## MAD OF MA

## PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Legistar File ID # 64458, Draft Historic Preservation Ordinance, Parking Lot Issues

**Prepared By:** Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: March 3, 2021

## **Background**

The Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee (LORC) has reached a point in its work on preparing a new ordinance for Madison's historic districts that it would like the feedback of the Landmarks Commission. The working draft presented to the Landmarks Commission contains some recommended edits to other parts of the ordinance, but primarily consists of new standards for evaluating work on existing structures. LORC determined that a more in-depth discussion and process was required for new construction standards, so the proposal at the moment is only focused on work to existing structures.

As one of the main users of the historic preservation ordinance, the Landmarks Commission's insight into the current state of the working draft is very important. While not all of the work of the preservation ordinance goes before the Commission, large and significant projects require approval by the commission, with most of those taking place in our historic districts.

The crafting of the language of the ordinance has been based upon the feedback we received from public meetings in the historic districts and guidance from current best practices in the field, and the committee has worked on the draft language based upon those materials. A primary challenge has been finding the compromise between the request for specifics about what a property owner could do with their property and making a streamlined ordinance that is user friendly. There is a great deal of detail in the current draft of the ordinance. It would be useful for the commission to provide insights on if this level of detail is helpful to their review process.

## **Case Studies**

In order to review how this new ordinance language would work, LORC requested that staff prepare staff reports of actual projects as if they were reviewed through the new draft ordinance language. For this meeting there are projects from each of our five historic districts ranging from smaller alterations to projects involving both additions and alterations to the existing historic structure.

Mostly these projects came to the same end point. The exception is the review for Marquette Bungalows where the project might have been allowed, but the commission would have had to weigh the impacts to the historic integrity of the individual resource. The staff analysis took more time to compile in each case. Some of this might be due to it being a new process. Some of it is due to the amount of detail included in the new standards. There are some possibilities for how to address these standards in staff reports that might streamline that review, which will be a part of the discussion at the meeting.

For each of the case studies, you will find the Certificate of Appropriateness, the original staff report, the alternative analysis using the proposed draft ordinance, and the applicant submission.