



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, November 5, 2018

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 111 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Marsha A. Rummel; Stuart Levitan; Anna Andrzejewski; Richard B. Arnesen and Katherine N. Kaliszewski

Excused: 1 - David W.J. McLean

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the October 15, 2018 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Fred Mohs, registering and wishing to speak

Mohs said that he has lived in Mansion Hill for decades, prior to its designation as a local historic district. He voiced his concern about the push from developers, law firms, and lobbyists who are seeking to destroy historic preservation. He said that he is worried about the feeling within the development community that if they hire enough lobbyists, they can push projects in historic districts through, and he hopes that the City government and those who value historic preservation can stand up to it.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Arnesen disclosed that he is a graduate of East High School. Rummel disclosed that her stepdaughter attended East High School.

PUBLIC HEARING - REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. [53356](#) 2222 E Washington Ave - Addition to a Designated Madison Landmark (East High School); 12th Ald. Dist.

Kirk Keller, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Ken Turba, registering in support and available to answer questions.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Andrzejewski, to Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

2. [53289](#) 1233 Jenifer St - Exterior Alteration in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th Ald. Dist.
Ted Hill, registering neither in support nor in opposition, and wishing to speak.
A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Andrzejewski, to Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the front porch with the stipulation that column details be finalized with staff. The motion passed by voice vote/other.
3. [53566](#) 952-956 Spaight St - Exterior Alteration in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th Ald. Dist.
Ben Fritz, registering in support and available to answer questions.
Richard Fritz, registering in support and available to answer questions.
A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Andrzejewski, to retroactively Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacement and to Approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the door replacement. The motion passed by voice vote, with Kaliszewski voting opposed.

REGULAR BUSINESS

4. [47837](#) Landmarks Commission Historic Preservation Plan Status Report
Fruhling reminded the group of the upcoming ordinance revisions meetings that are being held in each historic district in late November and early December. The Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee will then begin its work in January. He said that the next Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee meeting will be on December 12.
5. [50000](#) Secretary's Report
Fruhling said that they completed interviews for the Preservation Planner position last week, and hope to announce whom they have selected at the next meeting.
6. [49999](#) Buildings Proposed for Demolition - 2018
By unanimous consent, the Landmarks Commission voted to recommend to the Plan Commission that the buildings at 412 North Street, 1502 N Sherman Avenue, and 2501 S Stoughton Road have no known historic value. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

NEW BUSINESS

7. [53602](#) Review of Historic Preservation Plan Draft Goals, Objectives, and Strategies
Franny Ingebritson, registering neither in support nor in opposition, and wishing to speak.

Amy Scanlon provided a brief overview of the draft goals, objectives, and strategies document. She explained that the Commission is not voting on it today, but she will provide an update and gather feedback on the current draft. She pointed out that they plan to further refine the document and distill down the strategies and objectives to create a more manageable document. The group worked through the goals, objectives, and strategies, with Scanlon highlighting areas that need refining.

Andrzejewski agreed that the document does need to be streamlined, and suggested that in addition to ranking the importance of the strategies and objectives, they could also combine those that are similar.

Ingebritson shared her comments on objective 3a, "promote sustainable economic growth by balancing new development and preservation," noting that she felt it was scary to include such an objective in the Historic Preservation Plan. She voiced her concern with the word "balance," saying that balancing is really development, and having no clear signal on where redevelopment should occur leaves it open to everything. She said that it needs to be tightened up because the smaller, less grand houses in historic districts are already disappearing. She suggested that they instead identify areas where it would be appropriate for new development to occur. Levitan asked Ingebritson if she finds any of the strategies under objective 3a objectionable, or whether it was the objective itself that she disagrees with. Ingebritson said that she doesn't have a problem with the strategies, only with the objective because it is too open for interpretation by someone who might want to redevelop.

Scanlon began discussion of goal 4, and noted that there are a lot of objectives and strategies that could potentially be condensed. She explained line 89, "expedited/simplified review for tax credit projects," to mean that if a tax credit project is being reviewed by the State, it may not need to be reviewed by the Landmarks Commission, and could instead be approved administratively. Arnesen said that if a project is approved by the State, the Commission likely wouldn't find much to dislike.

Levitan asked about line 88, "Separate guidelines/standards for review of properties not built within the period of significance in historic districts," and Scanlon said that properties not built within the period of significance are currently held to the same standards as those that are. She explained that this strategy would allow less strict standards for buildings outside of the period of significance that are located in a historic district.

Rummel asked about opportunities to create more local landmarks in order to save more historic buildings. Scanlon said that staff has reached out to National Register property owners to encourage locally landmarking to protect the building, but they have not had much interest.

Scanlon discussed several strategies under objective 3b that provide incentives or financial resources for historic preservation projects, such as a loan program or a materials voucher program. She said that there are a lot of

ideas that could benefit owners of historic properties, but they would need a funding source and people to then apply for it.

Scanlon then began discussion of the letter they received from Linda Lehnertz with comments on the goals, objectives, and strategies document. Arnesen suggested that the letter be passed along to the Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee as well.

There was additional discussion about line 39, "promote moving historically significant buildings to appropriate sites," which Lehnertz said should only be done as a last-ditch effort. Andrzejewski agreed, and said that the language is too strong as currently stated. Scanlon said that the intention was to focus on the sustainability issue and that it is better to move than to lose buildings, and said they will change the wording to better convey that.

Regarding Lehnertz' comments on line 66 about other City plans supporting historic preservation, Arnesen suggested changing the wording to, "...plans should support historic preservation." Andrzejewski agreed and said that if you add the word "should," it brings the rest of her suggestions about that strategy in line.

The group worked through the remainder of the letter. There was consensus that the strategies need further condensing and refinement, and there was general discussion about the next steps for the plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 6:32 pm.