI 53703

Telephone: 608-229-2200 Facsimile: 608-229-2100 Toll Free: 800-728-6239 reinhartlaw.com

August 22, 2011

Harvey L. Temkin, Esq. Direct Dial: 608-229-2210 htemkin@reinhartlaw.com

SENT BY E-MAIL
Ms. Amy Scanlon and
The Landmark Commission Members

Dear Ms. Scanlon and Commission Members:

Re: Project at 1001 University Avenue /
St. Francis Episcopal Student Center Redevelopment

On May 9, 2011, representatives of Luther Memorial Church appeared in front of this Commission and spoke about the development at 1001 University Avenue. At that time, Luther Memorial Church was in the process of seeking landmark status, which it has now obtained. At the meeting, the Commission resolved that, if it were given jurisdiction (which now has occurred as it relates to Luther Memorial),

"it would not grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development proposal adjacent to a landmark unless the following concerns were addressed: (1) the development on the adjacent site shall not adversely affect the natural light that reaches the sanctuary at Luther Memorial Church; (2) the development on the adjacent site shall not adversely affect the enjoyment of the Luther Memorial Church site with increased noise and privacy issues."

The minutes indicate that the Motion passed by voice vote.

Through Luther Memorial Church's own due diligence, it found that a resubmission had been made by the developer that adjusts the building to become more of a box-shaped eight-story building. Unfortunately, Luther Memorial was not consulted about how the developer's adjustments might impact the concerns that it has been expressing and that the Landmarks Commission addressed in its Resolution nor did the developer or city staff even send a copy of the submission to Luther Memorial

Ms. Amy Scanlon and The Landmark Commission Members August 22, 2011 Page 2

Church. Fortunately, Alder Resnick has diligently informed us of the dates of the various meetings.

When we read the Staff Report prepared for this meeting, we were genuinely disappointed. Notwithstanding the deep concern that the Landmarks Commission expressed at its May meeting, the Staff Report consists of one line stating that Staff does not feel that the proposal has an adverse effect on the historic character and integrity of Luther Memorial Church.

Before preparing this report, no one from the Staff consulted anyone at Luther Memorial Church for its input, even though it is now a designated landmark. No one asked if Luther Memorial had prepared shadow studies that would insure that the redesign would not, as the Resolution requires, adversely affect the natural light that reaches the sanctuary at Luther Memorial Church. Furthermore, there is no record of any work that Staff has done to see whether the Resolution's concerns are now addressed.

Interestingly, the one time that I met at the site with the developer, the developer specifically stated that it had looked at a number of different designs and had determined that all of those other designs, including presumably this one, were far worse for Luther Memorial Church than the previous design. In fact, Luther Memorial's review indicates that, because the actual mass of the building would not be materially changed, none of the concerns in the Landmark Commission's prior Resolution have been addressed.

If this Commission adopts the Staff Report and recommends this project, thereby ignoring its previous Resolution, a complete mockery will be made of the landmarking process. Obtaining Landmark certification would offer little or no protection from development on adjacent properties regardless of the impact on the Landmark.

Madison is a beautiful city. This block on University Avenue helps make Madison beautiful. As noted at the May meeting, both of the buildings at issue are clearly landmarks and are clearly deserving of protection. At this point, however, only Luther Memorial is designated; a thoughtful process would seek the protection of the historic St. Francis site as well. Should this Commission recommend approval of this resubmission, thereby ignoring its previous Resolution, Madison stands to lose the

Ms. Amy Scanlon and The Landmark Commission Members August 22, 2011 Page 3

shared beauty of two historic landmarks. We hope the/Commission will honor the process, and uphold its May 9 resolution.

Yours yety truly,

Harvey L. Temkin

REINHART\7692589HLT:JBS

cc Attorney William White Attorney Kevin Delorey Pr. Franklin Wilson Pr. Brad Pohlman