



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Draft HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

---

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

5:30 PM

Madison Municipal Building, Room 215  
215 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 8 - Patrick W. Heck; Marsha A. Rummel; Richard B. Arnesen; Joy W. Huntington; Christina Slattery; Dawn O. O'Kroley; Jason N. Ilstrup and Eli B. Judge

**Excused:** 4 - Arvina Martin; Muriel Simms; Oscar Mireles and May Choua Thao

Staff present: Heather Bailey and Bill Fruhling, Planning Division

Also present: Carolyn Esswein, Ce Planning Studio; Bob Short, Legacy Architecture

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the October 3, 2019 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

### PUBLIC COMMENT

*Shawn Pfaff, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak*

Shawn Pfaff, representing the Apartment Association of South Central Wisconsin, said that he has been following the work of the Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee and brought these issues to their attention as well. He said that the Apartment Association urges the committee to keep the issue of affordability in mind as it relates to historic preservation, and said that Madison is not a cheap city. He said that the Apartment Association is available as a resource as the Historic Preservation Plan is implemented.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Ilstrup disclosed that he is a registered lobbyist with Downtown Madison, Inc.

By unanimous consent, Item 2 was taken before Item 1.

1. [57047](#) Draft Historic Preservation Plan

Bailey began discussion of comments on the draft Historic Preservation Plan that were received from the public and committee members, along with staff's suggested modifications to the comments. She said that it was the committee's decision as to whether they agree with the suggested edits and recommend the comments be incorporated into the plan. Slattery referenced

the public comments submitted by Einstein, and asked if the language on page 61 should be modified to reflect the fact that UW has been surveyed.

**A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Rummel, to include the submitted public comments as amended by staff. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

Bailey referenced the comments submitted by Slattery, and asked committee members whether they prefer the term “Latino” or “Latinx” be used throughout the document. She explained that there is a lot of diversity within the community, so there are divergent opinions on what terminology is best, and the City has no official position on the terminology. Rummel suggested that if they use Latino, they write, “Latino/a” to avoid a male-gendered presumption, but that she would also be willing to embrace “Latinx” if that is the way of the future. Judge voiced concern that as a group, the committee is not necessarily equipped to make this determination. Bailey pointed out that the research portion of the document uses “Latino” because that is the preferred terminology in federal reports and survey work.

Huntington suggested that when talking about the past, using language that was used historically is acceptable, and they should be representational of that cultural aspect. There was further discussion, and a general consensus that “Latino/a” was acceptable. Huntington said that terminology was more honest about the history and culture of that time.

Bailey agreed with Slattery’s comments on pages 19 and 35. On page 37, Bailey said that she would like to update the labels to read, “182 local landmark parcels” and “1 World Heritage Site.” She said that she agreed with Slattery’s comments on pages 38-49. On page 51, Bailey said they would change the reference to say “this chapter,” and on page 52, Bailey recommended the sidebar be removed. Bailey said that she agreed with comments on pages 61 and 79. On page 82, Bailey explained that the terminology for the committee starts out as the full name and becomes more simplified as the narrative continues, and asked the committee for their thoughts. Slattery said that her preference would be to initially use the full name with “(Committee)” in parentheses after, then simply use “Committee” for the remainder of the document. There was general agreement that this was reasonable.

**A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Judge, to include and accept Slattery’s comments as amended by the staff memo and the committee. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

Bailey began discussion of comments submitted by O’Kroley. Regarding the suggested revision on page 7, Bailey suggested adding “Commission” after “...the City Landmarks” at the beginning, and replacing “staff” at the beginning of line two with “the Preservation Planner.” Regarding comments on page 35, Bailey said that because the Neighborhood Character Conservation Zoning is not a preservation program and the Landmarks Commission is not involved, it

might be confusing to add it. Fruhling agreed and said that Neighborhood Character Conservation Zoning had separate types of mechanisms and review bodies, as well as separate criteria for its creation, so it should not be seen as part of the historic preservation program. O’Kroley said that she viewed it as another step to get more interdepartmental care of historic resources in National Register Historic Districts that are not local historic districts. Bailey said that she agreed with O’Kroley’s next comments on TIF programs and CLG grants, and asked for clarification on where the existing City policy of including underrepresented community members in the design and construction of City-owned resources would fit. O’Kroley said that if the goal of the Plan is to bring forward and identify resources in underrepresented communities, they need to keep those communities engaged in preservation, so it was important to acknowledge this City policy. Esswein pointed out that the purple box on page 35 contained a partial list of strategies, and the full list was in Appendix B. She suggested they add this policy to the full list of existing strategies under Goal 4, on page 75. Short suggested it be added to Objective 4a, and the group agreed.

Regarding O’Kroley’s comment on page 44, Bailey clarified that the historic preservation ordinance update will not include illustrated design guidelines. O’Kroley said that is how she interpreted the description of Strategy 4D-iii. There was discussion on how to revise the language. Esswein suggested they add, “to support the ordinance,” at the end of Strategy 4D-iii to clarify that the illustrated design guidelines are not a standalone document; the group agreed. O’Kroley said that her last comment about including primary façade setback illustrations could be added to the list of what to include in the illustrated design guidelines if it is not included in the Plan itself, and Bailey said that it would be added to the list. In the description of Strategy 4D-iii, Bailey suggested they remove the word “providing” at the beginning of the last sentence and change “will” to “would” to read, “Illustrated examples would help...” The group agreed. O’Kroley asked if this strategy was making a plea to get funding for the illustrated design guidelines, and Bailey said that it was. Slattery pointed out that this strategy was included as one of the priority strategies on page 52.

Regarding O’Kroley’s comment on page 14, Bailey said that staff did not copy the paragraphs exactly; they summarized the first few paragraphs and moved the rest to the appendix. For the comment on page 9 regarding tax credits, Bailey suggested they preface the information on tax credit amounts with “In 2020...” because the amounts can change over time. O’Kroley said that change is fine as long as percentages for both tax credit programs, homeowner and income-producing, are listed.

**A motion was made by Ilstrup, seconded by Judge, to include and accept O’Kroley’s comments as amended by the staff memo and the committee. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

Fruhling pointed out that staff will fill in information about the Advisory

Committee meetings and the last open house in Appendix C. O'Kroley said that a lot of the photos are contemporary, and asked if they could include more historic photos or examples of successful adaptive reuse projects like Garver Feed Mill, where they could show images of the beginning of the project and the final product. Bailey said that they weren't able to include many historic photos because they don't have rights to do so.

Fruhling thanked committee members for their contributions and dedication to creating the City's first Historic Preservation Plan. The committee thanked City staff, consultants, and previous committee members for their efforts, and said that it was exciting to see all of their work over the past two years come together in the final product.

**A motion was made by Judge, seconded by Huntington, to Approve the draft Historic Preservation Plan and forward it to the Landmarks Commission. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**

2. [56576](#)

Next Steps and Meeting Schedule

Bailey discussed the updated meeting schedule, pointing out that this is likely the final Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee meeting. She said that if the committee recommends adoption, the Plan will be referred to the Landmarks Commission, who will serve as lead. The Landmarks Commission will then refer the Plan to the Common Council and other bodies for review, with the Common Council having the final decision on adoption.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**By unanimous consent, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 pm.**