



Project Title: Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan
Application Type: Recommendation for adoption of the Plan
Legistar File ID # [30377](#)
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Summary

Project Representative: Jule Stroick, Planning Division

Requested Action/Proposal Summary: The Common Council requests that the Landmarks Commission review the plan and provide a recommendation to Plan Commission and if necessary, provide comments for inclusion in the plan.

Applicable Regulations & Standards: NA

Review Required By: Landmarks Commission (with Plan Commission as lead)

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject area is bounded by several major traffic arterials, including Midvale Boulevard, University Avenue, and Mineral Point Road.

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

The Hoyt Park Area Joint Neighborhood Plan describes geographic areas that may be of particular historic architectural or cultural significance to the City of Madison and may be areas where historic districts may be appropriate. Because of the relationship between the Neighborhood Plan and the creation of historic districts, it is important for the Landmarks Commission to review the Plan with the language in the Landmarks Ordinance as a guide. The Landmarks Commission review of the Plan does not begin the process to create a historic district.

33.19(5)(d) Creation of Historic Districts.

1. For preservation purposes, the Landmarks Commission shall select geographically defined areas within the City of Madison to be designated as Historic Districts and shall, with the assistance of the City Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development, prepare an historic preservation plan in ordinance form for each area. An Historic District may be designated for any geographic area of particular historic, architectural, or cultural significance to the City of Madison which:
 - a. Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state or community; or
 - b. Is identified with historic personages or with important events in national, state or local history; or
 - c. Embodies the distinguishing characteristics of architectural type specimens inherently valuable for the study of a period or periods, styles, methods or construction, indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or
 - d. Is representative of the notable works of master builders, designers, or architects who influenced their age.

Each historic preservation plan prepared for or by the Landmarks Commission shall include a cultural and architectural analysis supporting the historic significance of the area, the specific guidelines for development and a statement of preservation objectives.

Analysis and Conclusion

Staff has reviewed the Plan and provides the following comments and suggestions for Landmarks Commission consideration and discussion:

1. {Page i} Suggestion: Under the first arrow of the Key Recommendations, add a bullet point that reads, Preserving and maintaining the existing building stock. Reason: The existing building stock is a primary factor in the character of the neighborhood and because it is missing in the bulleted list, it seems that the Plan is encouraging the redevelopment and investment that incorporates new buildings instead of existing buildings. An existing building offers a more sustainable solution than a new building.
2. {Page i} Suggestion: Under the third arrow of the Key Recommendations, change the order of the sentences so it reads, Encourage the use of guidelines for minor and major construction activities. Also encourage compliance with the residential design guidelines...for demolition and replacement... Reason: Demolition and replacement should always be the last option, not the first, when trying to maintain character.
3. {Page i} Suggestion: Change the photo or the caption to better address one of the key recommendations. Reason: The photo shows a new building or an existing building that has experienced a major renovation leaving the original building unrecognizable. The caption claims this building is a “renovation” and suggests that it is an example for other renovations. While well-designed and probably of high quality, there are aspects about this building that do not complement the existing character of the neighborhood.
4. {Page ii} Suggestion: In the language in the third arrow from the top, change “Neighborhood Preservation Areas” to Neighborhood Protection Areas or to Core Character Areas (or similar name). Reason: This change will allow discussions about historic preservation to occur with less confusion.
5. {Pages 7 & 8} Suggestion: Similar to Item 1 above, the section on “Welcoming High Performance Buildings” should include language about the importance of preserving and maintaining the existing building stock and reduce the promotion of redevelopment as a more sustainable practice. Reason: Preservation is a more sustainable practice than redevelopment. Existing buildings can be retrofitted for increased energy efficiency while maintaining the character of the original style.
6. {Page 12} Suggestion: Change “Neighborhood Preservation Areas” to Neighborhood Protection Areas or to Core Character Areas (or similar name). Reason: This change will allow discussions about historic preservation to occur with less confusion.
7. {Page 14} Suggestion: Delete policy 7 in its entirety. Reason: That policy is already covered in the language of policies 3 and 4.
8. {Page 16} Suggestion: Change the language of the second arrow from the top of the page to read “Incorporate some of the following elements to encourage variation and innovation while ensuring that future development is consistent with the Area’s character.”
9. {Page 16} Suggestion: Remove the word “careful” from the fourth arrow at the top of the page.
10. {Page 27} Suggestion: Change the language for the third arrow to read “Existing Anchor Bank Building should be evaluated for potential local landmark status.” Reason: This language exactly matches the language that is used on Page 30 regarding the landmark status of Fire Station No. 9.
11. {Page 27} Suggestion: Change the caption to read “...has a mid-century modern design.”
12. {Page 39} Suggestion: Change the language for the third arrow under Specific Guidelines to read “...for possible landmark status and ensure that it is incorporated into future development at the site.” Reason: A landmark/historic building should remain on its original site. Every effort should be made to accommodate the historic building into adjacent redevelopment plans.

13. {Page 50} Suggestion: Change the wording of the first sentence in the Sunset Village brackets to read "...subdivisions to offer the perspective homeowner the option to choose floor plans, materials and finishes for their new home rather than the common practice..." Reason: Homeowners did not swing hammers and construct/build their homes. Typically a builder constructed the home to the specifications of the owner.
14. {Page 50} Suggestion: Change the wording of the second sentence in the Sunset Village brackets to read "...loan practices in the 1930s [confirm that it isn't 1940s] made it possible for owners to acquire a long-term mortgage, opening up the affordability to design, build and own their homes."
15. {Page 52} Suggestion: In the sixth arrow under Cottage Design , add the word "front" so it reads "...just above the front grade with low front stoops."
16. {Page 52} Suggestion: In the sixth arrow under Ranch Design , add the word "front" so it reads "...just above the front grade with low front stoops."
17. {Page 52} Suggestion: In the seventh arrow under Ranch Design, change the wording so it reads " Predominantly hipped roofs with some low-pitched gable variations."
18. {Page 54} Suggestion: Include photos of Lustron homes.
19. {Page 56} Suggestion: Change the wording of the second bullet of the upper caption to read "Natural stone exterior building material"
20. {Page 79} Suggestion: Change the wording of the third paragraph so the last sentence reads "especially if future changes would limit and/or close the roadway to automobile traffic or change the location of the roadway."
21. {Page 84} Suggestion: Include the plan recommendation for Chapter 6 in Chapter 6. The Plan should use information from the West Side Architectural Survey 2012 (Tim Heggland) to expand on Chapter 6: Single Family Character or in a new chapter on Historic and Cultural Resources. It might be possible to rename Chapter 6 to better cover Single Family Character and Historic and Cultural Resources without making a new chapter. Regardless, the following West Side Architectural Survey 2012 findings should be included in the Plan: description of historic resources; description of significant development patterns; Potential National Register Historic Districts; potential National Register individually eligible buildings; and a discussion of local historic districts, National Register districts, and conservation districts.
22. There has been discussion about Accessory Dwelling Units in the Plan Area. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) require conditional use approval by the Plan Commission. Their form and placement and size are dictated by the Zoning Code. In some cases in the Area, the ADU may be larger than the main residence or negatively alter the mass and character of the main residence or lot configuration. The neighborhood should carefully review the ADU requirements and possibly devise design guidelines to specifically address the concerns that the ADU may introduce in the neighborhood or in potential historic districts.
23. Add the attached graphics to Chapter 6: Single-Family Character.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the Landmarks Commission should recommend the adoption of the Plan with the revisions recommended in this report and any additional revisions discussed during the meeting.