

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 1/27/20

TITLE: Draft Historic Preservation Plan

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 1/29/20

ID NUMBER: 57047

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

SUMMARY:

Bailey provided an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan, and explained that this was Madison's first plan to identify, celebrate, and preserve the places that represent our collective history. She said that one of the foundation pieces for the Plan was public engagement, as well as taking into account the Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative, which is a focus of the City of Madison. She said that they reached out to various communities that represent Madison to get a more complete story about what is important to Madison's history, and the consultants completed an Underrepresented Communities Survey to identify places significant to groups that were historically not included in telling the story of Madison's heritage. She discussed the timeline of the Plan, which began in 2017 and included seven public events and eleven Historic Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (HPPAC) meetings. She explained that based upon what staff and consultants heard at the public meetings, they developed six goals that they were looking to accomplish. Bailey showed several graphics from the Historic Preservation Plan, including maps of future survey strategies. Bailey referenced the resolution that created the HPPAC, and discussed the review process for the Plan.

Andrzejewski applauded the HPPAC for their hard work, and said that she looked forward to seeing the final version of the Plan implemented. She said that the Plan is very ambitious, and she had some questions about how things will be implemented and whether they have enough staffing. She said that there were also good comments about simplifying and condensing the language to make it more accessible to the public. Banks said that in reading the African American Context section, she knew of other information that could be included, specifically about the William and Anna Mae Miller House. Kaliszewski asked when the Commission would review the Underrepresented Communities Survey Report, and Bailey said that copies would be provided for the next Landmarks Commission meeting. McLean said that Goal 3, which brings economic development hand in hand with historic preservation rather than always fighting it, was good to include in the Plan.

Bailey began discussion of the comments listed in the staff memo. Regarding the first comment on page 7, Andrzejewski said that the language is accurate, but she would like it to be more punchy, and suggested something similar to, "the Preservation Planner does not have authority over National Register properties." Kaliszewski agreed that it should be stated very specifically. Bailey said that the comments on page 22 and the next several comments following were looking at a more accurate and sensitive way of discussing prehistoric resources and the people associated with them. Andrzejewski asked who vetted the language and if the language was used consistently throughout the document. Bailey said that an anthropologist suggested the more correct terminology. Bailey said that the comments on page 61 were from UW Planning, who wanted

more accuracy in how their survey was represented. Andrzejewski asked if the language had been vetted by staff at UW, and Bailey said that this language was created by City staff in response to UW staff's concerns, so they have not seen it. Short said that UW staff's main comment was that an evaluation of university-owned buildings took place in 2009, but a survey report was not published so the information was difficult to find. He said that the 2009 evaluation was not specifically cited, but the conclusion that campus has been well-evaluated recently and would not need an evaluation for some time remains the same.

Regarding the comments on the last page of the staff memo, Bailey explained that they had originally used the term "Latinx" throughout the Plan, but after receiving feedback that that term could be problematic, the HPPAC recommended using "Latino/a" to encompass more of the community. She asked commissioners for their guidance on what terminology to use, and McLean asked if they were qualified to make that assessment. Fruhling said that staff checked with the City Department of Civil Rights to see if there was a City standard for terminology, but there is not. He said that they spoke to a number of people from the community, and they got a variety of perspectives that were all over the board, but everyone seemed comfortable with "Latino/a." Kaliszewski said that she was under the impression that "Latinx" was the most inclusive term, but if not everyone agrees, she is happy with "Latino/a." Andrzejewski said that she would prefer to use "Latina/o," but it is fine the way it is because her main issue is consistency. Kaliszewski said that the group being referred to typically makes the decision, and asked if the Landmarks Commission was qualified to do so.

Bailey referenced the comment to include more historic photos and adaptive reuse examples, and said that they have compiled some additional photos that are not in the current draft. She asked commissioners if there were particular properties they would like to see included. Andrzejewski said that she thought the photos were well done, and appreciated that there was a range of vernacular and architect-designed properties, as well as restored properties and those with more historic integrity. Arnesen asked if there were any photos of the Depot, and McLean suggested Hotel Washington, saying that it would be nice to include the landmark properties that have been lost. Arnesen suggested the Shoe Factory, now Das Kronenberg, or the Old Market Place as examples of adaptive reuse. Andrzejewski asked if there were any photos of Trachte buildings. McLean said that he liked the inclusion of the park shelter photo along with primarily livable structures.

Kaliszewski suggested that more active verbs be used to make the Plan more clear and easy-to-read, and said that she would pass along specific sections that she found unclear to staff. Andrzejewski said that on page 38, she liked objective 2A and the associated strategies, but all of them are passive voice and this is an example of where they could use some agency. She said that the strategies are wonderfully aspirational, but there might be questions of who will do this and how it will get done. Esswein referenced the Implementation Charts that include responsible parties. Andrzejewski said that people won't see the charts. Arnesen said the HPPAC was also trying to keep the narrative from being too long. Andrzejewski said that it was a general comment to consider, and it might be difficult in the recommendations, but in other places such as the executive summaries, they could activate the language. Esswein said that the City won't always be the responsible party, which is why they included potential partners. Bailey added that for some strategies, they deliberately chose passive voice to provide the possibility that other entities aside from the City could complete it. Andrzejewski said that it was a general comment to consider because words matter, and when there is no agency with it, she worries that it is so open to anyone doing it that it will end up not getting done.

Banks pointed out that the Madison Public Market is including story-sharing about different cultures, which is a City-driven initiative. Kaliszewski said that the burial preservation law recently had an edit, so it might help to specifically call out the state statute number and point out that it was rewritten and strengthened. She suggested they add state statute numbers throughout because some are called out and some are not, and people may want to look at the state statutes that are referenced.

Esswein said that if there were concerns about people not reading the Implementation chapter, they could add the related chart to the end of each section. Andrzejewski said that would be cluttered. McLean asked if there were references to the relevant chart within each section that mention where it could be found. Esswein and Short said they could add that information at the end of each goal. Commissioners agreed it was a good idea to direct people where to find the information.

Andrzejewski referenced strategy 4B-iii on page 43, and said that she loved the idea, but asked if it was a problem to encourage something that people are going to make money from? McLean said that he thought it was a good thing. Esswein said that the strategy was included in response to public comments that there are not enough people who have these skills. Staff said that they did not see a problem with it. Kaliszewski asked if they should remove "Madison College" and simply say "technical colleges." Arnesen agreed that it would make sense not to favor one school, and suggested "local and regional technical colleges." Esswein agreed that it was fine that the strategy be more general because Madison College is called out as a potential partner in the Implementation Charts.

Bailey explained that based on the comments received, staff and consultants will create a final draft of the Plan that will be introduced to the Common Council, which will refer it to other bodies for review. She said that after that, it will come back to the Landmarks Commission for another review, and then to the Common Council for final approval.

Kaliszewski asked if any of the strategies call out that the City needs additional staff and resources to complete the items in the Plan. She said that everyone recognizes that this is a lot to take on, and it might be a good idea to specifically call out what resources will be needed. Fruhling said that will be part of the discussion going forward because the Plan is a comprehensive overview of what we as a community believe are important priorities to work on and build the preservation program, but one Preservation Planner can't do it all by herself. He said that they won't be doing everything in the Plan all at once, so they need to know what the priorities are in order to assess what additional staffing or funding they will need. Esswein read from the second paragraph on page 51, "Staffing and funding, for existing and proposed efforts, are critical implementation components that need to be prioritized and evaluated..." and asked if that language was too soft. Kaliszewski said that she thinks it needs to be called out as a strategy under one of the goals because that will strengthen it. Esswein said that it could fit under goal 4; she and Short suggested it could be added to objective 4e, 4b, or 4a. Andrzejewski asked if it could be added on its own under goal 4.

Fruhling said that when the Plan is introduced to Common Council, a resolution will be attached that adopts the Plan and authorizes some immediate next steps, and will also include a fiscal note. He said that even if they don't have the specific numbers in terms of extra staffing or funding, it will be important to call it out in the resolution. He pointed out that the HPPAC also recognized that staff can't do all of this, even if it is not all meant to be done right away. As they begin working on things over the next several years, they will need additional resources. Arnesen asked who is responsible for prioritizing the strategies and implementation and keeping in mind the cost after the Plan is adopted. Bailey said that it is partially staff, but primarily Common Council. Fruhling said that the Landmarks Commission will also have an opportunity to keep the Plan and its priorities front and center, including when they review an annual progress report on the Plan.

Andrzejewski said that she appreciated Kaliszewski's point that the funding and staffing information should be pulled out to the foreground and elaborated. She said that this is also a section where they could change the passive language to be more active. Arnesen asked if the final Table of Contents will include page numbers. Fruhling said that it would, and the current chapter numbers would also be corrected. Andrzejewski asked which goal or strategy included adding information on landmarks to the website. Esswein said that it was mentioned in multiple places, including objective 5A-i. Andrzejewski pointed out that it was also mentioned in objective 6A-ii, and that she had just wanted to make sure it was called out somewhere in the Plan. Kaliszewski asked that her name be changed on page 2. Andrzejewski suggested that staff look into other Landmarks Commission members who may have served when work on the Plan began.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to approve the Draft Historic Preservation Plan, including the comments and edits as discussed, and forward it to the Common Council for introduction. The motion passed by voice vote/other.