

Parks, Timothy

From: Murphy, Brad
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2007 4:52 PM
To: Noonan, Katherine; Parks, Timothy; Tucker, Matthew; Firchow, Kevin
Subject: FW: Madison Demolition Ordinance Draft

Attachments: Madison Demolition Ordinance.doc



Madison Demolition
Ordinance.d...

See the message below and the attached comments.

Brad Murphy
Planning Division Director
Dept. of Planning & Community & Economic Development PO Box 2985 Madison WI 53701-2985
608 266 4635
608 267 8739 FAX

-----Original Message-----

From: Penkiunas, Daina J - WHS [mailto:Daina.Penkiunas@wisconsinhistory.org]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2007 4:48 PM
To: Kelly Thompson-Frater
Cc: Konkell, Brenda; Nan Fey; Murphy, Brad; Brian Ohm; James Boll
Subject: RE: Madison Demolition Ordinance Draft

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft revisions to Madison's demolition ordinance. Several of us met to discuss the ordinance and our comments are included in the attached document.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Daina Penkiunas
National Register Coordinator
Wisconsin Historical Society
816 State St.
Madison WI 53706
608-264-6501
daina.penkiunas@wisconsinhistory.org
www.wisconsinhistory.org

Preserving a Sense of Place -

Joint Local History and Historic Preservation Conferences: Eau Claire, October 26-27, 2007

Mark your calendars now and watch for more detailed information to follow this summer.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelly Thompson-Frater [mailto:remodeling@thompson-frater.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 9:55 AM
To: Penkiunas, Daina J - WHS
Cc: Brenda Konkell; Nan Fey; Brad Murphy; Brian Ohm; James Boll
Subject: Madison Demolition Ordinance Draft

Daina,

Please pass this on to Chip Brown or anyone else for comments. This draft is the final version out of the committee and will now make it's rounds to the appropriate city committees and commissions. Any comments

would be welcome. Getting back to us soon with any suggestions would be good timing for the process, especially if there was a major concern. Knowing these early, the sub-committee could possibly alter this draft before it gets through much of the city process.

Thanks, Kelly

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed revisions to Madison's demolition ordinance. We have limited our comments to the effect of the demolition ordinance on historic properties and offer these comments in the interest of promoting additional discussion at the local level.

Standards 1c:

We urge caution in requiring review of all properties over 50 years old. Fifty years is a convenient measure of time used by the National Register as a guideline for determining when a property is old enough to be viewed in an objective historical context, but as a rule, review of every 50 year old building may be cumbersome and a burden to city staff while providing minimal additional protection. With the tremendous growth and expansion of Madison in the 1950s and 1960s, this provision would soon include a substantial portion of Madison's housing stock, as well as a large number of shopping centers and other commercial buildings. A possible solution to the large numbers of potential project reviews would be to establish other more restrictive criteria in addition to age (for example, geographic boundaries, or types of properties) to define which buildings over 50 years old would require staff evaluation.

The ordinance revision provides consideration for any property listed in the State or the National Register of Historic Places (either individually or as part of a district) regardless of age. These properties have been reviewed and evaluated in a rigorous and objective process and deemed worthy of preservation. There are over 2670 built resources in Madison that are listed in the National Register.

We suggest extending that same review to properties that have been found potentially eligible or have been determined eligible through intensive surveys and actions taken by the State Historic Preservation Office. These properties already receive consideration in federal and state funded licensed and permitted projects, so including these properties in demolition reviews would be consistent with their treatment by other levels of government. Such review would also incorporate the city's existing grant-funded architectural and historical survey information into the broader planning process. A review of the Wisconsin Historical Society's historic preservation database shows 155 buildings in the determined eligible category and 54 in the potentially eligible category. This would include buildings that have come to our office through the compliance process, as well as those that have qualified for either state or federal historic preservation tax credits.

Since National Register listed properties, those determined eligible for listing, and those identified as potentially eligible for listing comprise a relatively small number of properties and are because of their nature among the city's most important properties, we would suggest that those properties receive review and comment on the proposed demolition from the Landmarks Commission instead of a staff review.

Standards 2

For applications where no proposed use has been identified, there is no provision for reviewing historic properties. Properties meeting qualities listed 1c and 1d should be evaluated consistent with properties having these values. Historically and/or architecturally significant properties should be provided the opportunity to be rehabilitated or be put to new uses.

Other:

No provision is made to address damage or destruction of archaeological sites as part of the ground disturbing activities associated with demolition. The ordinance could consider historically significant archeological sites in a manner consistent with our comments above, or we would be happy to discuss additional options or strategies.