

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 5/14/18

TITLE: Adopting the City of Madison
Comprehensive Plan

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5/23/18

ID NUMBER: 51349

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

SUMMARY:

Levitan brought the Commission's attention to two communications submitted by Gary Tipler and Linda Lehnertz regarding their concerns that historic preservation language present in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan has been removed in the revised version of the plan.

Bill Fruhling, City of Madison Planning Division, noted that in this update of the Comprehensive Plan, staff worked hard to consolidate goals, strategies, and actions in order to focus the plan so that it more clearly lays out the City's priorities. He pointed out that three important things have happened since 2006 that have affected the plan's content. First, the Downtown Plan has been adopted, and a lot of the content cited in Lehnertz' letter from the 2006 Comprehensive Plan is now in the Historic Resources section of the Downtown Plan. Second, the Planning Division is currently developing the City's first Historic Preservation Plan, which will provide more in-depth information about preservation priorities. Third, the City is in the process of updating the Landmarks Ordinance, which specifically looks at the five local Historic Districts. He noted that the updated Comprehensive Plan still includes language regarding the value in preserving historic buildings, though it is worded more succinctly than in the previous plan.

Andrzejewski asked what will happen once the Historic Preservation Plan is adopted. Fruhling explained that it will be adopted as a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan and used to provide more detail and depth on the topic.

Rummel expressed concerns about the hierarchy of City plans, and if the Comprehensive Plan is at the top of the hierarchy that it should include more specific information about historic preservation to ensure that there is no contradictory language between plans and to keep historic preservation front and center.

Levitan inquired whether there can be conflicts between the Comprehensive Plan and the adopted Historic Preservation Plan. Fruhling confirmed that there can be conflicts, though when that happens, the more specific and stringent plan typically takes precedence. He noted that staff tried to remove inconsistencies in the new version of the Comprehensive Plan in order to make it more clear in that regard.

Levitan noted two amendments that he submitted to staff, which include correcting the year that the Landmarks Commission ordinance was created to 1971 (not 1969) and revising the wording in the paragraph regarding Action 2b (page 76) to remove the phrase, "which has changed little during that time," revise the second

sentence to read: "The City in 2015 adopted a thorough revision of the Ordinance's provisions relating to process and procedure, and is currently updating the standards in each of the local historic districts," and add ", and recent state legislation" to the end of the third sentence. Fruhling agreed that these are good suggestions, and they will correct the Comprehensive Plan accordingly.

Levitan asked for any other comments related to Gary Tipler or Linda Lehnertz' letters. Andrzejewski observed that Tipler feels the process has been rushed. Fruhling stated that the plan was introduced to Common Council two weeks ago and was referred to 18 boards, committees, and commissions. The Plan Commission, as lead, will hold a public hearing as well as a few working sessions to ensure they consider all comments. He mentioned that the public comment version of the plan is available online for any individuals wishing to express their thoughts on any sections of the plan.

Andrzejewski returned to discussion on adopting the Historic Preservation Plan and whether that plan takes precedence over the Comprehensive Plan. Fruhling confirmed that it would take precedence on that topic because it will be more specific. Andrzejewski went on to emphasize the importance of the Comprehensive Plan, and that more time may be needed to seriously consider and review it.

Staff read comments from Commissioner Lon Hill, who was unable to attend the meeting, stating his agreement with Character and Culture Strategy 2, Action c, on pages 76 and 117, and thought it may be useful to include in an ordinance. Andrzejewski agreed with Hill on the value of this action, and stated that she feels good about what she has read in the new Comprehensive Plan.

Levitan stated that if Commissioners are comfortable with the level of detail in the plan and have no further comments or suggested amendments, they can vote on adoption. Arnesen made a motion to recommend adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

McLean pointed out that the Zoning Code often conflicts with Historic Preservation, and suggested that another action be added to Culture and Character Strategy 2 regarding Zoning. Fruhling noted that concerns about the disconnect between Zoning and the Landmarks Ordinance have been raised in several other meetings on the Historic Preservation Plan and Ordinance update, and this will need to be addressed in those efforts.

Rummel suggested adding an additional action to Culture and Character Strategy 2 that would update the Zoning Code to ensure preservation of Historic Districts and protection of other historic corridors. She noted that the wording could be modeled after Strategy 1, Action d. Andrzejewski voiced agreement for this comment. Levitan asked the group if there was consensus to accept this suggestion as an amendment. The Commission unanimously agreed.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Rummel, to Return to Lead for Approval with the Following Recommendations to the Plan Commission:

- 1) Correct the year the Landmarks Ordinance was created to 1971, not 1969 (p. 76).**
- 2) Revise the wording in the paragraph regarding Action 2b (p. 76) to remove the phrase, "which has changed little during that time," update the second sentence to read: "The City in 2015 adopted a thorough revision of the Ordinance's provisions relating to process and procedure, and is currently updating the standards in each of the local historic districts," and add the phrase ", and recent state legislation." to the end of the third sentence.**
- 3) Create an additional Action to address the relationship between the Zoning Code and Historic Preservation.**

The motion passed by voice vote/other.