



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved AD HOC LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 28, 2019

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 153 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 4 - Steve King; Marsha A. Rummel; Keith Furman and Shiva Bidar-Sielaff

Excused: 1 - Ledell Zellers

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Bidar-Sielaff, seconded by Furman, to Approve the February 12, 2019 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Mollenhoff, registering in support and available to answer questions

James Matson, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak

Stu Levitan, registering neither in support nor in opposition and not wishing to speak

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

James Matson, representing the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation, referenced the draft of the proposed ordinance language submitted by the Alliance. He said that it streamlines the current ordinance while maintaining the historic district standards, and can be used as a starting point. He explained that it includes basic minimum standards for all districts, which are based on the current ordinance criteria, and allows for supplementary standards that address district-specific goals, characteristics, and concerns. He suggested that they also incorporate discretionary guidelines to help interpret and apply ordinance standards. He said that they should avoid a one-size-fits-all ordinance, and said that the Alliance would provide an additional document in the upcoming days with language for the district-specific ordinances.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

1. [54448](#) Discussion of Next Steps and Schedule

Bailey went over the suggested work plan document with discussion for each meeting broken down by topic. Bidar-Sielaff said she liked the idea of providing advance notice of specific topics that will be discussed, and suggested they think of other topics that may need to be added to the schedule.

Bailey outlined the ordinance review process to date, pointing out that the goal has been to provide clarity and consistency to those using the ordinance and to protect and promote historic resources, while following state statutes and using industry best practices. She referenced the suggested table of contents and example ordinance section document, explaining how it could potentially be organized to include district-specific exceptions within the text. She said that once the Committee decides which topics need to be discussed in more detail, staff will begin to develop the ordinance language.

Bidar-Sielaff suggested that each historic district be considered an overlay district because she thinks that including the exceptions within the text could be confusing. John Strange, City Attorney's Office, said that the number of district-specific exceptions they end up with will be the determining factor in whether they include the exceptions within the text or separate them. In discussion of how to address any district-specific exceptions, the Committee decided that they should work through the standards and consider whether there may be district-specific elements for each part. It was also decided that the district-specific elements should be added to the work plan as a topic for a future meeting.

Rummel asked where it might fit to discuss zoning. Scanlon said they could discuss it anywhere it might be relevant as they go through the list of topics. Strange said that the zoning and historic preservation ordinances both have clauses that state that the most restrictive ordinance applies. Bidar-Sielaff said that they need to make that very clear in the ordinance. Strange said that his general advice is that if they want plans and guidelines to be enforceable, it should become part of the ordinance. Bidar-Sielaff suggested that it would be helpful to have zoning maps for each historic district at future meetings.

2. [54447](#) Discussion of Consultant's Recommendations

Scanlon briefly described the example ordinance section document, and asked if there are additional topics that need to be added to the standards for new structures. Bidar-Sielaff asked if landscaping should be included here, and Scanlon said that landscaping would fit under section D, Building Site. Scanlon mentioned that they may rearrange the sections to begin with general information and move to more specific information. Bailey explained that they are using the highlighted draft ordinance document to pull out topics that need to be discussed and clarified by the Committee. Bidar-Sielaff said that the building materials section had an enormous level of detail.

King referenced the Alliance's draft document, and said that it is similar to staff's document but without the detailed descriptions. Bidar-Sielaff discussed the definitions section and the descriptions within the document, and pointed out that it may cause confusion to have terms defined in multiple places. Scanlon said that the example document uses the consultant's descriptions within the text to provide further explanation, as well as any district-specific exceptions. Matson said that the Alliance used the same approach for their document, where the definitions section includes the meaning of the word and the requirement or standard for the topic is included in the document itself.

Rummel asked about the height requirement within a 200 foot radius, and Scanlon said that the language needs to include something more specific about adjacency or average height to address that issue. In discussion of the definitions section, Scanlon pointed out that volume and height already describe the gross area of the front façade. She asked the Committee if they thought the gross area of the front façade needed to be defined on its own or if that would add another layer of complexity that may not be necessary. It was agreed that this topic would be discussed at a future meeting. Scanlon said that staff will prepare a complete example section for new structures, as well as case studies for discussion at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Bidar-Sielaff, to Adjourn at 6:45 pm. The motion passed by voice vote/other.