

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 11, 2011

TITLE: Landmarks Ordinance Revisions
(17835)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 11, 2011

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stuart Levitan; Christina Slattery; Daniel J. Stephans; Robin M. Taylor; and Michael J. Rosenblum. Erica Fox Gehrig was excused. Ald. Rummel left during discussion of Item #3.

SUMMARY:

The Secretary explained that there are topics that should be discussed for possible Ordinance revision consideration.

The standard green sheet could be amended to show 3 minutes or 5 minutes for public hearing. The Secretary will determine if there is a separate form for public hearings and if not, it should be stated at the beginning of the public hearing. The Secretary stated that we need public hearings for Landmarks Commission for additions and new/additions/structures in University Heights, demolitions, Landmarks designations, and ordinance changes. Rummel asked if public hearings for new additions/structures happen for all historic districts or only University Heights? The Secretary explained it is only for University Heights. Rummel stated that it should be standardized.

The Secretary requested that the Commission discuss staff enforcement capabilities. Staff needs a legitimate way of saying stop work. Stephans stated that the Preservation Commission of Milwaukee has enforcement capabilities. Staff will red tag a building if work is being done with or without a building permit if a COA has not been issued and it needed to be done. Rosenblum stated that yes, we want to give staff the ability to red tag projects and suspend work. The Commission will discuss after some research. We also need wording for a citation, red tag, cease and desist notice. The Secretary asked about fines, harsher fines, for working without a COA. Prior discussion about the amount being progressive where we raise the number per day and subsequent violations were more than the first violations. The Secretary will research the discussion of chimney removal enforcement in 2008 and 2009 and get back to the Commission. Stephans said as a practical matter it would be hard to argue for a greater fine or any other greater economic disincentive in a Landmark matter than a building code matter. It would be hard to say that aesthetics are more important than structural integrity. The Secretary said that there have been numerous signage questions where signage in an historic district needs to be reviewed and the review process may need to be formalized in the Ordinance or in the Policy and Procedure document. The Secretary requested that the Commission discuss formalizing the demolition notice review process, but more research is needed.

The Secretary suggested that the criteria for landmark alterations and maintenance (33.19(5)(b)4 be revised to be more specific.

The Secretary stated that other municipalities required HABS documentation for buildings proposed for demolition in historic districts. Slattery noted that there are different levels of documentation and that the Applicant is typically responsible for the costs. More discussion is needed.

The Secretary will collect more information about these topics and report back at a future meeting.

ACTION:

No action was taken.