



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Amended AD HOC LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Monday, December 18, 2017

5:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 103A (City County Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Clear arrived at 5:15 pm.

Present: 4 - Steve King; Marsha A. Rummel; Mark Clear and Shiva Bidar-Sielaff

Excused: 1 - Ledell Zellers

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Bidar-Sielaff, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the September 14, 2017 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Staff added information regarding the approval of minutes, which had previously been omitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments related to items not on the agenda.

Jeff Vercauteren, registering neither in support nor in opposition, and available to answer questions.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

1. Discussion of findings from Historic District Round 1 Meetings

Staff described the items in the meeting materials, which included a communication from Linda Lehnertz, summary letters for the consultant describing the Landmarks Commission meeting of August 14 and the LORC meeting of September 14, and a report by staff summarizing the comments.

Staff described Round 1 historic district meeting attendance and noted that the meetings were facilitated to allow attendees to talk about the ordinance and related topics. The comments varied from items related to Plan recommendations to methods of improving education, but there were very few comments directly related to ordinance and any revisions.

Bidar-Sielaff explained that the University Heights meeting was a good place

for people to come together to discuss living in a historic district and that there were many thoughtful comments.

Rummel commented that she found that people are resistant to the standards and that windows will be a discussion point.

Staff read through the summary report.

King noted that the findings in the summary report were consistent with the Landmarks Commission and LORC comments.

Rummel said that she was reminded during one of the meetings that staff administratively approves numerous projects that do not go before the Commission. The ordinance and policy document enable and outline that administrative power.

Bidar-Sielaff suggested that staff could provide a quarterly report to the Landmarks Commission which would show the administratively approved projects.

Bidar-Sielaff also suggested that there be a way to convey the process and its timeframe to property owners.

There was general discussion about the need for illustrated guidelines. Rummel noted that during Landmarks Commission meetings, staff will draw details to convey issues.

2. Discussion of general plan to move forward

Fred Mohs, registering neither in support nor in opposition, and wishing to speak.

Staff described the next steps for the historic district meetings as summarized in the findings report.

There was general discussion about how the Alders would like to have involvement in the determination of the Round 2 meeting dates.

Bidar-Sielaff suggested that staff find a way to identify who is in attendance at meetings so that attendees can understand the unique perspective. Rummel suggested having color coded name tags to connote developer, general city resident, single family property owner, landlord, etc.

There was general discussion about how the revisions would be presented. It was suggested that the items be prioritized by impact and that the existing language be shown with the proposed for comparison.

There was discussion about the need for LORC update meetings at the end of each round of historic district meetings.

Mohs explained that if the city wants people to make a commitment to live in and care for the buildings in the city's historic districts, then the city must address macro issues about livability and walkability and maintenance. He explained that historic districts should not be difficult to live in and that keeping staff as the front line for administrative approvals is a more efficient process. Mohs explained that the window issue will be a significant discussion and appreciates that the ordinance revision discussion has begun.

3. Discussion of Public Engagement Strategy for Ordinance Revisions

Staff explained that the Public Engagement Strategy for the Historic Preservation Project has been separated into two strategies. One public engagement strategy will be approved for the Ordinance Revision part and another public engagement strategy will be approved for the Plan part. Bidar-Sielaff asked that both strategies be reviewed by the LORC and the Landmarks Commission.

There was general discussion about the status of the Advisory Committee. Staff explained that three alders are interested in serving so a revision to the approved resolution will be needed.

There was discussion about the need to continue to direct mail public meeting postcards and to revise the public engagement strategy to acknowledge that every effort will be made to provide a direct mailing for the rounds of historic district ordinance revision meetings.

A motion was made by Bidar-Sielaff and seconded by Clear to accept the Public Engagement Strategy for the Ordinance Revisions with the minor revision noted above. The motion passed on a voice vote.

[47745](#)

Ad Hoc Landmarks Ordinance Review Committee Materials

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adjourn at 5:58 pm. The motion passed by voice vote/other.