



City of Madison

Meeting Minutes - Final

LANDMARKS COMMISSION

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Wednesday, September 5, 2007

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Rm LL-130 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Present: Brenda K. Konkol, Daniel J. Stephans, Stuart Levitan, Robin M. Taylor,
Michael J. Rosenblum, Randall A. Page and Erica Fox Gehrig

Guests: Cheryl Elkinton, Carole Schaefer, Michael Bridgeman, Ledell Zellers

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Stephans, to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2007 meeting, with the correction of the spelling of the word "Discussion," and to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2007 and August 20, 2007 meetings as written. The motion passed by acclamation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS ITEMS

- [06956](#) Amending Section 28.04(22) of the Madison General Ordinances to change various provisions of the ordinance regulating the demolition of buildings.

Mr. Levitan suggested that there be an amendment to the proposed ordinance that for those sites listed in section 28.04(22)(d) the owner would be required to notify the pertinent parties 60-days before submission of the request for a demolition permit. Further that in Sec. 28.04(22)(b)2. the words "except for application submitted pursuant to (d) below" be stricken.

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Rosenblum, to Rerefer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION. The motion passed by acclamation.

Ms. Ledell Zellers was the first member of the public wishing to speak on this issue. She said that Mr. Bridgeman would be bringing up some points that she agreed with, but for the sake of brevity, she would defer to Mr. Bridgeman to discuss those points. She recommended that the draft be changed to include a 180-day delay of demolition for the types of buildings that are described in the draft in section 28.04 (22)(c)1.c. (over 50 years old, etc.) She also expressed concern about the fact that some owners are still getting permission to demolish buildings that they have caused to be demolished by neglect and buildings that owners have essentially demolished by tearing down significant portions of the buildings. Ms. Rankin noted that, although the owner of 117 S. Butler St. claimed that they were only remodeling, the Building Inspection people said that the ordinances were clear that it was indeed a demolition and a demolition permit should have been obtained. Ms. Rankin will get information from Building Inspection on the definition of the term "demolition." Ms. Zellers noted that

her proposal that the delay be for 180 days came from other demolition delay ordinances, but that others were for 90, 60 or 30 days.

Mr. Michael Bridgeman spoke next. He said he had been to a lot of the meetings of the demolition committee and was disappointed in the proposed changes. He said that he thought they were too weak. He also argued in favor of a demolition delay because, first, it would allow time to identify significant buildings, second, that our perceptions and understanding of what constitutes an historic building may change and third, it further permits time for exploration of alternatives to demolition. He added that his comments were his personally, and that the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation has not had time to discuss the proposal.

Ms. Carol Schaefer spoke as a representative of Smart Growth Madison. She said that she did not object to the rules that add other parties to the 30-day notice list for planned demolition, since property owners already need to give 30-day notice to some parties. She did say, however, that the discussion today about extending that period to 180 days was probably too long. She noted that she had been to many of the demolition committee's meetings and her main concern is with the wording that states that "the proposed future use must be consistent with adopted neighborhood plans, the City's Comprehensive Plan and with the character, massing and density of the neighborhood." Her concerns are that the wording may be too vague to be objective and, since there might be conflicts between the various plans, she wondered how the Plan Commission would decide which took precedence.

Ms. Cheryl Elkinton stated that retention of older housing is important, not just for historic reasons, but also to ensure that there is housing for the less fortunate in Madison, who are often not able to afford to live in new buildings.

The Commission members then discussed the proposal. Ms. Konkel stated that the demolition committee left some of the questions regarding the changes up to the Landmarks Commission, believing that the Commission might have some important ideas for inclusion in such an ordinance. Most of the discussion centered on the idea of a demolition delay/more notice of demolitions. Ms. Rankin was asked to check into whether the timing of the notice should be before the application for a demolition permit or before the submission for approval by the Plan Commission/Council. Ald. Konkel said she would redraft the ordinance to include the 60-day notice requirement and have it ready for the next Landmarks Commission meeting.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

Consideration of Issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness

2. [07356](#) Majestic Theater, 115 King Street, designated landmark - consideration of issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for painting façade and marquee with metallic paint
A motion was made by Stephans, seconded by Taylor, to Rerefer to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION. The motion passed by acclamation.
Ms. Rankin reported that the architect had asked for a deferral to the next meeting because the metallic paint had not yet arrived.

3. [07357](#) 1920 Kendall Avenue, University Heights historic district - consideration of request for waiver of condition of Certificate of Appropriateness for new sun porch windows
- The motion approved the elimination of the white color on the corner squares, with the understanding that the Commission does not want this project to create a precedent for allowing applied exterior leading as a substitute for real leaded glass windows. Future requests for using applied leading should be accompanied by a sample of the work so that its compatibility with the character of the building and historic district can better be assessed.*
- A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Stephans, to Approve. The motion passed by the following vote:**
- Aye:** Konkel, Stephans, Levitan, Taylor and Gehrig
- Abstain:** Rosenblum and Page

Other Business

4. [07358](#) Plaque for Sherman Avenue Bridge - request from City Engineering Division for Landmarks Commission approval of plaque text
- A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Taylor, to Approve the draft revisions. The motion passed by acclamation.**
- Ms. Rankin passed out a draft revision of the text with a more accurate date for the 1840s construction, researched by Mr. Levitan, and some editorial revisions.*

Secretary's Report

The secretary passed out short assessments of two buildings proposed for demolition.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m