

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 27, 2012

TITLE: Landmarks Ordinance Revisions
(17835)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 27, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Jason Fowler. Michael Rosenblum and Marsha Rummel were excused.

SUMMARY:

Bob Klebba, 704 E. Gorham Street, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Mr. Klebba stated that the Ordinance should be revised and reworked. He explained that the organization of the document by neighborhood is difficult to follow and that the material notations should be timeless.

Franny Ingebritson, 516 Wisconsin Avenue #7, registering in opposition and wishing to speak. Ms. Ingebritson stated that the Ordinance is difficult to follow. She explained that the Ordinance should have distinct district criteria for each separate district.

Staff explained that the current changes are in the beginning of the Ordinance and no substantive changes have been made to the individual historic district sections.

Ms. Ingebritson asked about changes to the language and how the revised language differs from the current Ordinance language.

Levitan noted some clarification language.

Gehrig noted that there should be a guide for the lay person to describe the Ordinance.

The Commission discussed the desire to change the name to the Historic Preservation Commission to better represent the charge of the body.

Staff stated that the criteria for maintenance of landmarks needs more clarification.

There was general discussion regarding the Visually Related Area (VRA) definition.

Ledell Zellers, 510 North Carroll Street, requested a way to have the ordinance address buildings that are not appropriate in an historic district in a different way. Ms. Zellers suggested using contributing and non-contributing language.

There was general discussion regarding the landmark site definition.

Levitan suggested that the definition should be clarified and requires more discussion.

There was general discussion about the Powers and Duties Section. Staff noted that the Ordinance has been reorganized.

There was general discussion about rescission process. Levitan explained that there may be a conflict of interest in regard to 4(e) – as the Landmarks Commission should not assist the owner if the Commission is also conducting a public hearing.

McLean asked if inheritance should be included as a way to initiate the request for rescission.

Levitan asked about the policy that would not allow the property to be re-designated for 5 years once rescinded.

“Within 10 days” should be changed throughout the Ordinance to “at the next regularly scheduled meeting”...

There was general discussion about needing criteria for the maintenance of landmarks.

Levitan requested a process for amending a historic district.

There was general discussion of how the Ordinance should relate to the removal and retention of architectural features.

There was general discussion of the demolition criteria.

Staff explained that there is a need for enforcement of maintenance/preservation related issues that should be addressed in the Ordinance.

John Schlaefer, 1814 Kendall, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Schlaefer said the VRA is too small, at 200 feet and should be increased to 500 feet.

ACTION:

No action was taken.