



## MARQUETTE BUNGALOWS NEIGHBORS GROUP

February 28, 2022

Heather Bailey  
Preservation Planner  
Department of Planning, Community & Economic Development  
Planning Division  
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.; Suite 017  
PO Box 2985  
Madison WI 53701-2985  
hbailey@cityofmadison.com

Cc: Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee:

Alder Keith Furman - District 19 – [district19@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district19@cityofmadison.com)  
Alder Patrick Heck - District 2 – [district2@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district2@cityofmadison.com) Alder Arvina Martin - District 11 -  
[district11@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district11@cityofmadison.com)  
Alder Regina Vidaver - District 5 – [district5@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district5@cityofmadison.com)  
Alder Tag Evers - District 13 - [district13@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district13@cityofmadison.com)  
Marsha Rummel, Resident Member – [marsha.rummel@gmail.com](mailto:marsha.rummel@gmail.com)

Marquette Bungalows Historic District Alder:

Brian Benford - District 6 - [district6@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district6@cityofmadison.com)

Chair of Madison Landmarks Commission

Anna Andrzejewski - [avandrzejews@wisc.edu](mailto:avandrzejews@wisc.edu)

Planning Director Heather Stouder - [hstouder@cityofmadison.com](mailto:hstouder@cityofmadison.com)

Staff

Bill Fruhling, Principal Planner - [bfruhling@cityofmadison.com](mailto:bfruhling@cityofmadison.com)

Kate Smith, Assistant City Attorney – [ksmith@cityofmadison.com](mailto:ksmith@cityofmadison.com)

Dear Ms. Bailey, LORC, Alders and Staff:

Having read through both the revised draft and the staff comments, I am pleased that many of our complaints and concerns have been addressed. I plan to speak at the LORC meeting on March 2 and after expressing thanks for listening to us, will address specific issues that I feel are still not addressed. This letter summarizes my remarks.

First, regarding the eight point summary in our letter sent in January:

1. The timeframe for finishing the ordinance revision is what it is, I guess. I have no idea if it will be stretched out. I continue to feel the last months are a race to the finish that is unnecessary. A little less haste would make this a better ordinance.
2. I want to re-emphasize that we consider these houses to be first homes and a neighborhood, and then a historic district. While we strive to keep up our homes and keep them within the style of the two block district, we are not a museum. We need the flexibility to adjust our homes as tastes and needs change!
3. Lead paint is an issue that is much improved upon, at least on windows. The language is in 41.33 (1) (e), (Alterations). It's important to notice that doors are not included, but the language does refer to "features," which

could be interpreted to include other items. I'd feel more confident if they said "window and door replacement due to lead," or, better, "movable features of the house such as windows, doors, etc." I feel doors with lead paint are a hazard for all the reasons windows are, and should be included.

4. I am reasonably satisfied with the approval conditions; it seems clear to me that repairs do not need CoA's and alterations do. I can live with the current language.

5. Color choice limitations have been taken out of everything except storm doors and storm windows. WHY do doors and storm windows have color requirements? Just like anyone else's houses, ours should not have color requirements.

6. I am satisfied with the language about substitute materials, and note that the Staff Report to LORC indicates that alternative material approval that has similar appearance has often been granted.

7. In the Staff Report section titled "Nonconformities," it says, in part, "There is nothing in the ordinance that requires changes to an existing building. While building code requires areas undergoing work to become compliant with current building code, the preservation ordinance would treat those activities as an opportunity to make a feature more architecturally sympathetic *but that change would not be required.*" (Chuck's emphasis). However, since this position does not appear in the recent draft, I ask that it be included in the final version, and since it seems to be the staff position, perhaps LORC will be motivated to include it.

8. I'm pretty clear that vantage point now means anywhere from the front view up to 200' from the structure. What I think this means is that the entirety of the sides of a building will be subject to the standards of the front of the house. Compared to the original ordinance, this definition more than doubles the amount of wall surface subject to the strictest interpretations of the historic code. Thus our costs and red tape involved with repairs and alterations will go up. I prefer the current standard of only part of each side wall being subject to strict interpretation.

Second, some notes referring to specific places in the code, many of which duplicate what I've said above.

#### REPAIRS (41.32)

- (1) (a) 2. Allows compatible substitute materials! Color is NOT included here.
- (3) (a) 2. This refers to alterations, but it's concerning that brick must be the same size, color, etc. Just concerned that exact dimensions are hard to find. I've expressed this often.

#### ALTERATIONS

- (1) (e) was added to address lead paint, as I mentioned above. It needs to include doors.
- (5) (c) 3 clearly defines replacement window standards, which should make this process easier.
- (5) (c) 5 clearly approves replacing non-historic windows with more historic ones, IF an owner wants to. It says "may," not "must."
- (5) (d) 3 describes storm doors. Why color requirement?
- (e) 1 covers garage doors, and I think it addresses our concerns; I note that here color was removed as a criteria.