MEMORANDUM

Date: May 5, 2025

To: Landmarks Commission

From: Alex Saloutos

Re: Recommendations for Enhancing Madison's Historic Preservation Ordinance and Review

Process and Text Amendments to the Historic Preservation Ordinance, MGO 88167

Thank you for your continued dedication to Madison's historic preservation efforts and for thoughtfully engaging in discussions about our city's preservation policies. Reflecting on your productive discussion at the June 13, 2024, Landmarks Commission meeting, I would like to offer recommendations that directly address the concerns raised and ensure meaningful improvements to our preservation framework.

Strengthening Demolition Review and Introducing a Demolition Delay Ordinance

During your 2024 meeting, commissioners rightly highlighted that Madison's current demolition review ordinance frequently concludes with findings of "no known historical significance," potentially overlooking buildings whose historical significance requires further examination. To address this:

- Implement a More Robust Demolition Review Process: I recommend updating our ordinance to ensure comprehensive evaluations of potential historical significance. Other municipalities provide effective models, including explicit criteria, ample notice and comment periods, and clear documentation requirements. The National Trust's brochure, "Protecting Potential Landmarks Through Demolition Review," offers valuable guidance and examples of best practices (attached/link provided).
- Establish a Demolition Delay Ordinance: Introducing a demolition delay ordinance, applicable only to properties identified as historically significant through the improved demolition review process, would create a critical time buffer, enabling thorough investigation into buildings' historic value and exploring preservation alternatives. Cities employing demolition delay provisions have significantly increased opportunities to preserve culturally and historically important structures. Madison should consider commissioning a consultant knowledgeable in historic preservation best practices to guide this process effectively.

For additional details and best practices related to demolition review and demolition delay ordinances, please refer to the attached brochure "Protecting Potential Landmarks Through Demolition Review."

Concerns Regarding Changing "Master Architect" to "Architect of Note"

I also wish to express strong reservations regarding the proposed ordinance change from the term "master architect" to "architect of note." This proposed shift fundamentally alters the standard and meaning applied in historic preservation assessments:

National Preservation Standards: The Secretary of the Interior's criteria explicitly reference
"master architect," defined as "a figure of generally recognized greatness in a field, a known
craftsman of consummate skill...whose work is distinguishable by its characteristic style and
quality" (National Register Bulletin 15). This standard is vital to maintaining the rigor and
integrity of our preservation program.

- Implications of Changing Terminology: The term "architect of note" lacks formal definition and rigor, leading to ambiguity and diminished preservation quality. The Merriam-Webster definition underscores this disparity, characterizing "noteworthy" merely as "worthy of or attracting attention" rather than denoting exceptional skill or influence. In contrast, Merriam-Webster defines "master" as "a great figure of the past (as in science or art) whose work serves as a model or ideal." It is important to note that the dictionary includes more than a dozen definitions for "master," minimizing the singular connotation related to slavery and emphasizing its diverse and contextually appropriate applications. Additionally, none of the guidance in the 2024 Legistar file, which extensively discusses diversity, equity, and inclusion, mentions the term "master architect" as problematic or having negative connotations.
- Consistency Across Ordinances: The term "master" appears throughout Madison's ordinances (e.g., master plans, master plumbers, master electricians, master's degrees). Changing it in isolation within historic preservation lacks coherence and rationale, given that it is contextually and professionally appropriate.

Therefore, I strongly recommend retaining the terminology "master architect" to maintain consistency with federal standards, clarity in preservation evaluation, and to uphold the integrity of our historic preservation efforts.

In conclusion, I urge the Commission to:

- Develop a strengthened demolition review process.
- Adopt a demolition delay ordinance informed by best practices, applying specifically to historically significant properties.
- Retain the established, federally recognized term "master architect."

Thank you again for your thoughtful consideration of these recommendations. I look forward to your discussion and am available for further assistance or clarification.

Attachment: National Trust for Historic Preservation. "Protecting Potential Landmarks Through Demolition Review" Brochure.

A National Trust preservation law publication . . .

Protecting Potential Landmarks Through Demolition Review

by Julia H. Miller





1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 202.588.6035

The National Trust for Historic Preservation provides leadership, education, and advocacy to save America's diverse historic places and revitalize our communities. Support for the National Trust is provided by membership dues, endowment funds, individuals, corporate and foundation contributions, and grants from federal and state agencies.

The National Trust's Law Department provides educational materials and workshops on legal developments in historic preservation law for the benefit of citizens, organizations, and governmental institutions throughout the United States. Through this work, the Trust helps communities protect their heritage, their homes and businesses, their neighborhoods, and their history.

For further information, contact the Law Department at 202-588-6035 or send an email to law@nthp.org. Also visit our website at www.nthp.org/law.html.

© National Trust for Historic Preservation 2006. All rights reserved. For additional copies, reproduction permission, or for information about our other legal publications, please contact the National Trust's Law Department at the contact information listed above.

Cover Photo: Redwood Street Historic District, Baltimore, MD (Historic American Buildings Survey, NPS)

Protecting Potential Landmarks through Demolition Review

By Julia H. Miller*

ast year, the wrecking ball fell twice in downtown Baton Rouge—almost. Two historic buildings, the 1910 S.H. Kress Building, the site of a 1960 civil rights protest at the then all-white, lunch counter of the five and dime, and the adjacent Welsh & Levy Building, built in 1885, were spared only after the owner backed off his plans to demolish the buildings for a surface parking lot in response to public outcry. The fate of a third building, the Old Baton Rouge Ice Plant, proved less fortunate. This 1880s one-story brick building was demolished for a riverfront condominium project. Once used for ice production, the building had been located on the Mississippi River on one of the city's few remaining intact blocks dating from the Nineteenth Century.

Baton Rouge has since taken steps to protect its unprotected resources and other communities can too. Through the adoption of a "demolition review ordinance," older buildings (generally those over 50 years) cannot be demolished without review by a preservation commission or special committee to determine whether a building is historically significant. If the building qualifies as significant, then a commission may delay the issuance of a demolition permit to explore preservation alternatives, such as designating the building as a historic landmark or finding a purchaser who may be interested in rehabilitating the building.

What is a Demolition Review?

Demolition review is a legal tool that provides communities with the means to ensure that potentially significant buildings and structures are not demolished without notice and some level of review by a preservation commission. This process creates a safety net for historic resources to ensure that buildings and structures worthy of preservation are not inadvertently demolished.

Demolition review does not always prevent the demolition of historically significant buildings or structures. Rather, as the name suggests, it allows for review of applications for demolition permits for a specific period of time to assess a building's historical significance. If the building is deemed significant, then issuance of the permit may be delayed for a specific period of time to pursue landmark designation, or alternatively, to explore preservation solutions such as selling the property to a purchaser interested in rehabilitating the structure or finding alternative sites for the proposed post-demolition project.

What is the Difference between "Demolition Review Laws" and "Demolition Delay" or "Interim Protection" Provisions used in Preservation Ordinances?

Demolition review laws are typically, but not exclusively, separate and distinct from historic preservation ordinances. They preclude the demolition of *any* building or structure over a certain age, or any building or structure identified for protection—regardless of significance—for a specific period of time, to allow for a determination of historical or architectural merit. Historic properties may or may not be designated as a landmark at the culmination of this process, depending upon a law's specific terms, and such laws may or may not include a

^{*}Special Counsel and Legal Education Coordinator, National Trust for Historic Preservation

"demolition delay" or "waiting period" component.

The nomenclature can be confusing. Demolition review laws are sometimes called "demolition delay ordinances" or simply, "demolition ordinances."

Demolition delay provisions in historic preservation ordinances are used to prevent the demolition of buildings or structures that have already been designated as historic landmarks or as contributing structures in a historic district for a specific amount of time, usually ranging from 6 to 24 months. During that time, the preservation commission, preservation organizations, concerned citizens, and others may explore alternatives to demolition, such as finding a purchaser for the structure or raising money for its rehabilitation.

These provisions are typically used by communities that lack the authority to deny demolition permits. For example, in North Carolina, local jurisdictions generally only have the authority to delay a demolition permit up to 365 days unless the structure at issue has been determined by the State Historic Preservation Officer to have "statewide significance." *See* N.C. Gen. Stat. § 160A.400.14.

Interim protection provisions are also found in preservation ordinances. They preclude the demolition or alteration of buildings or structures during the period in which the building is under consideration for historic designation. The objective is to preserve the status quo pending designation and to prevent anticipatory demolitions. For further information, see Edith M. Shine, "The Use of Development Moratoria in the Protection of Historic Resources," 18 PLR 3002 (1999).

Why Do Communities Adopt Demolition Review Procedures?

Demolition review procedures help to prevent the demolition of historically significant buildings. Given the vast numbers of older buildings in cities and towns across the United States, it is virtually impossible for a community to identify all buildings that should be protected under a historic preservation ordinance in advance. By establishing a referral mechanism, communities can be assured that buildings meriting preservation will not fall through the cracks. The delay period provides an opportunity for the municipality or other interested parties to negotiate a preservation solution with the property owner, or to find persons who might be willing to purchase, preserve, rehabilitate, or restore such buildings rather than demolish them.

Demolition review procedures have also been adopted to protect buildings that may not meet the standards for designation but nonetheless embody distinguishing features that help to make a community an attractive place to live or work. For example, demolition review provisions are being used to address the proliferation of "teardowns" in many of our older neighborhoods. By delaying demolition for a period of time, concerned residents may be able to negotiate the preservation of character-defining houses on a case-by-case basis. *See, e.g.* Santa Monica, California, and Highland Park, Illinois.

Which Properties are Subject to Demolition Review Procedures?

Demolition review ordinances typically set forth objective criteria for determining which properties are subject to review. For example, a demolition review ordinance may require some level of review for all buildings built before a specific date or all buildings that have attained a certain age on the date the permit application is filed. Many communities use "50 years" as the critical benchmark. *See, e.g.* Boston, Massachusetts, Boulder, Colorado, and New Castle, Delaware. A few jurisdictions have opted for a shorter time period, largely in recognition of their younger building stock, see, e.g. Santa Monica, California (which uses a 40-year benchmark), and Gainesville, Florida (all structures listed in the state's "master site

file" and/or 45 years of age). Still others utilize a specific date. See, e.g. Alameda, California, and Weston, Massachusetts, which protect all buildings constructed prior to 1945.

Alternatively, the demolition ordinance may only apply to properties identified on a historic survey or listed on a state historic register or the National Register of Historic Places. Chicago, for example, requires review for the roughly 6,200 buildings designated as "red" or "orange" on its 1996 Historic Resources Survey. Montgomery County, Maryland, stays the issuance of a demolition permit for properties included on its Locational Atlas and Index of Historic Sites.

Finally, some communities limit the scope of protection afforded to buildings located within a specific geographic area. Baton Rouge's newly-enacted demolition ordinance, for example, applies only to its downtown buildings. Boston's law governs any buildings located in its downtown area, Harborpark, and neighborhood design overlay districts, in addition to all those that are at least 50-years old.

Keep in mind that the viability of this system may depend upon an applicant's representation or a permit official's ability to verify or accurately determine a building's age. Boston addresses this issue by insisting that all demolition permit applications be referred to the city's landmark commission. Staff to the commission makes the determination as to whether the building is subject to review.

In Wilton, Connecticut, the burden of establishing the age of the building rests on the demolition permit applicant. Applications must include a statement regarding the size and age of the building or structure to be demolished with verification through independent records such as tax assessment records or the city's cultural resource survey. Santa Monica bases its age determination on the date the original permit for the building or structure was issued. Alameda, California's law provides that the age is to be determined by review of city records. Weston, Massachusetts, protects against the potential problem that the date of a building or structure cannot be determined by record by also requiring the review of all properties of "unknown age."

What Actions Generally Trigger Demolition Review?

All demolition review procedures are triggered by the filing of an application for a demolition permit. The scope of demolition work requiring review, however, varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In addition, requests for permits to move or substantially alter buildings may also require review.

In Boulder, demolition review is required for the demolition or removal of any building over fifty years old. Demolition includes the act of either demolishing or removing—

- Fifty percent or more of the roof area as measured in plan view (defined as the view of a building from directly above which reveals the outer perimeter of the building roof areas to be measured across a horizontal plane); or
- Fifty percent or more of the exterior walls of a building as measured contiguously around the "building coverage"; or
- Any exterior wall facing a public street, but not an act or process which removes an exterior wall facing an alley.

[Illustrations omitted.] To meet the exterior wall retention standard,

 The wall shall retain studs or other structural elements, the exterior wall finish, and the fully framed and sheathed roof above that portion of the remaining building to which such wall is attached;

- The wall shall not be covered or otherwise concealed by a wall that is proposed to be placed in front of the retained wall; and
- Each part of the retained exterior walls shall be connected contiguously and without interruption to every other part of the retained exterior walls.

In Davis, California, the city's demolition review procedures apply to "the destruction, removal, or relocation of a structure not classified as an `incidental structure,' or the permanent or temporary removal of more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the perimeter walls of a structure." Incidental structures are accessory buildings such as sheds, fences, play structures, and so forth.


In Newton, Massachusetts, the demolition review requirement applies to any permit, without regard to whether it is called a demolition permit, alteration permit, or building permit, if it involves total and partial demolitions. A "total demolition" is "[t]he pulling down, razing or destruction of the entire portion or a building or structure which is above ground regardless of whether another building or structure is constructed within the footprint of the destroyed building or structure." A "partial demolition" is "[t]he pulling down, destruction or removal of a substantial portion of the building or structure or the removal of architectural elements which define or contribute to the character of the structure."

A few jurisdictions have narrowed the number of applications requiring review by limiting referrals to projects entailing the demolition of at least 500 square feet of gross floor area. *See, e.g.,* Concord, New Hampshire, and Monroe, Connecticut.

How is Demolition Review Accomplished?

Under typical demolition review procedures, the permitting official is directed to refer a demolition permit application to a review body for an initial or preliminary determination of significance. In San Antonio, for example, all demolition permits are referred to the city's Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) to determine within 30 days whether or not a building or structure is historically significant. If the HPO finds the building significant, the HPO is required to forward the application to the Historic and Design Review Commission (HDRC) for review and recommendation as to significance. If the HDRC concurs in the HPO's finding of significance, then the Commission must recommend designation to the City Council. Buildings and structures not deemed significant at any time during these proceedings may be demolished.


San Antonio Demolition Review Process



Santa Monica and Chicago also delay issuance of a demolition permit to allow for the landmark designation of the building, if warranted. In Santa Monica, the demolition permit may be issued if no application to designate is filed within 60 days. Chicago's demolition ordinance delays issuance of permit up to 90 days "in order to enable the department of planning and development to explore options to preserve the building or structure, including, but not limited to, possible designation of the building or structure as a Chicago Landmark in accordance with Article XVII of Chapter 2-120 of this code."

Some demolition review laws simply provide for a delay in the issuance of a permit to explore preservation-based solutions. New Castle County, Delaware utilizes this approach. The county may delay issuance of a demolition permit for any building "thought to be over 50 years old" for a period up to 10 days, during which time the Historic Review Board must make a determination whether the building is historically significant. If the building is deemed significant, then the board may order further delay up to 9 months from the date the application was initially filed to seek demolition alternatives.

New Castle County Demolition Review Process



In Boston, the Inspectional Services Department must transmit a copy of an application for a permit to demolish a building to the Boston Landmarks Commission within three days. The commission staff, in return, must make a determination within 10 days as to whether the building is (1) subject to review and (2) significant under specific criteria. If the property is determined not to be significant, then no further review is required. If the property is significant, the commission must hold a public hearing to determine whether the building should be subject to demolition delay. A decision on whether to delay the permit must be made within 40 days from the date the demolition permit application was initially filed.

To invoke the delay period, the commission must find that, in considering the public interest, it is preferable that the building be preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished. Factors for consideration include: (a) the building's historic, architectural, and urban design significance; (b) whether the building is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the city, or the region; and (c) the building's condition. If the commission finds that the building is subject to demolition delay, issuance of the demolition permit may be delayed for up to 90 days from the close of the public hearing. A "Determination of No Feasible Alternative" may be issued during the public hearing or prior to the expiration of the 90-day period if the commission finds that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition.

Who Makes the Determination of Significance?

In most cases, the historic preservation commission makes the determination of significance, with initial review by the staff to the commission. *See, e.g.,* Boston, Massachusetts, Davis, California, and San Antonio, Texas. Variations, however, do exist from community to community. In Santa Monica, for example, demolition permit applications are forwarded directly to each of the members of the landmarks commission. In Boulder, initial review is performed by the city manager and two designated members of the landmarks board. If the property is significant, then the matter is referred to the city's landmarks board. In the cities of Keene and Concord, New Hampshire, the demolition review committee, comprised of three members of each city's heritage commission, is responsible for conducting the initial review, making an official determination of significance, and holding a meeting to explore preservation alternatives.

What Evidence Must be Submitted for Review?

Most jurisdictions require the submission of sufficient information to enable the decision maker to make an informed decision on a building's age and significance. In Santa Monica, for example, a completed application form must be submitted to the landmarks commission, along with a site plan, eight copies of a photograph of the building, and photo verification that the property has been posted with a notice of intent to demolish.

Boston requires the submission of photographs of both the subject property and any surrounding properties with a demolition permit application. In addition, the applicant must provide a map identifying the location of the property, a plot plan showing the building footprint and those in the immediate vicinity; plans for site improvements, including elevations if a new structure is planned, and the notarized signatures of all owner's-of-record along with proof of ownership. Additional materials may be required if a public hearing on the issue of whether the property is "preferably preserved" is held. Items such as a structural analysis report, adaptive reuse feasibility studies, the availability of alternative sites for the proposed project, effects of post-demolition plans on the community, and other materials the commission may need to make a feasibility determination may be requested.

Newton, Massachusetts has comparable requirements. In the case of partial demolitions involving alterations or additions, the town also requires the submission of proposed plans and elevation drawings for the affected portion of the building.

What Standards are Used to Determine Historical Significance?

In Gainesville, Florida, the preservation planner is essentially charged with determining whether the structure would qualify as a landmark under the city's historic preservation ordinance. A demolition permit may be issued if the planner finds that the structure "is not designed in an architectural `high style' or a recognized vernacular building pattern, and it does not have historic events or persons associated with it."

In New Castle County, Delaware, the Historic Review Board makes a determination as to whether the building or structure is historically significant, based on the criteria for listing in the New Castle County Register of Historic and Architectural Heritage.

In Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the city's planning commission is charged with determining whether "[t]he structure is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places or included in a National Register Historic District, or the structure is classified as National Register Eligible or Major Contributing in the historic building survey of the Central Business District."

In Westfield, Connecticut, individual findings of significance are not made. Rather, to invoke the 90-day, demolition delay period, the structure must be listed in or located within a historic district listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the State Register of Historic Places, the Westfield Historical Commission Register of Historic Places, or a local historic district created under the city's historic preservation ordinance. To be included on the city's historic register, the property must "contain or reflect distinctive and demonstrably important features of architectural, cultural, political, economic or social significance to the City of Westfield."

In Boulder, a preliminary finding on whether there is "probable cause" for designation as an individual landmark is made. If there is "probable cause," then the matter is required to be referred to the landmark commission for a public hearing on the eligibility of the building for designation as a landmark. In addition to determining whether the building meets the objectives and standards for landmark designation under its preservation ordinance, the Boulder commission must also take into account: (1) "[t]he relationship of the building to the character of the neighborhood as an established and definable area;" (2) "the reasonable condition of the building;" and (3) "the reasonable projected cost of restoration or repair." If the building is found to merit designation, then a delay period not to exceed 180 days from the date the demolition permit application was initially filed may be invoked.

Cities and towns enacting demolition review procedures in Massachusetts may not invoke a delay period until the building or structure at issue is found to be both "significant" and "preferably preserved." The term "preferably preserved" essentially means that it is in the public's interest to preserve the building. In some cases, a determination may be made to seek landmark status. Newton's "demolition delay ordinance" is illustrative. Under the city's law, a significant building is "any building or structure which is in whole or in part fifty years or more old" and which:

- (1) is in any federal or state historic district, or if in any local historic district, is not open to view from a public street, public park or public body of water; or
- (2) is listed on or is within an area listed on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible for such listing, or listed on or is within an area listed on the State Register of Historic Places, or eligible for such listing; or
- (3) has been determined by the commission or its designee to be a historically significant building after a finding that it is:
 - a) importantly associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City of Newton, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the United States of America: or
 - b) historically or architecturally important by reason of period, style, method of building construction or association with a particular architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures; or
 - c) located within one hundred fifty (150) feet of the boundary line of any federal or local historic district and contextually similar to the buildings or structures located in the adjacent federal or local historic district.

A building or structure is "preferably preserved" if issuance of the requested demolition permit "would result in the demolition of a historically significant building or structure whose loss would be detrimental to the historical or architectural heritage or resources of the City of Newton."

What Procedures are Used to Evaluate Significance?

The notice and hearing requirements set forth in demolition review ordinances normally address two concerns. One is meeting the constitutional rights of the applicant to due process. The other is ensuring that the community knows about the pending demolition and has a meaningful opportunity to participate in the proceedings. Determinations of significance are generally held upon review by a city's historic preservation commission at a public hearing.

Notice. Individual notice is often required when specific findings are made affecting the applicant's request for a demolition permit. For example, in Boulder, notice must be provided to the applicant upon a finding by an initial review committee that probable cause exists that the building or structure may be eligible for designation as an individual landmark. The applicant is also entitled to notice of the public hearing before the full commission regarding the property's eligibility for landmark status and notice of the commission's final decision to stay the demolition permit for a period of 180-days to explore preservation alternatives.

Public notice requirements under demolition review ordinances can also be extensive. In situations where delay periods may be invoked for the purpose of exploring preservation alternatives, public awareness can be critical. In Monroe, Connecticut, for example, concerted efforts are made to inform the public. The city's ordinance requires publication of notice in newspaper of general circulation and individually-mailed notice to the city's historic district commission, the town historian, the Monroe Historical Society, and all abutting property owners. In addition, the city is required to post for at least 30 days a 36 by 48" sign visible from nearest public street with the words "DEMOLITION" printed on the sign with the letters being at least 3 inches in height. Among other requirements, Gainesville, Florida, requires that the historic preservation planner post a sign on the property "notifying the public of the owner's intent to demolish the structure in order to allow interested parties to come forward and move the structure upon consent of the owner."

Hearings. Public hearings are typically required under demolition delay provisions to determine whether the building or structure posed for demolition is historically significant. See, e.g. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Boston, Massachusetts, Boulder, Colorado, Westfield, Connecticut, Gainesville, Florida, and Concord, New Hampshire. Some demolition delay laws also use the public hearing format to consider alternatives for demolition delay. The Westfield, Connecticut, ordinance, for example, specifically states that "[t]he purpose of said Hearing shall be to discuss, investigate and evaluate alternatives that will allow for the preservation of such buildings, structures, features/components or portions thereof." It provides, however, that [t]he applicant's intended use/reuse of the property is not a topic of the hearing."

How Long Do Delay Periods Typically Run?

The delay periods invoked under demolition review ordinances run from 30 days to two-years, with most falling within the 90-day to six-month range. In some jurisdictions, the length of the delay period may be prescribed by state law. For example, in Connecticut, § 29-406(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes authorizes any town, city, or borough to impose a waiting period of not more than ninety days. Also note that the effective length of equivalent waiting periods can vary significantly, depending upon the date upon which the delay is measured. Boston, for examples, measures its 90-day delay period from the close of the public hearing. Chicago, in comparison, measures its 90-day delay period from the application filing date.

Communities with longer delay periods sometimes include specific provisions that enable the issuance of a demolition permit prior to the expiration of the waiting period if spe-

cific conditions are met. For example, in Lake Forest, Illinois, the city's 2-year waiting period for all demolition permits may be waived or shortened, upon a finding by the Building Review Board, after holding a public hearing, that—

- a. The structure itself, or in relation to its environs, has no significant historical, architectural, aesthetic or cultural value in its present restored condition; or
- b. Realistic alternatives (including adaptive uses) are not likely because of the nature or cost of work necessary to preserve such structure or realize any appreciable part of such value; or
- c. The structure in its present or restored condition is unsuitable for residential, or a residentially compatible use; or
- d. The demolition is consistent with, or materially furthers, the criteria and purpose of this section and Section 46-27 of the Zoning Code.

In Newton, Massachusetts a demolition permit may be issued before the expiration of the city's 12-month delay period if the Newton Historical Commission is satisfied that the permit applicant:

- has made a "bona fide, reasonable and unsuccessful effort to locate a purchaser for the building or structure who is willing to preserve, rehabilitate or restore the building or structure; or
- has agreed to accept a demolition permit on specified conditions approved by the commission.

See, also, Boston's Demolition Delay Ordinance, which provides for the issuance of a finding of "no feasible alternative to demolition" at the public hearing or any time prior to the expiration of the delay period.

Also note that some jurisdictions insist that the property be secured during the demolition delay period. In Boston, for example, the applicant is required to secure the building during the review period. If the building is lost during this period due to fire or other causes, then the action is treated as an unlawful demolition.

How are Demolition Alternatives Explored?

The historic preservation commission usually sits at the center of the preservation effort. The commission will work with the owner and other interested organizations, public agencies, developers, and individuals who may be instrumental in developing a workable solution. Boston's demolition review ordinance specifically identifies who must be asked to participate in the city's investigation of alternatives. In addition to the owner, the Landmarks Commission must invite the Commissioner of Inspectional Services, the Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and the Chairperson of the Boston Civic Design Commission, and any other individual or entity approved by the applicant. In Boulder, the Landmarks Board may "take any action that it deems necessary and consistent with this chapter to preserve the structure, including, without limitation, consulting with civic groups, public agencies, and interested citizens."

The range of alternatives that may be pursued may be specifically identified in the ordinance or left to the preservation commission's discretion. In addition to considering the possibility of landmark designation, the moving of a building to an alternative location, and the salvaging of building materials, the Boulder Landmarks Board is empowered to "take any action that it deems necessary . . . to preserve the structure." In Wilton, Connecticut, the Wilton Historic District Commission or the Connecticut Historical Commission is charged

with "attempting to find a purchaser who will retain or remove such building or who will present some other reasonable alternative to demolition" during the 90-day delay period.

Alternatives that are often considered include the possibility of rehabilitating the building with the assistance of tax incentives or other financial assistance; adapting the building to a new use; removing the building to another site; finding a new owner who is willing and able to preserve the building; incorporating the building into the owner/applicant's redevelopment plans; and using an alternative site for the owner/applicant's project.

The submission of specific information pertaining to the property is generally required. An applicant, for example, may be required to submit a structural engineer's report and information on the cost of stabilizing, repairing, rehabilitating, or re-using the building, plans for the property upon demolition, and the availability of other sites that would meet the applicant's objectives.

What Exceptions May Apply to the Strict Application of Demolition Review Laws?

Many demolition review laws recognize exceptions upon a showing of economic hardship or where the public safety is at stake. In Gainesville, Florida, for example, the demolition delay period may be waived by the historic preservation board if the applicant can demonstrate "economic hardship." As is generally the case with the consideration of economic hardship claims under historic preservation ordinances, the burden of proof rests on the applicant to show that retention of the property is not economically viable and the applicant must set forth specific relevant information to make his or her case.

Virtually every demolition review law recognizes an exception on public safety grounds. Gainesville also provides that "any structure that has been substantially burned or damaged by an event not within the landowner's control with more than 50 percent of the structure affected" may also be demolished, regardless of the building's significance.

Weston, Massachusetts provides the following exception:

Emergency Demolitions

Notwithstanding the following provisions, the Building Inspector may issue a demolition permit at any time in the event of imminent and substantial danger to the health or safety of the public due to deteriorating conditions. Prior to doing so, the Building Inspector shall inspect the building and document, in writing, the findings and reasons requiring an emergency demolition, a copy of which shall be forwarded immediately to the Commission. Before allowing emergency demolition, the Building Inspector shall make every effort to inform the Chairperson of the Commission of his intention to allow demolition before he issues a permit for emergency demolition.

No provision of this by-law is intended to conflict with or abridge any obligations or rights conferred by G.L.c.143 regarding removal or demolition of dangerous or abandoned structures. In the event of a conflict, the applicable provisions of Chapter 143 shall control.

Once the Delay Period Expires, What Other Restrictions May Apply?

Some jurisdictions also require the submission of documentation of the property and/or the salvage of significant architectural features prior to the issuance of the demolition permit. Boulder, Colorado, expressly authorizes the city manager to require the submission of documentation about the building prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, such as a de-

scription of significant events, information on its occupants, photographs, plans, and maps. In Keene, New Hampshire, the demolition review committee is required to "photographically document the building" prior to demolition. In addition, the salvage of significant architectural features is encouraged.

How are Demolition Review Ordinances Enforced?

Experience has shown that historic buildings will be demolished, without regard to protections against demolition, if the ramifications for non-compliance are minor or insignificant. Accordingly, communities generally seek to establish penalties that will, in fact, discourage violations from occurring. Commonly used penalties, for example, include the imposition of significant fines for each day of the offense, and the preclusion of a permit to develop or occupy the property for specific period of time.

In New Castle County, Delaware, the county attorney is authorized by ordinance "to take immediate action prosecute those responsible" for the demolition of structures determined to have historic significance prior to the issuance of a demolition permit. In addition, building permits for the parcel affected may be withheld for a period of one to three years. Violators of the demolition ordinance in Monroe, Connecticut, may be subject to a fine amounting to the greater of one thousand dollars or the assessed value of the property for each violation. In Highland Park, Illinois, a person who violates the demolition review ordinance may be assessed a fine equal to "90 percent of the fair market value of the cost of the replacement of such regulated structure."

Newton, Massachusetts, authorizes the imposition of a \$300 fine and two year ban on the issuance of a building permit against anyone who demolishes a historically significant building or structure without first obtaining and fully complying with the provisions of a demolition permit issued in accordance with its demolition review ordinance. However, a waiver on the building permit ban may be obtained in instances where reuse of the property would "substantially benefit the neighborhood and provide compensation for the loss of the historic elements of the property" either through reconstruction of the lost elements or significant enhancement of the remaining elements. As a condition to obtaining the waiver, however, the owner must execute a binding agreement to ensure that the terms agreed to are met.

Do Demolition Delay Ordinances Work?

On December 15, 2003, a Chicago Tribune article written by architectural critics, Blair Kamin and Patrick T. Reardon, made headline news. Kamin and Reardon reported that, in a year's time, only one of 17 buildings slated for demolition had been preserved under the city's much acclaimed "demolition delay ordinance." The critics asserted that the city's much-touted effort to preserve the buildings coded red or orange on Chicago's 1996 Historic Resources Survey through the imposition of a 90-day waiting period on demolition permits, wasn't working. They attributed the loss of the buildings to the city's failure to make preservation a priority and by not providing sufficient legal protections and financial incentives to get the job done.

In the same article, Kamin and Reardon also reported that the Chicago Landmarks Division had made a contrary assessment. Sixteen out of the 17 orange-rated buildings posed for demolition were not recommended for designation because they had failed to meet the criteria for landmark status and the one building that was saved would have been demolished but for the demolition delay ordinance.

It cannot be denied, as Kamin and Reardon noted, that demolition review laws seem to support an "ad hoc" approach to landmark designation. The buildings being designated are

those threatened by demolition rather than those most deserving. Also, the question of what is preserved often depends upon who cares about the matter, rather than the historical or architectural merit of the building at issue.

Keep in mind, however, that the need for such laws really stems from the fact that it is impossible to designate every building worthy of protection in advance, especially in cities like Chicago, where over 17,000 buildings have been listed on the city's historic survey. Historic preservation commissions are often understaffed, and often cities simply lack the resources or political will to protect all of their historic properties in advance.

Indeed, in Massachusetts, where over 100 demolition review laws have been adopted, demolition review laws are considered overwhelmingly successful. According to the Massachusetts Historical Society, demolition delay enabled the preservation of the Coolidge Corner Theater and a Lustron house in Brookline. Negotiations under Eastham's delay provision enabled a historic house to be moved rather than demolished. Demolition review requirements have also helped to stem the tide of teardowns in residential areas in Newton, and resulted in the rehabilitation of the circa-1710 Foster Emerson House in Reading. For more information, see Christopher Skelly, "Preservation through ByLaws and Ordinances" (Massachusetts Historical Commission 2003).

What Else do I Need to Know About Demolition Review Laws?

By now you should be aware that demolition review laws can vary significantly. In developing your own program, it is important to understand not only how such laws work generally, but also to think about how such a law would work in your own community. Basic considerations include the types and number of buildings likely to require review, who should conduct that review, and how the law would relate to your city or town's historic preservation program. Communities should also seek to —

- Establish an efficient process. Provide a quick and efficient means for ensuring that permits on non-significant buildings are not held up unnecessarily. The number of demolition permit applications filed in a given year can sometimes be staggering. The San Antonio Historic Preservation Office, for example, reports that it reviews approximately 900 applications per year.
- Have resources in place which help applicants and/or permitting officials determine the age and significance of their buildings. In other words, take the guesswork out of the process.
- Avoid making the safety net too small. It is important to ensure that potential landmarks are, indeed, subject to the law's protections. In communities with resources from the recent past, for example, it may be necessary to establish a threshold date that is commensurate with those resources. Communities relying on specific dates rather than the age of the building may find the need to amend the ordinance over time. If demolition review is limited to a category of buildings or list of structures, comprehensive survey work must be done prior to the law's enactment to ensure that all buildings meriting protection are included.
- **Keep the community informed**. Effective notice provisions, such as the posting of a large sign, are critical. Members of the public cannot respond to a demolition threat unless they know about it.
- Don't make the delay period too short. Without a meaningful delay period, leverage is lacking. It takes time to find a new buyer or a new site, or to even make an assessment as to whether an adaptive reuse project would work.

- Give the preservation commission the necessary tools to negotiate a solution. Preservation solutions are more likely to be forthcoming with some level of financial assistance or tax savings. Enable the commission to draw on the expertise of other city officials when necessary and invite critical players to the table. Demolition review provides an invaluable opportunity to improve communication between a preservation commission and its staff, and other governmental officials and the development community.
- Enable the property to be designated, if designation is warranted. Negotiated preservation is no substitute for a strong preservation ordinance.
- **Enforce your ordinance**. Ensure that the penalties effectively deter non-compliance and be prepared to enforce your ordinance if violations occur.

Where Can I Find Examples of Demolition Delay Ordinances?

Listed below are examples of demolition delay ordinances that have been adopted around the country.

California

Alameda City Code § 13-21-7. http://www.ci.alameda.ca.us/code/Chapter_13/21/7.html

Davis Building Ordinance § 8.18.020 http://www.city.davis.ca.us/pb/pdfs/planning/forms/ Demolition Permit Requirements.pdf

Santa Monica Municipal Code \S 9.04.10.16.010 (as amended by Ordinance No. 2131 (July 27, 2004)).

http://www.codemanage.com/santamonica/

Colorado

Boulder Revised Code § 10-13-23. http://www3.ci.boulder.co.us/cao/brc/10-13.html#Demolition

Connecticut

Monroe Demolition Delay Ordinance http://www.cttrust.org/index.cgi/1049

Wilton Demolition Ordinance http://www.cttrust.org/index.cgi/1049

Delaware

New Castle County Code § 6.3.020(B). http://www.municode.com/resources/online_codes.asp

Florida

Gainesville Code of Ordinances § 6-19. http://www.municode.com/resources/online_codes.asp

Illinois

Chicago, Illinois. Municipal Code of Chicago § 13-320-230(a)-(c) and § 2-76-215. http://egov.cityofchicago.org/webportal/COCWebPortal/COC_EDITORIAL/DemolitionPermits.txt

Highland Park Ordinances, Ch. 17 §§ 170.040. http://www.cityhpil.com/govern/ordinances.html

Lake Forest, Illinois, Building Scale and Environmental Ordinance § 9-87. http://www.cityoflakeforest.com/pdf/cd/bsord.pdf

Louisiana

Baton Rouge and East Baton Rouge Parish Demolition and Relocation Ordinance http://municode.com/resources/on-line_codes.asp

Massachusetts

Boston Zoning Code, Art. 85, §§ 1-8. http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/pdf/ZoningCode/Article85.pdf

Cambridge Municipal Code Ch. 2.78, Art. II http://bpc.iserver.net/codes/cbridge/index.htm

Newton Revised Ordinances, Ch. 22, Art. III, § 22-44. http://www.ci.newton.ma.us/legal/ordinance/chapter_22.htm#art1

Town of Weston Bylaws, Art. XXX. http://www.lmstrategies.com/whc/by-law1.htm

Maryland

Montgomery County Code, Part II § 24A-10 http://www.amlegal.com/montgomery_county_md/

New Hampshire

Concord Code of Ordinances, Art. 26-9 §§16-9-1 through 16-9-5. http://municode.com/resources/on-line_codes.asp

Keene Code of Ordinances, Art. IV, §§ 18-331 through 18-335. http://municode.com/resources/on-line_codes.asp

Texas

San Antonio Unified Development Code. Art. 4, § 35-455(b)(2). $http://www.sanantonio.gov/dsd/pdf/udc_article4_04.pdf$