

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 10/14/19

TITLE: Review of Landmarks Commission Policy Document

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 10/21/19

ID NUMBER: 57664

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, and David McLean. Excused were Betty Banks and Arvina Martin.

SUMMARY:

Bailey referenced an email from Alex Saloutos requesting that the Landmarks Commission refer the item to a future meeting to give the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation a chance to provide input, specifically on the Window Replacement Requests section. There was consensus that the item would be referred to allow time for any comments from the public.

Bailey began discussion on other areas of the document, pointing out that anything highlighted in yellow was new language she proposed and anything highlighted in blue was not currently being implemented. On page 2, she pointed out new language that addresses the new guidance from the City Attorney regarding quorum. Also on page 2, she said that Building Inspection support staff and Plan Review & Permitting staff were added as designees because of their role in permit requests. She explained that if an air conditioning condenser is replaced in-kind, she would approve it, so in this case the Building Inspection staff would have the ability to ask if it was being replaced in-kind and approve it as a designee. She pointed out that on page 6, in-kind replacement of air conditioning condensers was added to Category 2. McLean asked if they should use more generic language, and suggested "mechanical equipment." Arnesen asked about the definition of in-kind in this context because condensers can be various sizes. McLean suggested they add language about the replacement not being greater or more obtrusive than existing. Arnesen said he would imagine there would be some leeway to change the configuration or size within reason. Bailey read back the revised language, "Replacement in-kind of exterior mechanical equipment when it maintains a similar size and configuration," and the group approved. Bailey said that under Category 3, she added composite to the list of acceptable materials for siding because they have been seeing it in a lot of projects.

Bailey moved to the Window Replacement Requests section on page 9, and said they could discuss it at a future meeting. Arnesen said that he had a comment on that section, and asked about the window assessment that must come from a contractor who completes window repair. He said that people are having trouble getting a repair person to look at their windows for an estimate, and asked how they will get someone to provide the window assessment. Bailey said that contractors this summer were extremely busy, and it was difficult to get contractors of any sort, not just window contractors. She said that there were a couple of projects recently whom she told to talk to a general contractor, painter, or carpenter, and they were able to get bids that ended up being cheaper to repair than replace. Arnesen said that a competent carpenter can do this work and determine if a window is beyond repair, and McLean agreed. Arnesen said that he wants to be sure people are not using window replacement contractors for the assessment. Bailey said that part of this language comes

from the State Historical Society, which requires an assessment from a contractor who does window repair. There was further discussion about the wording, and it was decided that they will need to edit the language and potentially include suggestions in parenthesis, such as general contractors, carpenters, or painters in order to make it clear that it does not need to be a window repair specialist.

Bailey explained that on page 10, she highlighted items that are in the Policy Manual, but are not being done. She asked if they should include those items or remove them. She said that the Planning Division Director participates in the new alder orientation and discusses the Landmarks Commission process, but they have not done a separate presentation that focuses on historic preservation. She said that it seems more practical to reach out to alders who have historic districts or landmark properties in their districts to discuss the process one-on-one. Andrzejewski said that this was aspirational, and was included so that all alders had some background on the process in case a project were to come up for appeal. She said that she would like to provide some information, even a one page handout, at the new alder orientation, and suggested that commissioners think about this while the item is referred to the next meeting. Bailey said she liked the idea of a handout, which could be included when she does one-on-one outreach with alders. Andrzejewski said that they need to explain why it is important for alders to understand this process. She said that the educational series was also aspirational. Bailey said that she understood that once the Historic Preservation Plan and ordinance revisions came about, the educational series was tabled as something to do in the future. She said that she has no problem leaving it in the document, but wanted to note that it is something they are currently not doing. McLean asked what information was provided to property owners related to maintenance of historic buildings. Bailey said that information is typically sent out to property owners in a spring letter, which is mailed in odd years. McLean asked if the Commission had a role in that, and Bailey said that the Commission could review the information being sent and suggest any updates.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Kaliszewski, to refer the item to a future Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.