

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 6, 2019

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review along with the Madison Historic Guideline Advisory Team held a joint special meeting on Monday, March 6, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Valecia Crisafulli presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Susan Schmidt, Owen McCall, John Collins, and Betsy Lyman. Also present: Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator and Devon Sharpe, Attorney. The following Madison Historic Guideline Advisory Team members were present: Link Ludington, Pam Newhouse, Victoria Perry, Jill Wiest, Louann Waller, Laura Renwick, Andrew Forrester, Jan Vetrhus, Donna Weaver, John Marsh, Tom Gold, Rhonda Deeg, John Staicer, Mike Pittman, Julie Berry, Bob Courtney, Jessica Butler, and Happy Smith.

Business - New:

V. Crisafulli laid out process to be followed for the meeting. N. Schell explained how to submit an electronic version of comments on the city's website. The comments link and guideline link is accessible on the Historic District Board of Review page on City of Madison's website. V. Crisafulli asked for members of the audience to provide written comments. Those written comments received are included within the spreadsheet provided within the minutes. V. Crisafulli opened floor for comments.

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Hope board can deal with issues with past practice and the issue of the waiting period. This needs to be fixed with public perception	Jan Vetrhus
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Need to increase demolition permit price (current is \$10). If the HDBR denies the demolition the price should be more to discourage people from proceeding. It's harder for people to do the right thing than the wrong thing	Jan Vetrhus
Demolition/Bighted Properties	economically and technically feasible is included in federal standards and should be added the local guidelines	Mike Pittman
Demolition/Bighted Properties	board needs to consider having more documentation on cost of rehabilitation	Mike Pittman
Demolition/Bighted Properties	John Staicer asked Laura Renwick about demolition costs in other communities. Laura Renwick stated she would research.	John Staicer
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Historic preservation is the greenest thing we can do as far as construction. This should be included in guidelines	Jan Vetrhus
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Asked board's opinion on if the applicants are not looking at the ordinance and the reason why a lot of information is included in the guidelines. V. Crisafulli stated the three criteria are included to emphasize them as important aspects of the decision.	Bob Courtney
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Asked about process of educating applicants. N. Schell explained her process of educating applicants but explained that she is not always in the office. Donna Weaver stated she thought the process should be lengthened to give N. Schell more time with applicants. B. Courtney stated he was supportive of extending process length for demolition applications	Bob Courtney
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Explained state code allows for a certain length of process. Would love to see the extension but it isn't possible. Would like to see it be impossible to demolish any contributing resource but the state code doesn't allow that. Only criteria that should be included are those included in the state code.	Link Ludington

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Demolition/Bighted Properties	would like to see that the applicants be given information to what all the board would like to have	Bob Courtney
Demolition/Bighted Properties	issue isn't with criteria for demolition, it's the criteria if the board denies the application and what is required to prove earning an economic return on its value	Link Ludington
Demolition/Bighted Properties	should include character and defining features language to criteria when determining demolition because not all contributing structures maintain those features which were there when it was surveyed to be rated for the district	Jessica Butler
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Is demolition by neglect included within this section? V. Crisafulli stated yes (Not Recommended #3)	Jan Vetrhus
Demolition/Bighted Properties	demolition by neglect should be made clearer in this section that it is not a factor when applying for demolition	Laura Renwick
Demolition/Bighted Properties	burden of proof is on the applicant and self-imposed demolition by neglect is not a factor	Laura Renwick
Demolition/Bighted Properties	What role does the building inspector have in this process? This should be included within this section	Mike Pittman
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Flow chart is good addition. Needs to be larger	John Staicer
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Properties are worth more without the building. This is an issue and some disincentives should be added	John Collins
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Enforcement needs to be included. (fees, dump fees, etc.), demolition by neglect, pre-demolition requirements (documentation)	Rhonda Deeg
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Too much on one person (N. Schell). Needs additional staff to help with applications	Tom Gold
Demolition/Bighted Properties	Madison needs full time preservationist and part time planner	Link Ludington
Demolition/Bighted Properties	if person buys lot with plans to demolish right away, disincentive of leaving the lot for 5 years should be added	Jan Vetrhus
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	Other communities do not break it down into recommended and not recommended. Other communities use combination of should and shall depended on type of activity. Shall is rarely used because not every situation is the same. The important thing is to work with the applicant before and during the meeting.	Laura Renwick
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	Do other communities have a committee to meet with applicants prior to applying? L. Renwick answered no, that staff meets with applicants	Mike Pittman

Page 3

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	Would appropriate and not appropriate be better. Pam Newhouse stated no, should be not approved or approved. Needs to be better enforced	Owen McCall
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	The current language is weak. Appropriate and Not appropriate would be better (John Staicer agreed and added it's more clear) (D. Weaver agreed and added that the board already uses that language)	Jessica Butler
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	The guidelines go further than recommended or not recommended because the board uses them to make their decisions. Stronger language would better prepare the applicants. Appropriate and not appropriate is better language	John Collins
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	will board use different language and change from meets guidelines and does not meet guidelines (V. Crisafulli answered no)	Happy Smith
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	There are gradations of appropriate and not appropriate. (Good, better, best) appropriateness concept is used because it is in the state code. Recommended and not recommended is the language used in SOI standards. Guidelines are not the law and should not use words like shall or must	Link Ludington
appropriate/not appropriate / Recommended/Not Recommended	Issue with wording is the definition of both recommended and not recommended. Definition needs to be amended.	Betsy Lyman
map	black and white map of the district is the map passed by city council	Link Ludington
map	map with rating with rating and not rated was lost 15 years ago	Link Ludington
map	There is confusion on overlapping districts and surveys that have been done.	Link Ludington
map	should choose the map that has the most up to date survey and pass that as the official map/survey	Jan Vetrhus
map	Bob Courtney to distribute his document to N. Schell	Bob Courtney
map	Should we do another survey	Mike Pittman
map	that would be a lot for one person	Jan Vetrhus
map	what does state code say on primary vs secondary areas	John Staicer
map	There are different standards for demolition in the two areas	Link Ludington
Map/standards for non-contributing	non-contributing could have a COA process different than contributing structures in secondary area	Bob Courtney
Map/standards for non-contributing	ordinance only difference in areas is for walls and fences (same language in state code with addition of exterior changes for non-contributing structures)	Laura Renwick

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Map/standards for non-contributing	Having multiple areas with different guidelines is a burden for both board and public to understand. If there is a way to simplify maps and areas that would be a priority	Andrew Forrester
Map/standards for non-contributing	Focus should be on the district as a whole and not on secondary areas. If it is kept then secondary structures should eventually fall out of the district if not held to the same standard as the primary district	Jessica Butler
standards for non-contributing structures	even though a building is non-contributing it has a visual impact to the district and should have the same standards to keep visual aspect	John Staicer
standards for non-contributing structures	The issue with the guidelines is areas like awnings that specifically state that metal awnings are not appropriate but on a 1960s house they would have been. (that is the reason for the board)	Owen McCall
standards for non-contributing structures	concerned that some buildings that are listed as non-contributing could be contributing today	Donna Weaver
standards for non-contributing structures	Resurvey would be great. Landmark staff adds professional opinion on rating within staff comments for each building. Work is held to same standards.	Laura Renwick
standards for non-contributing structures	the survey just needs updated	Link Ludington
standards for non-contributing structures	funding through MOA for historic preservation activities is coming to the city	John Staicer
standards for non-contributing structures	does other communities use the 50 year mark (L. Renwick yes) (50 years is minimum and there is other criteria that are considered for structures to become historic - L. Ludington)	Betsy Lyman
economic hardship	if the language is not clear that these documents are not required it will be amended to make it clearer that the documents may be included by the applicant to demonstrate economic hardship	Valecia Crisafulli
economic hardship	add availability of funds through PACE within this section (V. Crisafulli and J. Butler agreed)	Tom Gold
economic hardship	fees added for non-compliance and those fees go into the PACE fund	Jessica Butler
economic hardship	question of note comment on introduction section (N. Schell stated it would be removed)	Mike Pittman
economic hardship	district needs to be kept as a living community not a rich person's playground (comment in response to discussion on owners not affording renovations to district standards by T. Gold and B. Courtney)	Jan Vetrhus
economic hardship	should have documentation on alternative materials and prices	Louann Waller

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
economic hardship	Certificate of approval in addition to certificate of appropriateness (L. Renwick did not know of any communities that use that in her district. She will ask about that around the state)	Link Ludington
economic hardship	property maintenance/neglect is an issue within the district (L. Waller stated there is no current ordinance in place for property maintenance) (A. Forrester added that a property maintenance ordinance should be considered)	Susan Schmidt
economic hardship	lot of confusion on HDBR authority on property maintenance and it needs to be addressed to help out the board perception	Betsy Lyman
accessory structures	Primary issue is with demolition of accessory structures and infill. Do you apply the same criteria for accessory structures (most issues are not with contributing carriage houses - issue is with smaller outbuildings) (J. Vetrhus would agree)	Valecia Crisafulli
accessory structures	Should a building be considered lesser because you cannot park two cars in the garage? No, they should not have different standards	Donna Weaver
accessory structures	Are secondary structures included in the interim report? (L. Ludington and L. Renwick answered yes for those who have character) (Rhonda Deeg has surveyed 95 of those structures which were included in the interim report/NHL survey)	Happy Smith
accessory structures	layout on page 39 (photo of garage at 415 St. Michaels is next to not recommended) should be amended	John Staicer
accessory structures	Should the survey be included? Which survey? They should be included. (R. Deeg to provide survey on structures to board)	John Marsh
accessory structures	if historic secondary structures are as important as the primary buildings, then infill should be held to the same standard	Donna Weaver
accessory structures	how does other communities handle pre-built structures (L. Renwick stated it depends on visibility from streets and alleys)	Betsy Lyman
visibility	whole spectrum of alleys (some alleys cannot be driven down and others are like streets)	John Collins
visibility	all streets publicly maintained should be included as public right of ways (L. Renwick stated that is how her communities handle it also)	John Staicer
visibility	extensive definition for streets	Link Ludington
visibility	a lot of things have been given "certificate of approvals" because of visibility (inappropriate approvals have been given because it was visible from an alley where it wouldn't have been approved if it was along a street)	Jessica Butler
visibility	not all public right of way is paved	Owen McCall

Page 6

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
visibility	needs to be a reasonable definition of visibility (standing on a ladder down the road is not reasonable)	Andrew Forrester
visibility	define reasonable in terms of visibility	Andrew Forrester
visibility	cited historic district ordinance 151.20	Link Ludington
visibility	there is nothing in the ordinance that material for material does not need approval (conspicuous change could include the change in roof materials) (this just has been the practice for the last 35 years)	Link Ludington
visibility	expressed appreciation for the process that has been taking place with the revisions to the guidelines	Link Ludington
alternative materials	referencing preservation briefs from 1988 (might not be a good idea since it is old and there are newer materials) Look at something that is newer and more current	Rhonda Deeg
alternative materials	language to be added so this section is not always out of date	Jan Vetrhus
alternative materials	the language has to be fluid and allow flexibility	Julie Berry
alternative materials	Matrix was added to help with flexibility and help determine whether the material is appropriate or not appropriate	Betsy Lyman
alternative materials	flow chart is good addition	John Staicer
alternative materials	question on definition of historic (N. Schell stated it was just a summary)	Bob Courtney
alternative materials	focus should be whether the historic material should be removed/replaced (alternative materials should look, function, feel, etc. as the historic material it is replacing)	Link Ludington
General	Work happens over the weekend that was not approved by the HDBR. Is anyone tracking that? (V. Crisafulli stated this is enforcement by building inspector and probably needs a future discussion)	Happy Smith
General	N. Schell provided spreadsheets from other meetings. Asked what to do with them. (V. Crisafulli stated they are for information on how the board decided on these topics.)	Bob Courtney
General	Not sure on process going forward yet but will be formulated and provided to the public	Valecia Crisafulli
General	How will this go to council? (N. Schell stated it would be an amendment to the HD ordinance because the current ordinance specifically calls out commercial and residential guidelines. Therefore it will have 3 readings)	Jan Vetrhus
General	Will there be other changes to the ordinance? (N. Schell stated that she is working on that with Devon Sharpe and any changes will be presented to the board to give a chance for public comment)	Bob Courtney

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
General	The Preservation Coordinator should develop regular programs or methods to inform property owners, real estate agents, contractors, city officials and employees about the Historic District's benefits to Madison's economy, and how it helps to sustain individual property values.	Cornerstone Society (Written In)
General	Public comments indicate that there is concern about the blighted areas of Madison. Some citizens believe it is the Historic District Board of Review's job to address this. A determination needs to be made by the Mayor and City Council as to who is responsible to implement the Nuisance Ordinance in order to keep properties from falling into disrepair, or after a fire, sit neglected and deteriorate in place. A minimum maintenance clause should be defined and enforced by the City.	Cornerstone Society (Written In)
General	No access way should be considered of a lesser value architecturally and be exempt from HDBR guidelines.	Cornerstone Society (Written In)
General	For property owners who have applied for a COA, the Preservation Coordinator should have legal authority to be on their property in order to understand areas under consideration. Findings of the inspection should be included in the Staff report to the Board. Photos do not always tell the entire story. The Board should follow the directions in the Ordinance that defines the documentation necessary to have a complete application. The Staff should provide guidance, examples, and information to help property owners complete their application. Incomplete COA applications should not be accepted until all required documentation is submitted by the filing deadline.	Cornerstone Society (Written In)
General	The benefits of property ownership in Madison's Historic District are secured by consistent enforcement of the Historic District Ordinance and the Design Guidelines. When noncompliance occurs, the Board should have a series of clearly defined steps and procedures to be followed that encourages compliance. The staff should contact the property owners to discuss reasons for noncompliance, and if the owner is nonresponsive, a formal request for an appearance at the next Board meeting should be required.	Cornerstone Society (Written In)
General	Blight, deferred maintenance, etc. is a problem that needs addressing. Updated/new ordinances may be needed. Also a code enforcement person is also need to follow up on issues. (M. Pittman and V. Crisafulli Agreed)	John Staicer (Written In)
General	Referred group to look at City of Frederick, MD guidelines.	Rhonda Deeg (Written In)

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

March 6, 2019

No further business to be brought before the board or advisory team.

Meeting adjourned at 7:28p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Valecia Crisafulli, Chair

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation
Coordinator