



605 Erie Avenue, Suite 101
Sheboygan, Wisconsin 53081
(920) 783-6303
info@legacy-architecture.com
www.legacy-architecture.com

July 19, 2019

William A. Fruhling, AICP
Principal Planner
Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development
Planning Division
Neighborhood Planning, Preservation and Design Section
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard., Suite 017
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985

Re: Madison Historic Preservation Plan
July 17, 2019 Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Outcomes & Findings

To whom it may concern:

Bob Short of the Madison Historic Preservation Plan consultant team attended the Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (HPPAC) meeting held on Wednesday, July 17, 2019. The consultant presented drafts of Chapter 4 Goals, Objectives & Strategies and Chapter 5 Implementation Strategy to the HPPAC and gathered feedback to regarding the explanations of Strategies in Chapter 4 and prioritization, timeframe, cost estimate, responsible parties, and potential partners for the Implementation Strategy in Chapter 5.

Discussion of Chapter 4 focused on the draft explanations, that have been developed by City staff and the consultant team from discussion, comments, and feedback at previous public and HPPAC meetings as the Goals, Objectives, and Strategies have been the focus of discussion at numerous previous public and HPPAC meetings and the professional experience of City staff and the consultant team; however, comments on these items were welcomed. Discussion of Chapter 5 focused on the draft timeframe, cost estimate, responsible parties, and potential partners for each Strategy developed by City staff and the consultant team from discussion, comments, and feedback at previous public and HPPAC meetings and the professional experience of City staff and the consultant team. For the purpose of this summary, Strategies will be referred by abbreviation of “goal number”- “objective letter” – “strategy letter”, for example Goal 1 Objective D Strategy b abbreviated as “1-D-b”.

There was general discussion of the draft chapters, including the following:

- It was commented how the committee has reviewed these Goals, Objectives, and Strategies on numerous occasions to date.
- It was discussed and confirmed that the items in these chapters represent proposed new strategies that are not currently a part of the City’s historic preservation program and that strategies that are currently a part of the City’s historic preservation program will appear in other chapter of the plan.
- A map depicting current Landmarks, city historic district, and resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places be included in the plan document.
- It was suggested that the cost estimate is clearly identified as general indication of projected costs and not reflecting a specific dollar amount or range.
- Explanations in Chapter 4 should include mentions of work that has already been done to build off of or can give a start to implementing as strategy.
- A glossary of terms would be helpful, incorporate recent work of LORC

There was general discussion of Timeframes and prioritization in Chapter 5 Implementation Strategy, including the following items:

- It was noted that the draft includes 21 strategies marked for a “short term” Timeframe and 29 strategies marked for a “medium term” Concern was expressed that this may be highly aggressive scheduling and an unrealistic or infeasible number of strategies to initiate implementing with these time frames. When asked, city staff answered that it probably would not be feasible for the city to initiate 21 strategies in the short-term Timeframe.
- It was suggested to stagger implementing strategies within each timeframe.
- It was questioned if the number of strategies should be lowered.
- It was questioned and discussed how prioritization of strategies might realistically be affected at the time of implementation by city staff decisions, getting city departments act on implementation, and the city’s budgeting process. City staff clarified that having a strategy included in a plan that is adopted by the city helps secure budgeting for implementation for that strategy.
- It was discussed estimated higher cost strategies may be given a short-term Timeframe; with specific mention of Illustrated Design Guidelines Strategy 4-D-c.
- It was suggested to eliminate Timeframe from the chart or rename that aspect, possibly “priority;” however city staff commented that they find Timeframe to be a helpful element when determining a department’s annual work program; and that implementation of a strategy is more likely to take longer if it is not assigned a Timeframe.
- It was suggested that Timeframe be removed from the Implementation Strategy chart graphic, and Timeframe information provided elsewhere in the chapter, possibly with a list of strategies grouped by Timeframe.
- There was lengthy discussion leading to general agreement that the committee should re-evaluate prioritization with the goal of assigning short-term Timeframe to a more feasible number of strategies. There was general agreement that the committee members should do another strategy ranking, this time ranking strategies within each of the 6 goals, rather than within each of the 21 objectives as done previously.
- It was agreed that city staff will provide committee members new materials to rank the strategies, and an additional HPPAC meeting will be scheduled to review strategy prioritization and Timeframe.

There was general discussion of the Responsible Parties and Potential Partners other than City of Madison entities in Chapter 5 Implementation Strategy, including the following:

- It was acknowledged that the city cannot implement all of the strategies on its own.
- It was expressed that the wording “...shall oversee the implementation...” in the definition of Responsible Parties at the beginning of Chapter 5 may be too strong to apply to parties other than the city.
- There was discussion that the city is inherently the responsible party for initiating implementation strategies in a city plan, all other parties could be listed as Potential Partners, and the Responsible Parties column could be removed from the chart.
- It was expressed that implementing the strategies may be a new experience or endeavor for many of the parties mentioned; and therefore, the city may need to remain the responsible party, at a minimum to “spark” implementation of the strategy.
- It was expressed that while members of some of the groups have attended previous public meetings and two of the groups are represented by members on the HPPAC, not all may be aware of the plan or the planning process to this point.
- It was suggested that there should be a separate list of potential partners, and have that column removed from the chart.
- It was commented that individuals involved in groups may change over the lifetime of the plan and that listing an entity other than the city as a responsible party may keep a party from participating or taking a leadership role that they think is already assigned because Responsible Parties are listed in the plan.

- There was discussion and general agreement that there needs to be buy-in from parties mentioned specifically by name in the Implementation Strategy before the plan is adopted. It was expressed that parties may be surprised or displeased that they were mentioned without notification. It was expressed that reaching out to the potential partners may be valuable to implementation and the success of the plan. It was expressed that there should be no obligation to potential partners mentioned in the plan by name.
- There was discussion and general agreement that an additional step in this planning process is needed to notify, inform, and have a conversation with potential partners regarding the plan's desire for them to partner with the city on implementing the plan's strategies and determine the parties' capabilities and interest in partnering. One member volunteered to help notify potential partners.

Comments on the draft Chapter 4's draft Strategy explanations included the following:

Strategy 1-D-b:

- The explanation should highlight public access.

Strategy 2-B-a:

- Preservation easements have already been researched by the city and might be used. Focus should be on adopting the use of preservation easements as a city policy.

Strategy 2-B-b:

- Teaming with local building trades and professionals should include spreading the word about events.

Strategy 2-C-a:

- Review criteria and evaluation for demolition should address demolition by neglect.

Objective 3-A: "Promote sustainable economic growth by integrating new development, reuse, and preservation."

- Reverse the order of the list to be "preservation, reuse, and new development" to avoid misinterpretation that new development is a higher priority.
- Consider alternate word choice for "integrating."
- Clarification on use of the word choice "sustainable." Consultant agreed that this word has many meanings, and that it was a word preferred by city staff and the public.

Strategy 3-A-c:

- List should include resources outside of the period of significance that do not have individual significance.
- Add the underlined text to "...consistent with Downtown Plan and other neighborhood plans..."

Strategy 3-A-d:

- Add the underlined text to "Promote and document how good design and historic preservation..."
- Clarify that this strategy pertains to rehabilitation of historic buildings and new construction; and avoid wording that can be misinterpreted to prioritize new construction in historic districts.

Objective 3-C: "Measure neighborhood benefits from historic preservation."

- Add underlined text "Measure neighborhood and community benefits..."

Strategy 3-C-a:

- Include public health benefits, such as walkability

Strategy 3-C-a:

- Include public health benefits, such as walkability.

Strategy 4-D-c:

- The explanation should be re-written based on recent work by the LORC.

Strategy 4-E-e:

- Needs an explanation.

Strategy 6-A-a:

- Replace wording “a brochure” with “digital and hardcopy resources.”

Strategy 6-A-c:

- Replace wording “YouTube” with “video.”
- Replace wording “press groups” with “mediums.”
- Incorporate accessibility, examples were given of materials for the visually impaired and for individuals without internet access

Strategy 6-A-e:

- Replace wording “nominations” with “designations.”

There was discussion of adjusting the timeline for next steps to include conversations with Potential Partners and an additional HPPAC meeting to further discuss strategy prioritization and Timeframe in the Implementation Strategy. There was discussion of rescheduling the next HPPAC meeting in August and joint HPPAC-Landmarks Commission meeting in September for later dates.

When the floor was opened for public comment, members of the public made the following comments:

1. The Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation submitted a report to the city earlier in the year on the qualities of the best historic preservation plans resulting from their in-depth review of numerous historic preservation plans from across the country. The Alliance wants to provide a copy of their report to HPPAC members to review.
 - City staff confirmed receipt of the report, meeting with the Alliance earlier this year to discuss their report, sharing of the report with the consultant team, and use by city staff and the consultant team in the development of the plan. The city and consultant team believe many of the qualities outlined in the report are represented in the draft plan. City staff clarified that not everything mentioned in the Alliance’s report might appear in the plan; as the goal is to create a succinct plan with the all essence of a good plan without being a voluminous document.
 - The committee asked for clarification that the plan is nearing the final stages of the planning process. City staff and the consultant team confirmed that a complete draft of the report is expected to be released in advance of and will be the subject of the next public meeting, tentatively to be scheduled in August. City staff reminded that the HPPAC has not met since February.
2. A member of the public shared comments regarding redevelopment and new construction in historic districts, specifically using Mansion Hill Historic District as an example.
 - She expressed the importance of not overemphasizing redevelopment or new construction within historic districts, avoiding language that may be misinterpreted by developers who are interested in redevelopment and new construction in historic districts, and strengthening the ideals that significant historic buildings and properties within the period of significance of an historic district not be demolished for redevelopment and that only properties outside of a period of significance and lack individual historic significance may be allowed to be demolished for redevelopment.

- She expressed support for Strategy 3-A-a creating a database of properties eligible for historic tax credits, Strategy 3-A-b encouraging adaptive reuse, Strategy 3-A-c and its focus for new construction on vacant lots and sites of non-historic buildings within historic districts.
- The committee subsequently discussed and generally agreed on revisions, described in the previous summary of discussion on Chapter 4, in response to the public comments.

Sincerely,

Bob Short, Associate AIA
Architectural Intern & Historic Preservation Consultant