

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 5/4/20

TITLE: 7-11 N Pinckney St - Variance from the
Historic Preservation Ordinance to
allow the demolition of a
Designated Madison Landmark; 4th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5/8/20

ID NUMBER: 60204

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, Arvina Martin, David McLean, and Maurice Taylor. Excused was: Betty Banks.

Also present: Alder Michael Verveer, District 4

SUMMARY:

*Mark Binkowski, registering in support and wishing to speak
Brad Binkowski, registering in support and wishing to speak
Ronald Luskin, registering in support and wishing to speak
Robert Lewin, registering in support and wishing to speak
Jason Ilstrup, registering in support and wishing to speak
Kurt Stege, registering in support and wishing to speak
Paul Muench, registering in support and wishing to speak
Please see attached Public Comment Registration list for an additional 90 registrants, registered in support and not wishing to speak*

Andrzejewski opened the public hearing.

Bailey explained that the applicant is requesting a public interest variance from the demolition standards for securing a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the landmark buildings at 7-11 N Pinckney Street. She said that the applicants are requesting the public interest variance because the proposed project will increase the tax base, increase employment opportunities, and recreate the historic character of N Pinckney Street in a way that the current buildings do not. She provided historical background on the property, including that 7 N Pinckney Street was designed by Claude and Starck. She said that the landmark nomination called out the architectural character of both buildings, primarily looking at the 2nd story, and that the occupant from 1899-1975, Olson and Veerhusen, was the oldest operating menswear retail business in Madison, which speaks to the highly gendered history of the Capitol Square. She said that Urban Land Interests (ULI) created a proposal in 2007 to redevelop the block, which inspired the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation to nominate multiple properties in the N Pinckney Street block as local landmarks. The properties at 7-9 N Pinckney, 21-25 N Pinckney, and 27 N Pinckney became Designated Madison Landmarks in 2008. She said that ULI's current proposal includes salvaging elements from the 2nd story of the 7 N Pinckney building, including window surrounds and decorative balustrades around the cornice. She referenced the proposed plans to point out where those elements would be relocated. She discussed the applicable standards, pointing out that this was the first time the Landmarks Commission was dealing with a public interest variance, and said that the commission must find that all of the standards under 41.19(7) are met. This includes that the proposed building

provides unique, high priority benefits to the general public, the benefits to the public outweigh the strong public interest in preserving historic resources, and there are no reasonable alternatives that would allow the project to occur in the city. Bailey said that she included memos from Assistant City Attorney John Strange in her staff report regarding the thought process on creating the variance standard, which was to provide a relief valve for projects that create a unique public benefit in a way that didn't weaken the public interest in preserving historic resources. She said that staff's recommendation is that the standards for the public interest variance are not met and the Landmarks Commission should deny the request.

Taylor asked staff which of the three standards are not met. Bailey said that while the project would increase the tax base, it wouldn't be unique or different from other new office buildings in the city. She said that when the public interest variance was created, it was with projects similar to Monona Terrace in mind, not another large office building because she is not seeing that as unique or high priority. In terms of benefits to the general public, she said that if the project is not unique or high priority, she doesn't see how that outweighs the public interest in preservation and integrating the landmark into the new development. Lastly, she said that she thinks this project could occur elsewhere in the city, not specifically this block. Taylor asked what would make this project different from any other projects in the downtown corridor. Bailey said the difference is that this redevelopment project is proposing the demolition of a landmark building.

Applicants Mark Binkowski and Brad Binkowski of ULI began their presentation. Brad Binkowski referenced their application, which contained more detailed information on ULI's involvement in the preservation of landmark properties in Madison. He said that he was delighted the existing 2nd story of this building was designed by Claude and Starck. He said that ULI's commitment to downtown Madison started in 1980, when the square was devoid of activity, and mentioned their partnership with the City of Madison on the Block 89 redevelopment that included underground parking. He said that project demonstrates the right kind of development that ULI has been responsible for, and they can take lessons learned from Block 89 to make downtown Madison better. He said that since 1993, they have slowly bought enough of the block that the N Pinckney Street properties are on that they now have the opportunity for development that, like Block 89, will be transformative and improve what exists today. He pointed out that 55% of the current site area consists of surface parking, which makes this an underutilized property on the Capitol Square. He said that as one approaches the Capitol Square from the east, one sees buildings with no windows on the back that look blighted. He said that in their current use, the buildings don't add anything to downtown's life, vitality, or future, and the landmark building does not improve downtown or create any public benefit, mentioning that it was destroyed in a renovation prior to ULI purchasing it. He said that the future of downtown Madison will have more active shops and restaurants that meet the needs of contemporary users, and underground parking is the only way to create the necessary parking resources for office or retail tenants. He said that the underground parking ULI built at Block 89 and Anchor Bank (Old National Bank) is used after normal office hours to stimulate all the traffic coming downtown to enjoy the quality of life there. He pointed out that one cannot do underground parking further east on E Washington Avenue because the soils don't support it, and without parking, one cannot create the ground floor retail space that is needed. He said that the existing building is wood framed, and they cannot construct a project that would use the potential of the site without underground parking. He said that the 7 N Pinckney building was landmarked after its original terracotta detailing had been destroyed, and their concept is to restore the storefront to its original form using terracotta that is matching in detail to what originally existed. He showed renderings of the proposed three and four-story forms along N Pinckney Street, pointing out that they would use contemporary architecture to revive and restore the traditional scale of buildings on the Capitol Square. He said that they plan on extending the 19-foot-wide American Exchange Bank building using limestone for the addition with office space built above that steps back respectfully, and then using a series of building forms along N Pinckney Street to recreate activity, life, and energy. He said that with the buildings as they are, they can't keep the office space leased because of a lack of windows and parking. If they were to leave what exists today, he asked if the square is better off and what is in the public interest. He pointed out that density in the downtown area is part of the Downtown Plan, and said that the only growing market segment is technology, so the future of downtown involves attracting technology firms. He said that the proposed plans are not final, but they do propose up to 340,000 square feet of office space that is set back from the building. He said that the proposed project would increase the tax base of the block by 14 or 15 times, and this is in the public interest during a time when the mayor is concerned

about the city budget. He said that if we don't create spaces that can accommodate the expansion of the only growing market segment in Madison, we won't have demand that will support restaurants, retail, or mass transit/BRT, all things that are in the public interest.

Kaliszewski asked staff if the Landmarks Commission were to allow the variance and this particular project doesn't move forward whether that variance would stay in place. Bailey said that the variance is linked to the demolition request for this property; staff has received the Certificate of Appropriateness application for the demolition, which does not meet the standards for demolition. She explained that the current condition of the façade is the same as when the property was designated as a landmark, which is part of the standards; nothing has radically changed such that this building is no longer able to convey its historic associations. She said that the applicant is asking for a variance so they can then come in with the Certificate of Appropriateness application, so this variance is directly linked to that request. Kaliszewski said that she wanted to clarify that properties such as this one would typically get listed on the National Register of Historic Places. She said that when reviewing commercial buildings, the first floors often change, so the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and National Park Service (NPS) look for the 2nd floor to be intact. She said that the idea that because the first floor isn't intact that the building doesn't have historic value is not currently accepted by SHPO or NPS and does not mean that the building doesn't have the ability to convey historic significance.

Brad Binkowski said that this is an unusual circumstance because they can't begin the city's normal review process and submit materials to other commissions for review unless the Landmarks Commission grants the variance. He said that this project deserves a vigorous public debate and input, and by granting the variance, it would allow the applicants to get to the starting line and begin to engage in that process.

Taylor brought up Binkowski's reference to density and asked how many apartments or condos would be in the building and how tall it would be in reference to the adjacent AC Hotel building. Binkowski said that there will be no apartments or condos, only commercial space because they think it is the last available space on the Capitol Square to create office space that would appeal to the technology market segment. He said that they plan on office space and retail or restaurants, as well as parking. He said that the building will go up to the capitol height limit just as the AC Hotel does.

Arnesen asked if it was safe to assume the building was landmarked due to the exterior façade and not due to anything on the interior. Bailey said that the landmark nomination discussed the historical significance of the property and its exterior and architectural significance.

McLean referenced the applicant's comments that the existing space adds nothing to the Capitol Square, is vacant, underutilized, and blighted. He said that to his understanding, the street façade will change, but the spaces will be similar to what is currently on the first floor at the street façade. He asked what the proposed project will add that isn't already there and could be utilized, perhaps not in its current condition, but with completing interior work to make the space useful again. He said that he agreed that the corner of E Washington Avenue and N Webster Street is begging for something to go there in order to make a nicer approach to the capitol. He said that a lot could be done on that part of the site, though it would cut the building footprint by 1/3 or 1/4. He asked how much is really gained by demolishing the landmark and rearranging the façades on the Capitol Square that can't be done with the way things are now.

Brad Binkowski said the current buildings are wood frame and not sprinkled, and they are deep buildings with no windows. He said that in the proposed plans, there would be a common trash room instead of dumpsters and loading docks for merchandise deliveries. He said that the retail spaces would be less deep because people don't want that big of a space, so they would be able to create retail space sized to meet the needs of the market. He mentioned that the American Exchange Bank is too small and tenants typically outgrow it for their office space, so they propose expanding the building. He said that if they are to build a below-grade parking ramp, they need to be able to get under the ground floor level at the sidewalk. He said that they can't do a project that they would consider a long-term investment to add life, vitality, energy, and achieve the purpose of the City's master plan unless they can provide parking. He said that without the parking, they wouldn't be able to get financing or attract the users that would create the density that would make the square

more viable and sustainable long-term. He said that they could probably do the project somewhere else in the city, but it wouldn't achieve the goals of the City's master plan or create density, which is an important undertaking and goal. McLean said that it sounds like the underground parking is what is pushing the demolition of the landmark. Binkowski said that it's also creating responsible density for the Capitol Square, and the site would be too small to support development if only a portion of it is used. McLean mentioned the AC Hotel and said that there are other structures that have gone up in this area with small footprints that seem to be doing well, which is why he questioned the need to demolish the landmark as opposed to building around it. He said that he understands the underground parking is a big factor and with the foundation of the landmark there, it is tough to get around it.

Ronald Luskin said that he is a downtown resident and supports the project because it will add much needed parking and will be a transformative project for the city and downtown, particularly for an underutilized piece of real estate. He said that it will add to the tax base, improve density, and will be catalytic in generating more possibilities for successful retail in the downtown area. He said that ULI can be trusted to produce a high quality project and maintain it for years to come, as demonstrated by past practices. He asked the commission to allow the project to move speedily along in the process in order to enable this property to be brought to a higher and better use for all in downtown Madison, the city, and Dane County.

Robert Lewin said that in looking at the progress made along E Washington Avenue, the city can be quite proud of the rejuvenation up to the capitol. He said that this project is focusing on N Pinckney Street, but to have a new, vital development on this block will improve N Webster Street as much as it does N Pinckney Street. He said that they are worrying about a landmark that he is confused as to how it got its landmark status, and the majority of informed Madisonians wouldn't know what the Centre 7 building was. He said that it is empty, has outlived its usefulness, and if it can be kept in memory in a new façade while going to a greater use to improve the entire block, he would urge the commission to move ahead on the project.

Jason Ilstrup, representing Downtown Madison, Inc., said they are in support of granting the variance, which will allow the traditional land use process to take place and ensure there is an opportunity for the public and local government entities to vet and provide input on this important downtown project. He said they believe ULI should have the ability to the due course of public review to prove to the community the numerous direct benefits the project brings to the public. Without entering the traditional due course of review, projects like this may never have the chance of greater participation, and without the participation of neighborhoods, the Urban Design Commission, Common Council, and Landmarks Commission, development projects are not reviewed by the full value to our city. He said that historic preservation is an important value, but is not the only interest of our city, and other values should also be weighed by the community, such as economic development, downtown quality of life, and sustainability. He said that granting the variance and Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition will give ULI the ability to prove to the community that this development is within the public interest and should move forward. He said that projects like this are central to DMI's mission and civic agenda, and Madison needs both commercial and residential development that offers density, which will create more jobs, sustain local retail stores, restaurants, and arts and entertainment options, as well as generate additional tax revenue to ensure we retain a strong, sustainable urban core.

Kurt Stege, representing the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation, referenced a statement the trust submitted prior to the meeting. He said that they recommend that the Landmarks Commission approve the variance for the demolition of the landmarked building contingent upon the commission's review and approval of the final plans and specifications for the reconstruction of a portion of the subject property's façade. Stege then spoke not as a representative of the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation and said that his personal hope is that they can work with the developer to ensure reconstruction of all necessary components of the 2nd floor façade of the building. He pointed out the clamshell windows and balustrade on the façade and said that he was not familiar with comparable architecture elsewhere in the city. He said that the existing brickwork is important to the overall grouping of terracotta elements, and the bricks are old-style, long bricks with thin mortar joints. McLean pointed out that the façade of the landmark has not changed since it was landmarked in 2008 and asked Stege what has changed that the building was important enough to landmark in 2008 and now they say there is a better use for the site than the existing landmark. He also asked about the significance of

the landmark's integrity, and if it is already all together in its current location, why they would rebuild it somewhere else. Stege said those are difficult questions. He said that the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation was made up of different people then than it is now, and it is not a uniform block of individuals, so there are likely current members of the trust who strongly oppose granting the variance. He said the current board concluded that the circumstances have either not changed or have now taken a positive turn with the preservation of the façade, so it can be placed into a more appropriate context. He said that it is unfortunate because it is a lovely piece of architecture but is detracted by what is around it. He said this is a true reconstruction of a portion of a building, and in the larger context, the trust board believes it warrants the revision of the original nomination. Regarding the reconstruction of the façade, McLean said that the historic preservation world generally frowns upon restoring something that has been lost, and asked for the trust's opinion on reconstructing something that is not there. He added that if the first floor of the building is unattractive, then perhaps they could just change the first floor rather than demolishing the landmark. Stege said that the concept of reconstructing or moving historic buildings is a difficult question, and a lot of people think that trying to do so is inappropriate. He said that personally, he thinks that if one is using essentially the same materials and removing what undermines how apparent the structure is now, then it is a net addition.

Paul Muench said that he supports the variance in order to unlock this critical site. Regarding parking issues, he said that no one wants to see a landmark building removed in order to build a parking lot, but it's more complicated than that because having the parking underneath will create an overall development that will provide space for modern retail tenants. He said that in his own work as the director of real estate for the University Research Park, he finds that commercial tenants are often demanding regarding the number of parking stalls they want. He said that special sites deserve special consideration, and this is absolutely the site that deserves that consideration and support from the broadest possible community in Madison. He said that as one moves up E Washington Avenue, there have been so many great improvements, and at Webster Street, the gateway to the Capitol Square, there is instead a parking lot, abandoned bank, and the back of buildings. He said that the blighting has gone on for too long, and it is time for the site to be unlocked. He said that it is challenging to build in Madison with the height limits, and this is a tough site because it has responsibilities to the Capitol Square, E Washington Avenue, and N Webster Street, which is why it is even more important for the city that this happen. He said that Centre 7 is a compromise, and the real prize is maintaining the American Exchange Bank building, and landmark advocates and supporters should feel great about retaining that building for the future. He said that at some point, we have to face this site, and ULI has the credentials and motivation to do an excellent job. He said that given the advances on E Washington Avenue, we should put an exclamation point on that by completing the development on this block.

Bailey said that there are no other registrants wishing to speak. She said that at this time, there are 89 other registrants in support and not wishing to speak. She noted that earlier today, a letter of opposition from Linda Lehnertz was received via email and distributed to the commission.

Alder Mike Verveer, District 4, said that he understood the analysis Bailey presented in the staff report and respected her recommendation, but respectfully disagreed with that conclusion. He said that in all of the years he has served as an alder, he has rarely found his analysis to be contrary to that of Planning staff, so this was a rare occasion for him. He said that he supported the 2008 landmark nomination of the property with the full knowledge that ULI may someday have a proposal to redevelop the site, and that proposal should be considered on its own merits. He said that we are now at that point, and he strongly supports granting the public interest variance. He said that the public interest variance, created during LORC I, was created almost exactly for this type of proposal to be considered. He said that the application does meet each of the standards, and said that the location on the Capitol Square is extremely unique and provides for significant employment opportunities that are not available elsewhere in the downtown core, so it is imperative to unlock these properties. He said that he has seen downtown employers leave downtown for other parts of the city or suburbs, and he does not want to see that occur in the future. He said that given the economic uncertainties of the pandemic, his concerns are heightened even more. He referred to the Policy and Purpose section of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, 41.01(6), and said that it speaks to the proposal before them, which "can attract residents and visitors, create jobs, stabilize and improve property values, and stimulate business and industry." He said that by making these additional employment opportunities available, it will help foster and

bolster struggling downtown retail. He said they should accept at face value the arguments made by ULI that there are not reasonable alternatives to granting this variance, and that he believes this proposal outweighs the public interest in preserving historic resources. He said that during his time on Common Council, he has worked with ULI, and they do excellent work and have highly successful developments. He said that he supports the variance in part because the applicants have promised to preserve and reconstruct the original intact decorative balustrade and terracotta clamshell-style windows currently on the building at 7-11 N Pinckney Street. He said that the proposal is in the early stages in terms of what the community has seen and is heavily supported in principle, which is indicative of the record of tonight's public hearing registrants with dozens of people registering in support. He said that with only one negative comment in the entire record, that is consistent with input he has received from the community and constituents downtown. He said that the commission's vote tonight will simply allow the land use approval process to proceed, including what will be several future visits by the applicant to the Landmarks Commission. He said that while they have not officially taken a position on the project yet, the neighborhood association, Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc., has met with ULI and are eager to continue the conversation. He urged the commission to grant the public interest variance in order to be able to proceed with the important conversation over the course of the next year where they discuss more specifics and every aspect of the proposal is considered.

Andrzejewski closed the public hearing.

Arnesen said there were excellent points made by the applicants and Ald. Verveer. He said that under 41.19(7)(a), he doesn't see how they could find anything but that the proposed building provides unique and high-priority benefits to the public. He pointed out that Madison has been growing tremendously, and as Brad Binkowski said, the types of businesses who are able to pay and want to locate downtown are in the technology sector. He said that ULI will clearly create a unique project that will benefit the public, continue growth, and be instrumental in the continued success of downtown Madison. Regarding 41.19(7)(c), Arnesen said that he does not believe there are reasonable alternatives to this project. He spoke from personal experience to emphasize the importance of parking to commercial tenants and pointed out that office buildings require more parking than residential. He said that Binkowski was correct in that one cannot build underground parking further down E Washington Avenue, and the reason some of that development was able to be successful without the ability to build their own parking is the City-owned parking ramp that was built nearby. He pointed out that there is little chance to do a similar project west of the Capitol Square because the university owns so much property, there is a lot of student housing, and there is not enough space to do a large-scale project like this. He concluded that there is not a reasonable alternative for the project other than where it is currently proposed. Speaking to 41.19(7)(b), Arnesen said that one of the best points that was made was with regard to the American Exchange Bank building being one of the crown jewels of the square in terms of historic resources. He said that buildings with no parking are struggling to maintain tenants, and being able to adapt that space into a more standard office floor plate would ensure the long-term viability of the American Exchange Bank building. Regarding 7-11 N Pinckney, he said that what we have now is some nice detailing on the 2nd floor exterior façade, and while he understands it isn't great practice in the historic preservation world, it would be reconstructed and we would still have that detailing if this project goes through. He said that from a practical standpoint, the project is proposing many other benefits, and he agreed with Ald. Verveer that it is too important to kill it at this juncture without it being properly vetted over the next year by various groups, neighborhoods, and city commissions. He added his agreement that the N Webster Street side of the block is a blight, as one sees an old bank drive-thru and surface parking when coming downtown.

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Taylor, to approve the request for the Public Interest Variance to allow the demolition of a Designated Madison Landmark.

Speaking to 41.19(7)(a), Taylor said that this is a unique opportunity being right on the corner of the Capitol Square, and with all of the building occurring on E Washington Avenue and around this site, it will be a great addition. Ald. Martin said that Arnesen's points were well-founded, and she agreed.

Kaliszewski said that she understood what the commissioners were saying, but she very much disagreed. She said that it is the Landmarks Commission's job to look after these buildings because they were landmarked for

a reason. She pointed out that this building was landmarked in 2008, and while the idea of what needs to be preserved and protected changes over time, it is the commission's job to protect these small things that no one thinks have importance and may want to demolish to add parking downtown. She said that if it is truly needed by the public, the Common Council can make that decision, but the Landmarks Commission should be standing by what they previously found to be a landmark. Regarding the 2nd story façade being reconstructed on a new building, she said that she would prefer it not be rebuilt because it is unneeded, but they will discuss that again when the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness is made. She said that she definitely doesn't agree with the arguments made on 41.19(7)(a) or 41.19(7)(b). For 41.19(7)(c), she said that she wouldn't call the N Pinckney Street block that the Old Fashioned sits on as "blighted," and she doesn't see the majority of the project fitting any of the three criteria.

Andrzejewski asked Bailey what the next stages were if the variance were to be approved. Bailey said that this is a multifaceted project that requires a number of approvals by additional bodies beyond the Landmarks Commission. She said that as currently proposed, the project will need Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition, land combination, and new construction attached to the American Exchange Bank building. She said that the Landmarks Commission will also provide an advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission regarding the construction adjacent to a Designated Madison Landmark, so the project will go to all formal Planning bodies and other city departments that would review development of this scale downtown.

McLean said that he shares the same sentiments as others have mentioned about ULI regarding what they have brought to the Capitol Square and Madison as a whole, and he has always held high regards for them. He said that he has no doubt they will do a fantastic job with this project, but he is not convinced that a project on this site has to include the demolition of a landmark. Regarding 41.19(7)(a), McLean said that others have brought up how the site is unique, so one could argue that any project brought forth would be unique and qualify for removal of the landmark. He said that the arguments about the project's uniqueness seem to be more about the site and not about the project, which to him is not what 41.19(7)(a) is about. He said that he doesn't see the benefits to the public outweighing the public interest in preserving historic resources in 41.19(7)(b). He said that there is site and space to do a great project on that block without encompassing the entire half of the block, though he understands that would downsize it quite a bit and isn't what the applicants are looking for. He said that the public interest that will be developed on the site would still be the same if they were to keep the buildings on the square as they are. He explained that his understanding is that the majority of the public interest would be on the first floor storefront access all around the block, which can still be done without taking out the landmark. Regarding parking, he said that he knows that parking downtown isn't great and if they were talking about something other than the demolition of a landmark, it would be a different discussion. He said that he has a hard time with the Landmarks Commission issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a landmark. He said that 41.19(7)(c) is subjective, and a project can happen on the site; it might not be the full-blown project being proposed today, but there is no reason a project can't happen here. He said that even the part of the site that is barren with nothing on it right now is bigger than some of the sites that have been developed around the square very successfully, which is why he questions the need to take out the landmark.

Taylor requested clarification that the current vote was for the variance request, not a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bailey confirmed that this was for the variance request, which is related to a Certificate of Appropriateness. She said that if the variance request is granted, then when the commission reviews the Certificate of Appropriateness request for the demolition, the variance request approval would meet the requirements for granting that Certificate of Appropriateness. Andrzejewski said that in effect, this is the vote on the Certificate of Appropriateness. Andrzejewski asked Bailey about the supplemental staff report, which referenced memos from the City Attorney's Office about the creation of the ordinance language. Andrzejewski mentioned Assistant City Attorney Strange's reference to an "escape valve" for projects with high public interest components. She said that a concern she is hearing relates to this potentially being precedent-setting and could be an escape valve that comes to the fore with a lot of different projects, pointing out that they often say there are no precedents in historic preservation. Bailey explained that during LORC I, staff was concerned about creating a situation where the city was painting itself into a corner and as Ald. Verveer brought up, rather

than historic preservation increasing vitality and the economic benefits of the city of Madison that it would become something that stagnated the vibrancy of the community, so in the policy section of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, it says that historic preservation should be to the benefit of the city. She said that for the escape valve, LORC wanted to include something that didn't completely undercut the intent of the Historic Preservation Ordinance but acknowledged there might be instances where the value of the historic resource was outweighed by a greater public need. She said that every project is unique with a unique set of circumstances, and she recommended providing detailed findings for each part of the variance standards, which will provide the precedent for how this particular case is unique. She said that any other projects in the future would still need to make a case for why their project meets the unique set of circumstances.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Taylor, to approve the request for the Public Interest Variance to allow the demolition of a Designated Madison Landmark. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 - Arvina Martin; Maurice D. Taylor; Anna Andrzejewski and Richard B. Arnesen

Noes: 2 - David W.J. McLean and Katherine N. Kaliszewski

Excused: 1 - Elizabeth Banks

With 6 members present, 4 votes were necessary for a majority. The Chair voted to break the tie.