



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved AD HOC LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, January 24, 2019

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 111 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Ledell Zellers; Steve King and Marsha A. Rummel

Excused: 2 - Amanda Hall and Shiva Bidar-Sielaff

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Zellers, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the October 29, 2018 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

1. [54446](#) Presentation of Consultant's Recommendations on Historic Preservation Ordinance Revisions
Jeff Vercauteren, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak
Robert Procter, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak
John Hausbeck, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak
Jim Murphy, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak

Jennifer Lehrke, Legacy Architecture, explained the organization of the recommendations document, which includes standards for review for alterations, new additions, and new structures. Within each of those categories, there is further detail regarding building materials, building features, building site, and code required work. She then described the changes made to the recommendations following the Round 3 meetings. She suggested that the Committee discuss the definition of "visible from the street" and determine if that is the language they would like to use. She also pointed out the terms that she thought would be beneficial to add to a definitions section, and suggested adding a section on grandfathering and

non-conformity. She emphasized that the priority of the recommendations is to make the standards more consistent.

King requested confirmation that the goal is to use a single set of standards for all of the local historic districts rather than having separate standards for each district. Lehrke confirmed that it is the goal, noting that it is a starting point and they welcome any examples of situations where having one set of standards may not work.

Vercauteren shared his concerns that the ordinance revision process is feeling rushed. He referenced the memo he submitted prior to the meeting, and noted concerns regarding the limitations on new structures. He described examples from the memo regarding height restrictions, and said that some standards seem overly strict. He said that the current compatibility standards are good, and overly restrictive language should not be added to the ordinance.

Procter, representing the Realtors Association of South Central Wisconsin, said that he appreciates the consistency of the proposed standards, but is most concerned with affordability and feels there should be a part of the review process that considers affordability. He said that he supports allowing staff to review more projects, which would help to alleviate the cost of going through the review process. He echoed Vercauteren's comments about the pace of the ordinance revision process, saying that he would like to have time to submit additional comments, and there is a lot to review in a short time.

Hausbeck, Public Health Madison and Dane County, said that he would like the ordinance to be as flexible as possible for families dealing with lead hazards in the home. He said that it would be helpful for the standards to call out lead directly so there is a clear process in place.

Murphy stated that more specific language would be helpful, especially as it relates to windows and lead mitigation. He said that if lead is present, replacement of windows should be allowed immediately.

2. [54447](#)

Discussion of Consultant's Recommendations

Rummel asked about using the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Scanlon said that one of the overarching goals in this process is to align our ordinance with industry best practices, part of which are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She stated that they are looking for an ordinance to stand the test of time, and using the Standards will help to achieve that goal.

Zellers began discussion of the location from which structures are judged, including the term "street facing" and how other public right-of-ways fit into that definition. She referred to Scanlon's comment that the ordinance should stand the test of time, and asked if the ordinance will encompass potential new historic districts. Lehrke said that she does not think that lake-facing elevations or bike paths rise to the level of being considered "street facing,"

but that sidewalks do. Rummel said that all elevations of a building in a historic district should be considered in order to maintain its integrity, and said that bike paths should be considered as a right-of-way view when building new structures.

Rummel asked Lehrke to speak about building height recommendations. Lehrke said that her thoughts on this changed after the Round 3 meetings, and she thinks that heights can be one story higher than adjacent historic buildings, but also need to be pushed back so that they don't overpower the historic buildings. Zellers said that the historic separations between buildings and volume of the building on the lot are also important. She voiced agreement with Rummel that to maintain the integrity of a historic district, one must consider more than just the front façade of a building. She asked if the recommendations consider the spacing of the buildings only as viewed from the sidewalk or if the depth of the site is also taken into account. Lehrke said that the rhythm on the street is addressed in the recommendations, and provided examples of new structures that do a good job of breaking up the façade to relate to adjacent historic buildings. She said that the depth of a building is not specifically addressed.

Zellers mentioned that public comments were received regarding the zoning ordinance, and asked Lehrke to discuss nonconforming structures. Lehrke said that she thinks it is important to include language about nonconformity in the ordinance. John Strange, City Attorney's Office, suggested that they add a section about nonconforming and grandfathering to the historic preservation ordinance rather than relying on the zoning code to cover those issues.

Rummel suggested that visual character should be considered from a distance in addition to looking at what is visible from the street, and Zellers agreed. King said that adding a visual corridor review may overly complicate the ordinance. Lehrke said that she has considered the issue of distance, and thinks that more than a block is too far away. Rummel said that a 200-foot radius is a standard currently used in some reviews, and Lehrke said perhaps that is a better distance to use.

There was discussion on whether the period of significance for each historic district should be included in the ordinance, and it was decided that discussion of this topic will continue at a future meeting.

Rummel suggested that accessory dwelling units be moved to a different category within the ordinance so they are treated differently than other types of accessory structures like garages and garden sheds.

3. [54448](#)

Discussion of Next Steps and Schedule

There was brief discussion on the upcoming meeting schedule.

King informed the Committee that Alder Furman will be nominated to join the

LORC at the Common Council meeting on February 5. He will fill the seat previously held by Alder Hall.

Strange said that the Committee will need to decide if they are going to move from having individual historic district ordinances to one uniform ordinance. King said that the Committee will begin with that question at the next meeting on February 7.

ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Zellers, to Adjourn at 7:20 pm.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**