

From: [Bailey, Heather](#)
To: [Heiser-Ertel, Lauren](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment Tonight at Ad Hoc Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee
Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 11:35:10 AM

From: Katherine Kaliszewski <knkaliszewski@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2020 2:59 PM
To: Albouras, Christian <district20@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Bailey, Heather <HBailey@cityofmadison.com>; Scanlon, Amy <AScanlon@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Re: Public Comment Tonight at Ad Hoc Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee

Of course. Thanks for allowing me this opportunity to provide my comments in writing and potentially expand upon them.

I believe that rewriting the ordinance, particularly for the different districts is incredibly important. As a commissioner I have seen how the current system works, and while I do believe it is working to preserve our historic districts, it could be improved to work better for both the city and residents who live within them.

As a preservation professional who has worked within the field for over 6 years, I believe that we can combine the historic district standards into one comprehensive standard, with some additional stipulations for specific districts, depending on what the residents want and the character defining features we believe are important to preserve. Many other communities across this state and the country, have one set of standards they use for all of their landmarked districts. In fact, the National Park Service only uses one set of standards when they review proposed changes to properties - the Secretary of Interior Standards. The Madison Landmarks Commission already relies on those standards to review proposed alterations to buildings that individually landmarked. It is this reason why I do not see moving to one set of standards for every district leading to the loss of their historic character, which has been argued by some.

While I did not implicitly state this in my public comment - I *do not* believe that we should move to only use the Secretary of Interior Standards to review all properties within the city - but to point out that a single comprehensive list of standards can be used to preserve our landmarks without leading to the loss of character. But I do believe that the current district standards - which have no consistency - can be confusing to both commissioners and property owners. At meetings, we will often review projects from different districts and have to constantly remind both commissioners and members of public the different standard for review in each district.

The district standards we currently use were all written at different points in time, and during different points in preservation practice. The first district, Mansion Hill, has very simple and open standards, while the newest district, First Settlement has comprehensive and detailed list of standards. All laws evolve over time. By taking the time to update and strengthen the language and standards, we are not disrespecting what has been used for the past 50 years, but allowing it to continue to be useful for the next five decades. The previous authors of the ordinance have provided an good and stable base to start this revision. By making these changes we are able to both protect what they have done and make sure their hard work continues to preserve Madison in the future. Also, and I should have stressed this last night, but I don't think we should throw out all the language that came before. I believe that we can use standards that are already written and working well to be the frame for these ordinance

rewrites.

Also, to provide additional clarification on my point of wanting one simple and clear standard for every district to use. I believe I was not clear enough during my public comment. When I said we wish for simple standards, I was talking specifically about having one set of standards that are clearly understood. I think for some, they thought I meant they should only be a few standards and they be as basic as possible. And this is not what I meant. I meant simple in terms of understanding and specificity. For example, this standard in Third Lake Ridge could potentially not be referred to as "simple" in terms of language, but is simple in terms of a clear standard for the public and the commissioners to use:

Standards for New Structures in the Third Lake Ridge Historic District - Parcels Zoned for Mixed-Use and Commercial Use. Any new structures on parcels zoned for mixed-use and commercial use that are located within two hundred (200) feet of other historic resources shall be visually compatible with those historic resources in the following ways:

- (a) Gross Volume.
- (b) Height.
- (c) The proportion and rhythm of solids to voids in the street facade(s).
- (d) The materials used in the street facade(s).
- (e) The design of the roof.
- (f) The rhythm of buildings masses and spaces.

This is a standard that could be used for all historic districts, for all new mixed-use and commercial buildings within their boundaries. This standard also has some give for potential new structures, while allowing it to visually conform with the properties around it. Some of the more recent landmarks have much more tight and specific standards that could be adopted in each district. I do believe there should be different standards for the different types of properties in each district - residential versus commercial, as well as different standards for buildings within the period of significance and outside the period of significance and additions. But, I also believe you can have a well-written and clear ordinance that has many moving pieces that calls out each separate property type or potential project.

I also believe that we should have the same level of scrutiny for every property in every district. Some districts we review was is visible from the street, some we review all facades, and some we review only facade alterations. Some we offer specifics on doors and windows configurations, and others we don't. We should offer the same level of review for all districts.

Also, I went home and thought about Marsha's question about concept of "visible from the street." And what I think it should be change to "visible from the public right-of-way." This then accounts for all streets in Madison, as well as things that are visible from bike and pedestrian paths, alleyways, or other open spaces for the public. And this is easy information to determine by commissioners, staff, and property owners.

Please let me know if you want anything additional, or would like additional clarification. I am always happy to help.

Katie Kaliszewski

On Wed, Feb 12, 2020 at 7:09 PM Albouras, Christian <district20@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Commissioner Kaliszewski:

Thank you very much for your insightful public comments this evening and answering the questions that we had. Per the discussion, I am reaching out for you to share your perspectives here via email as the critical feedback you had regarding the direction of our potential ordinance and the information you shared was quite practical/efficient for helping our committee move forward. Feel free to elaborate on your points as I would like to have them as points of reference while doing this work. Thank you very much.

Regards,

Alder Christian Albouras

Madison Common Council | 20th Aldermanic District

Email: District20@cityofmadison.com

Phone: 608-358-8387

Subscribe to my blog at: www.cityofmadison.com/council/district20/blog