



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, July 26, 2010

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 5 -

Stuart Levitan; Christina Slattery; Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans
and Erica Fox Gehrig

Excused: 2 -

Robin M. Taylor and Michael J. Rosenblum

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Approve the Minutes of July 12, 2010. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS

- 1. [19096](#)** City Development Review & Approval Initiative Discussion - Communication from Tim Cooley, Director of the Economic Development Division

Mr. Cooley briefly described the intent of the review process and requested recommendations from the Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Levitan asked if there had been any movement toward the previous idea of "one-stop-permit-shopping" as a way to streamline the process. Brad Murphy, Director of the Planning Division, stated that a few initiatives had been implemented in recent years. The addition of the development services center on the website, and the creation of the Development Assistance Team have been implemented, but not the physical renovation of the lower level of the Municipal Building.

Mr. Levitan stated that the neighborhood notices seem to help reduce time during the approvals process. Mr. Murphy noted that while it does include a 30-day notice at the beginning (which can be waived by an alder), it has resulted in fewer referrals by commissions. Ms. Gehrig noted that the City list serve notifies all interested parties of proposed demolitions (which requires a 60-day advance notice).

Mr. Cooley stated that Madison has a "bad reputation" in the time investment relative to the development process. Ms. Gehrig suggested that perhaps some positive public relation campaigns would help convey that most projects are approved in a timely manner.

Ald. Maniaci suggested that there be a guidebook explaining the process that could be available online. Ald. Maniaci feels that there is a breakdown in the process of information sharing and suggested that there be a set schedule of necessary meetings for neighborhood groups, developers, alders and staff. Mr. Murphy noted that a set schedule is difficult to maintain.

Ald. Maniaci asked if the recommendations should relate to the process involving the Landmarks Commission or at the process in general. Mr. Cooley stated that a "framework" is needed to structure the pre-application review processes so that the process has a predictable schedule and an identifiable time frame.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff stressed the importance of the Landmarks Commission in the development process. She explained that development in a historic district is very different than in other areas of the City. This difference demands a process with flexibility to address diverse contexts and the interests of dissimilar neighborhood groups. She suggested that the alder might be able to suggest the number of neighborhood meetings about a project based on the knowledge of their district. Ald. Maniaci suggested that the process include a preliminary project meeting that would involve the alder, a representative from the neighborhood group, the developer/architect/contractor, relevant City staff and other relevant project team members. Mr. Levitan noted that the developer has a large responsibility to make the pre-application process go smoothly and that the Best Practices Guide should be followed. Ald. Bidar-Sielaff noted that the projects that are considered exceptions to the rule should be held to a higher standard.

Ms. Slattery noted that the 2004 development review reports did not mention the operations and review processes of the Landmarks Commission.

Mr. Cooley explained that recommendations from the Landmarks Commission are due at the end of the week, but that the Commission should take the time needed to provide a thoughtful response (hopefully) by August 15.

A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Levitan, to Table the development review and approval process discussion until later in the meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

INFORMATIONAL REVIEW

2. [19275](#) 40 North Roby Road - University Heights Historic District - Proposal for new addition

Ms. Amy Hasselman and Mr. Arlan Kay presented the proposed project. Ms. Hasselman explained that the side addition would include a 2 car garage in the lower level, a family room on the first floor and a master bedroom at the second floor. In addition, there is a 3-season porch addition on the back elevation. Finally, the proposal includes removing the existing flat roof area by continuing the existing roof slope to create a hipped form and remove the flat roof on the small side appendage and create a shed roof. Ms. Hasselman explained some window relocations. She noted that variances are required for the increased height of the roof and the change in the roof shape.

Mr. Stephans stated that it is an excellent design solution; but that the proposed roof addition alters the original building and the proposed side addition increases the perceived mass of the building from the street. He suggested a proposed design that retains the existing roof and alters the height of the addition roof.

Ms. Slattery noted that the University Heights ordinance strongly encourages new additions to be of similar design vocabulary to the existing building. Ms. Gehrig suggested that the window groupings on the proposed side addition be more similar to the existing windows.

Ald. Maniaci noted that the column spacing on the first level of the proposed addition was not in keeping with the details of the existing building.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff noted that the architecture of this project is different from a previous project at 2021 Van Hise and that University Heights Historic District residents will need the applicants to illustrate how this project is different.

Received an Informational Presentation

SPECIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS

1. [19096](#) City Development Review & Approval Initiative Discussion - Communication from Tim Cooley, Director of the Economic Development Division

Mr. Levitan suggested that staff prepare a draft document reflecting the Commission's discussions and possible recommendations for review at the next meeting.

Ald. Maniaci noted that her recommendation would be to have a pre-application meeting with City staff from relevant divisions, the applicant and the alder to determine the process. She also recommended that the Landmarks Commission have joint meetings with UDC when necessary to streamline the process.

Staff presented the 2009 approval statistics, noting that there are approximately 60,000 parcels in the City and that 1500 of those (2.5%) are local landmarks or in local historic districts. Staff also noted that there is currently no neighborhood group notification requirement in the ordinance.

Ald. Maniaci requested that staff compile information on the approvals for more than one year including how many times each came before the Commission. Staff stated that except for three cases in 2009, all cases before the Commission were seen only one time. Mr. Levitan noted that the Landmarks Commission meets two times per month to provide a high level of customer service.

Mr. Levitan suggested that the Landmarks Commission respond to specifics in the DMI memo as part of their formal recommendations. He noted DMI recommendations to define a simplified process for "small" projects, changing the neighborhood notice, eliminating overlapping jurisdictions, having the Landmarks Commission advisory to the Common Council and the supermajority vote as examples that he would like to have the Commission refute. Ms. Gehrig added that she likes the recommendation that City Commissioners receives proper training, and that staff be able to participate and learn from national conferences. Mr. Levitan stated that the comments related to the qualifications of staff in the DMI report were offensive.

Ms. Gehrig suggested that the 2009 approval statistics be used in the formal recommendation document.

Ms. Slattery suggested recommending the Landmarks Commission review cases before the UDC. Ald. Maniaci suggested a way to eliminate multiple visits to the Landmarks Commission could involve signing off on the option that is preferred and allowing conditional revisions by the UDC. Staff noted that Landmarks Commission approvals are typically conditional and that staff often reviews and approves the revisions at the administrative level. Staff also noted that typically the UDC review follows the Landmark Commission review and defers to the Landmarks Commission in a majority of cases.

Ms. Gehrig asked how to make a suggestion that a case be seen by the neighborhood group versus a legal requirement to be seen by the group. Ald. Maniaci suggested that there be a neighborhood group president notification as part of the process to allow them to decide if neighborhood meetings are necessary and how many. Staff asked if there should be a threshold scope as some cases are small and can be approved administratively.

Mr. Levitan commented on the June 11, 2010 Bill White Ad Hoc memo and wanted to make it known that there is not a set time limit for presentations to the Landmarks Commission. Mr. Levitan asked how the Commissions should evaluate the validity of the neighborhood meetings and added that the neighborhood group meetings are valuable, but are not determinative.

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Refer the discussion to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION meeting of August 9, 2010. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. [17835](#) Landmarks Ordinance Revisions
- Staff noted that there is a document in the packets showing the proposed revisions to date. Staff handed out a list of definitions that need review. Mr. Levitan asked that staff investigate the definition of "improvement". He suggested that "betterment" be changed to "alteration" and that the word "genius" be reviewed. Ms. Slattery suggested that the word "hardship" be included. Mr. Levitan also noted that he would like staff to look at hardship language as related to the appeals process.
- Mr. Levitan suggested that staff find legislative history on the regulation of painting signs on buildings and the use of sand-blasting.
- Mr. Levitan also noted that he would like staff to look at hardship language as related to the appeals process.
- This Item was Discussed and will continue.**
4. [18755](#) Discussion about applying for a Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant from the State of Wisconsin Historical Society.
- A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Refer the discussion to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION meeting of August 9, 2010. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**
5. [08717](#) Buildings proposed for demolition
- Staff handed out a letter from Elizabeth Miller which explains that she is working with Wisconsin Department of Transportation on the proposal to reconstruct University Avenue. Her task is to identify any buildings and structures in the area of the project that may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. She notes a few addresses along the corridor that she believes are potentially eligible and would like to know if the Commission has any other historic resources in the area that might be affected by this project. The Commission agreed to look at the buildings and provide a statement at the August 9, 2010 meeting.
6. [07804](#) Secretary's Report
- Staff handed out a copy of the new ordinance regarding reconsideration, which was recently passed by the Common Council, Legislative file #17976.
- Upcoming Issues:
Public Hearing - Consideration of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 1384 Williamson Street.
Discussions on potential Ordinance Language Changes.
Discussions on potential Development Process Recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Slattery, to Adjourn at 7:30 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.