

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 20 March, 2017

TITLE: Window Memorandum

**REFERRED:**

CONTACT: John W. Strange, Assistant City  
Attorney

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 22 March, 2017

**ID NUMBER:** 46486

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Marsha A. Rummel, Lon Hill, Erica Fox Gehrig, and Richard Arnesen. Excused was David WJ McLean.

### **SUMMARY:**

Curt Brink, registering in neither support nor opposition and wishing to speak.  
John Strange, representing the City Attorney's Office, author of memorandum.

Brink is essentially looking for clarification with regard to language of the memo.

Staff explained that the ordinance currently has 5 historic district sections which provide allowances for alterations. Sometimes the Commission finds that the ordinance standards conflict with one another and change from district to district. The Commission has struggled for years with how to treat historic fabric. Preservation theory demands that historic parts should remain because that's what makes the building historic. Each Historic District currently provides different language with regard to how to preserve those parts. Strange's memo is an attempt to provide a commonality for how the Commission can be involved with finding consistency over all of those districts. This memo is his way of saying that if one has looked at the standards for each historic district, one has the tools necessary to determine whether the standards are being met. National standards (Secretary of the Interior) only come into play if the property owner is seeking tax credits. In those cases, the Landmarks Commission has no authority unless it's also a landmark.

Gehrig added that there are sometimes overlaps between Madison's historic districts and those on the National Register, and that having the language of the memo also helps in situations like those.

Strange described the memo and that the Landmarks Commission should review 41.18a-d. He believes that Sub d allows the Landmarks Commission to find that replacement of historic features is not in the public interest.

Rummel clarified that she wasn't trying to prohibit window removal, but wanted to strengthen the language of the ordinance and increase the Commission's authority when it comes to windows.

Gehrig has reservations that this memorandum will be sufficient for the public and for each district.

There was discussion about the implications of not allowing window replacements.

**ACTION:**

**No action was taken on this item.**