

NOTE TO LANDMARKS COMMISSION
July 19, 2010

Legistar ID # 19096
Development Review Process Discussion

At the July 12, 2010 Commission meeting, Commissioners asked staff to put together a list of approvals that required coordination with other commissions, specifically the Urban Design Commission (UDC) and the Plan Commission (PC). Staff looked through all of the agendas for the three commissions for the 2009 calendar year. Some projects may have been carried over from 2008, or extended into 2010, which will account for some discrepancy in the numbers. In addition, since this was a cursory survey of the 2009 agendas, please use these numbers as an approximation.

2009 Approvals Information

2009 Landmarks Ordinance Administrative approvals:

There were approximately **200 administrative approvals** for roofing projects, repairs, and minor changes according to the "Policy for Designee Approval of Certain Projects for Landmarks and Buildings in Historic Districts" section of the Landmarks Commission Procedures manual. Some of these were in coordination with administrative approvals for both the UDC and the Plan Commission. (This is only an approximation derived from e-mails, building permits and notes.)

2009 Landmarks Commission: 47 total cases

(44 Certificates of Appropriateness and 3 advisory opinions to the Plan Commission)

- Landmarks (or adjacent to landmarks):13
- Local Historic Districts:
 - University Heights: 16
 - Mansion Hill: 4
 - Marquette Bungalows: 1
 - Third Lake Ridge: 11
 - First Settlement: 2
- *Of the 47 Commission reviewed cases, 45 were approved or received a favorable advisory recommendation (sometimes with conditions), 2 were not approved (2021 Van Hise and 666 Wisconsin Ave.)*
96% approval rate

2009 Landmark Commission: 47 cases

- 8 cases were also reviewed by the Urban Design Commission / Plan Commission: **20% of all cases**
- 1 additional case was also reviewed by the Urban Design only (façade grant): **2% of all cases**

2009 Urban Design Commission: 90 cases

- 11 cases were also reviewed by the Landmarks Commission (includes carryover from 2008): **12% of all cases**
- 54 cases were advisory and went to Plan Commission for final approval: **60% of all cases**

2009 Plan Commission: 154 cases *(includes routine items, re-zonings, land divisions, conditional uses and demolitions)*

- 9 cases went to the Landmarks Commission (includes carryover from 2008): **6% of all cases**
- 45 cases went to Urban Design Commission: **30% of all cases**

Landmarks Commission Approvals

	Project Type	LC Role	LC Public Hearing	Staff Approval of Minor Alterations
1	Landmark / Landmark Site Designation	Advisory to CC	Yes	No
2	Creation of Local Historic Districts	Advisory to PC & CC	Yes	No
3	Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to, and signs on, Designated Landmarks	Final Approval*	No	Yes
4	Certificate of Appropriateness in Local Historic Districts: Includes new construction, alterations of existing buildings, and signs	Final Approval*	Only for new buildings/ large additions in University Heights	Yes
5	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of all or part of a Landmark or improvement in a Historic District	Final Approval * (but must also get separate approval from PC)	Yes	No
6	Development adjacent to a Designated Landmark	Advisory to PC/CC	No	Yes
7	Variances	Final Approval*	Yes	No
8	Sale of Landmarks and Rescinding of Landmarks Designation	No LC decision role - CC only	No	No
9	Misc referrals from other Commissions	Advisory	No	No
10	Voluntary applicant submittal for review of buildings in National Historic Districts	Advisory	No	No

** Appeal of final approvals goes to the Common Council where a 2/3 vote is required to overturn*

Administrative approvals: *Excerpt from the Landmarks Commission Procedures manual of types of approvals usually administered by staff: (Items below can be sent to the Commission at staff's discretion.)*

1. Repairs to existing structures that will not change the appearance
2. Most reroofing projects (with conditions)
3. Some residing projects (with conditions)
4. Gutters, downspouts, and handrails (with conditions)
5. Minor changes of appearance that do not destroy significant architectural elements (with conditions)
6. Replacement of windows (with conditions)
7. Projects that will result in a moderate change of appearance (for emergency repairs only – with conditions)
8. Replacement of the face of an existing sign with new information and the installation of awnings (with conditions)
9. The demolition of garages or other accessory buildings with no historical significance.
10. Construction of garden sheds, less than 10’x10’ in rear yard of a property (with conditions)

Coordinated Approvals with other Commissions

Certificates of Appropriateness that also require additional land use approvals by other commissions are coordinated amongst Planning Division staff. Examples of potential projects that fall into this category include:

Plan Commission:

- PUD-GDP / PUD-GDP-SIP
- Rezoning
- Conditional uses

Zoning Board of appeals:

- Variances to zoning code
- Area exceptions

Urban Design Commission:

- Comprehensive Sign Review
- C-4 Zoning approval
- Urban Design Districts Review
- Façade Grants
- PUDs, Rezoning and some Conditional Uses in an advisory role to the Plan Commission