



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved AD HOC LANDMARKS ORDINANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 14, 2019

5:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Room 013 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Bidar-Sielaff arrived at 5:39 pm.

Present: 5 - Ledell Zellers; Steve King; Marsha A. Rummel; Keith Furman and Shiva Bidar

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the February 28, 2019 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

1. Election of Vice Chair

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Zellers, to nominate Furman as Vice Chair. Furman accepted the nomination. By unanimous consent, Furman was elected Vice Chair.

2. [54447](#)

Discussion of Consultant's Recommendations

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

Jeff Vercauteren, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak

Shawn Pfaff, registering in support and wishing to speak

Jim Skrentny, registering neither in support nor in opposition and wishing to speak

Jason Tish, registering neither in support nor in opposition and available to answer questions

James Matson, representing the Madison Alliance for Historic Preservation, discussed the draft ordinance language the Alliance had previously submitted to the Committee. He said that their draft combines general and

district-specific standards in a more concise way than the consultant's recommendations. He noted that their draft retains the current district-specific standards, but they have edited them for clarity and consistency. He mentioned that the draft is intended as a tool to help the Committee assess what improvements can be made to the ordinance language; it is not a final version of the ordinance. He described several improvements that should be made to the ordinance, including the addition of more general standards, a careful assessment of whether certain district-specific standards can be distilled into general standards, the creation of stronger district-specific standards for Mansion Hill and Third Lake Ridge, as well as determining which guidelines should be included in the ordinance and which should remain as guideline documents to aid in the interpretation of the ordinance.

Jeff Vercauteren said that he supports the staff recommendations for the standards for new structures. He said that the standards provide the Landmarks Commission with the tools they need to fully evaluate new structures, and encourages the Committee to adopt the standards as proposed.

Shawn Pfaff, representing the Apartment Association of South Central Wisconsin, said that they are comfortable with the staff recommendations for new structures standards. He mentioned one question about the definition of the phrase "historic resource" and how it is used in the ordinance language. Scanlon referred Pfaff to the current ordinance, which defines "historic resource."

Jim Skrentny, a property owner in First Settlement and member of the Alliance for Historic Preservation, said that he likes the reorganization of the ordinance as shown in staff's sample Table of Contents. He said that staff's example section for the Standards for New Structures is complicated, and it is difficult to understand what is required versus what is suggested. He pointed out that there is no definition of "historic resources" within the example section of the ordinance, and it is unclear how the period of significance will be dealt with. He compared this to the Alliance's sample district-specific ordinance document, which defines the period of significance and historic resources at the beginning of each district section. In staff's example section under Primary Structures, he said that he disagrees with the phrase "...the Landmarks Commission may consider factors such as..." in sections a-e because use of the word "may" leaves too much room for interpretation. Instead, he suggested they use the word "shall" so that it is clear that these standards must be followed. He also suggested the word "other" be removed before the phrase "historic resources" throughout the document where visual compatibility is discussed. He said that the Alliance also suggests a blend of general and district-specific standards.

Zellers said that she agreed with public comment regarding use of the word "may" in the Primary Structures section, noting that it does not provide the clarity necessary for the ordinance and should be more clearly defined. She

also agreed that the word “other” should be removed from sections that discuss visual compatibility with historic resources. She pointed out that staff’s example section ignores the overall mass of the building, and they need to consider how that could impact the nature of the historic district. She said that she understands considering the street view as a more primary aspect, but it should not be the only view they consider. She also asked if they should include something about buildings that are demolished by neglect in order to further discourage it, such as specifying the size of the building it can be replaced with. Lastly, she asked about the phrase “visible from the street” and what is meant by “the street.” Scanlon said that “visible from the street” is scheduled to be discussed in May, and they will add demolition by neglect to the “parking lot” to be discussed at a future meeting.

Bidar-Sielaff said that she agrees that the word “shall” should be used in place of “may,” and said they will need to consider whether to use “or” versus “and” in any lists that follow so that the requirements are clear. There was group consensus that “may” be changed to “shall” in the example Primary Structures section. Bidar-Sielaff suggested they determine whether everything that is enumerated after the word “shall” should be included. There was discussion about whether they should use language that allows some flexibility or language that is more restrictive. Bidar-Sielaff suggested adding “all of” before “the following ways:” in the opening Primary Structures section. Zellers suggested that gross volume be included in the Primary Structures section. Bailey asked if gross volume could be added to part c, Visual Size, and Zellers said that it could. Strange asked the Committee to discuss the Primary Structures section and decide whether the Landmarks Commission would need to confirm that they considered each item in the list or confirm that each item in the list is satisfied. Strange asked them to consider which items in the Primary Structures section they want subjected to the visual compatibility test, and suggested various options for the language in that section. King said that he likes the list of items grouped under the general headings that currently exist in sections a-e rather than creating one large list of items. He asked that staff provide examples of the various options to review at the next meeting where discussion of new construction standards is scheduled.

Scanlon provided an overview of section B, Building Features and Materials. King asked if district-specific standards would overrule the general standards if a new historic district were to be created. Scanlon confirmed that they could add a district-specific exception for the new historic district that would overrule the general standards. There was other brief discussion on what the signage section will include, as well as ensuring the overall ordinance wording is clear and maintains its parallelism to other sections.

Scanlon provided a brief introduction of the recommendations for alterations and new additions standards. She explained that the way to preserve the character of a historic district is to retain as much historic fabric from the period of significance as possible. She said that the ordinance language must

ensure that historic resources retain their historic integrity because every exterior alteration affects the integrity of the building and the district overall. She said that the Committee needs to consider the integrity at the material level and the ordinance needs to specify what is appropriate and what is not regarding various materials. She briefly spoke about additions and provided examples of additions that help to retain historic integrity as well as others that are inappropriate.

3. [54448](#) Discussion of Next Steps and Schedule

Scanlon referenced the updated work plan and pointed out that they are scheduled to discuss alterations and new additions standards at the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Zellers, to Adjourn at 7:28 pm.
The motion passed by voice vote/other.**