



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved AD HOC LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 14, 2017

4:30 PM

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 201 (City County Building)

****Note**** Quorum of the Landmarks Commission and/or Common Council may be in attendance at this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Zellers, to Approve the Minutes.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

1. Discussion of historic district standards

Staff provided a description of the materials provided for the meeting.

Jennifer Lehrke, representing Legacy Architecture, provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining Legacy's plan for updating the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Lehrke provided a summary of the Landmarks Commission's discussion. There was open discussion during this (summarized below). In large part, the LORC agreed with the issues brought up by the LC.

Zellers commented that the first bullet on the summary outlines the same issue that occurs in the Mansion Hill Historic district; the national historic district boundaries are not the same as the local. Staff indicated that University Heights has a similar problem. When it comes to tax credits, and proper review process, this presents a problem and creates confusion.

Rummel said that part of this process was to implement uniform standards that will apply to each district.

King commented on the issues with visual compatibility and volume. Staff agreed that the current language, although improved, is still difficult to use in the decision-making process for the Landmarks Commission.

Zellers asked if there had been a consensus about what standards should be uniform. Specific standards were not formally discussed. Instead, there was agreement that uniform standards may be a possibility.

Bidar-Sielaff commented that the topography should possibly be taken into account when it comes to visual compatibility. Zellers said that the idea of uniform standards in that capacity would be difficult to create, as the topography varies significantly district to district. There was discussion about the National Parks Service standards for visual compatibility. Rummel provided some insight regarding what Landmarks Commission currently uses to make determinations. Staff clarified the language and hierarchy of the current ordinance standards.

Rummel is of the opinion that there need to be more layers to a TSS zoning district that would allow for some more differences. The issues between zoning and preservation are significant, and will be discussed extensively. Bidar-Sielaff asked why such disparities exist. Fruhling responded that zoning and historic districts are layered, were created at different times, and create issues and confusion. There was general discussion about those conflicts.

Zellers asked for clarification about the bullet concerning NPS standards, how they have been incorporated in other preservation plans, and how they relate to tax credits. Lehrke gave an example of how this has happened elsewhere.

There was discussion about how tax credits are difficult for individual homeowners to understand/obtain.

Rummel said that the level of discernment from the general public as it relates to determining what is new vs. old is not very high. She asserted that there should be some education within the districts to help residents understand what is important and why. Staff and Lehrke indicated that it's one of the goals of the plan. There was more discussion about the importance of educating the public.

There was discussion regarding John Strange's memo addressing 41.18d, which is the clause about frustrating the public interest and how general preservation issues can fall under this standard.

The ambiguity caused by the "period of significance" language was discussed, as was how the Landmarks Commission uses that information to make decisions.

Staff commented that there is no precedent in historic preservation; that just because one property owner is permitted to make an alteration to their historic resource, it does not allow the next owner to do something similar. Clear said that perhaps the revisions to the ordinance might be able to

quantify that sentiment.

Clear said that there needs to be some consideration for things that are "grandfathered" in with things concerning zoning, and how that doesn't necessarily translate to preservation.

There was a general consensus that siding and windows would be the biggest points of contention and relate to the ordinance standards that need the most revision. Rummel commented that it's very expensive and difficult to find contractors in favor of preservation. The committee agreed. Staff asserted that if preservation is made a priority, the nature of contractors' priorities might also change.

Lehrke asked if the City has enforcement for preservation and/or demolition by neglect. It does; at least one specialist and a host of knowledgeable inspectors.

Zellers thinks installation of unique signage is a good idea. There was general conversation about signage.

Rummel brought up the Confederate Monument issue. Staff said that there would be a joint meeting between Landmarks Commission, Park Commission, and the Equal Opportunities Commission. Rummel indicated that there was nothing in the ordinance that spoke to the daily operation of a cemetery on a landmark site. Staff responded that the City Attorney was working on how the Landmarks Commission might be able to weigh in on subjects like this.

There was a general consensus that the issues outlined by Landmarks Commission were detailed and comprehensive.

2. Discussion of historic district meetings

Committee members would like some public outreach regarding public meetings. There are mailings planned soon. Any planned mailings will be given to Alders in email format. Lehrke reminded the committee members that there would be three meetings per district. Alder Zellers would like the Alder associated with the district to be referenced in the mailing.

Bidar-Sielaff asked for clarification regarding who the intended audience is for this plan (city-wide vs. historic districts, etc.). Staff explained that the audience is city-wide, but that property owners in historic districts will likely be more interested in the ordinance revisions.

Rummel brought up the Advisory Committee.

Next LORC Meeting: December 18th - 5:00pm

3. [47745](#)

Ad Hoc Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee Materials

ADJOURNMENT

The committee adjourned by unanimous consent at 6:45pm.