

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

December 27, 2016

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Tuesday, December 27, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Ann Roller, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey, and Penny Sanchez (arrived at 5:36pm). Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell; City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

R. Hopper gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. R. Hopper notified the public that the board was using a new process tonight by using the Historic District Board of Review Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet which has all the elements of both the Residential and Commercial Review Guidelines and added he would be going through the appropriate sections which pertain to an application and asking each board member if they agree or disagree on whether that particular item meets the guidelines. R. Hopper added that at the end of each application the board would then vote.

R. Hopper mentioned he would like to honor Ann Roller because this is her last meeting and she has been on the board for quite a few years. R. Hopper presented A. Roller with a Certificate of Appreciation for her long term commitment and dedication to Madison's historic district as a member of the Historic District Board of Review from Jan. 2011 to Jan. 2016.

Minutes:

There were no additions or corrections to minutes of the previous meeting. B. Lyman made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Absent

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.

New Applications:

1. Martha Jane Shimfessel – C. of A. to build a 23-ft. x 10-ft. front porch.
Location: **620 E. Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented that the house was a circa 1920 and is a contributing gable-ell style home. N. Schell presented photos which showed the current and historic look of the home and images of the porch design which would be added. N. Schell noted that there was an existing concrete slab which the porch would be attached to if constructed.

M. Shimfessel was present and stated the home was actually built in 1936. N. Schell stated the information she presents comes from a survey the office uses but thanked M. Shimfessel for the more accurate information.

B. Lyman stated she was always interested in this house because it sits between two others. M. Shimfessel stated the house to the left originally owned the land which her house sits on and her father purchased the land from that property. B. Lyman asked if the lot had always been open like that. M. Shimfessel stated yes.

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

R. Hopper stated the board would begin using the board member worksheet at this meeting and he would go over the sections which are relevant to this application.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Check all that apply	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Gutters & Downspouts	X	46	44	R. Hopper stated the gutters are going to be aluminum. M. Shimfessel stated that was correct. M. Dorsey – Yes. B. Lyman – Yes. A. Roller – Yes.
Porches	X	49, 50	--	M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – Agreed because it is going to be wood framing which meets the guidelines. A. Roller - Yes
Porch Columns & Railings	X	51, 52	---	R. Hopper asked if the applicate is keeping the existing railing. M. Shimfessel answered yes. M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – yes, and also the six inch round aluminum columns are also appropriate. A. Roller - Yes
Roofs	X	53, 54	47	R. Hopper asked if the materials would be asphalt shingles. M. Shimfessel asked if she could have a rubber roof because that is what her contractor recommended. B. Lyman stated the rubber roof would be more appropriate because the pitch is flat because when a roof has a pitch which is very flat asphalt shingles can back the water back up on them. M. Johnson stated 3/12 is the lowest pitch on which you can put asphalt shingles. M. Dorsey asked what the slope of this roof. M. Johnson stated he didn't know. M. Dorsey stated from the image provided it did not look like it would be 3/12. B. Lyman stated she agreed with the contractor that a rubber roof would be more appropriate because it wouldn't leak as easily as other materials. R. Hopper noted the material was changed from asphalt shingles to rubber. M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – Yes A. Roller – Yes N. Schell stated the applicant had mentioned to L. Waller during her meeting when she brought in the application that she might like a standing seam metal roof. M. Shimfessel stated yes but that was before she talked with her contractor and he said a rubber roof would be the best to have on account of the leakage.

Page 3

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that the historic board approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as presented with the addition of using the rubber roof method.”

Motion was seconded by A. Roller.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Abstained

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

M. Shimfessel asked what the next steps were for this project. L. Waller and M. Johnson stated she would need a building permit and she could come into the office for the building permit but it might be easier for her contractor to come into the office since they would need construction plans.

R. Hopper stated her Certificate of Appropriateness would be generated and signed and then she would get a copy of it but her project has been approved.

2. James M. Cunningham – C. of A. to demolish and remove existing single family structure.
Location: **838 East St.** Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell stated the building was built circa 1960 and is a non-contributing modern movement style home. The photos presented showed the deterioration of the exterior, the roof which has several holes, the ceilings which showed that many of the holes continued from the roof, and the deterioration of the interior.

J. Cunningham was present and stated this structure is more of a negative impact on the community and his property than an asset. J. Cunningham added it was not economically feasible to renovate the property. B. Lyman asked when the last time the home was inhabited. J. Cunningham stated approximately June of 2011. B. Lyman asked if this home was a rental property. J. Cunningham answered yes. B. Lyman asked what the applicant intended to do with the property once the home is demolished. J. Cunningham stated the building would be removed but there may be a foundation left. J. Cunningham added there was an aluminum carport on the property which may be left standing but at this time he has no further plans for reconstruction.

R. Hopper stated that if the applicant planned to build on the property in the future he would have to come back before the board with those plans. J. Cunningham asked if that would come before Zoning or Historic. M. Dorsey stated it was already zoning residential. M. Johnson stated everything starts with this board. B. Lyman stated this board approves the design and then Zoning approves the setbacks and M. Johnson approves the building permit.

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

J. Cunningham stated he was under the impression that if you are renovating an old structure it may come under Historic within the district but if it is a completely new structure it would come completely under Zoning. R. Hopper stated that if it is within the city’s historic district even if it is a new structure, you would come before the Historic Board of Review with plans and drawings of the building because it has to be compatible with the rest of the neighborhood.

J. Cunningham stated that the historic board is step one and zoning is step two. M. Johnson asked if this was the first house north of the trailer park. J. Cunningham stated that the house M. Johnson was thinking of at the head of Moody Park Lane where it comes out on East St. is Virginia Facemire’s property or at least it used to be. J. Cunningham added that V. Facemire has a two story garage and this property is immediately to the left of that property. D. Sutter stated that depending on what the applicant wanted to put on this property he might not even need to go before the Zoning Board or Plan Commission.

M. Johnson stated that the reason he was asking was because he was trying to figure out if it was in the floodplain. J. Cunningham stated it was his understanding that the entire downtown of Madison was in the floodplain. D. Sutter and M. Johnson stated that was not true. J. Cunningham stated he believed that it was and added that he thought the last flood affected the structure. M. Johnson stated if that was true then the first step for this property would be through the Department of Natural Resources because of the floodplain.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Check all that apply	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Demolition	X	80-81	71-72	<p>R. Hopper asked if the board agreed that this building was an unsafe structure and should be demolished.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – yes. B. Lyman – Agreed because it was a 1960s structure and was not contributing to the historic district P. Sanchez – Yes A. Roller – Yes</p> <p>J. Cunningham stated he wasn’t sure about the date of construction but his mother obtained the property in 1992 and he has found parts of crates from the Proving Ground as part of its construction. B. Lyman stated she has heard of that happening and a lot of people built from that. J. Cunningham stated he wasn’t sure what the date was but he had guessed 1940s or 1950s but N. Schell had presented that it was 1960s. N. Schell stated that date was from the survey which the office bases everything. R. Hopper stated there was a county wide survey done and they marked down the date of construction and they usually used research from title searches from the courthouse.</p>

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that the board approves the application as proposed.”

Page 6

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

“I move that the Historic District Board of Review approve a COA for the plan at 304-306 Broadway as proposed to put six wood shutters on the front façade of the building.”

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved

B. Lyman Approved

M. Dorsey Approved

A. Roller Approved

P. Sanchez Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

R. Hopper stated the applicants would receive their Certificate of Appropriateness once it was generated and signed and that N. Schell would mail it to the applicants.

4. Michael and Deb Fine – C. of A. to remove and replace entry door, side light and transom with solid wood door that has one (1) window, wood side light with one (1) window, and wood transom with one (1) window on North façade.

Location: **124 E. Main St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell stated this building is circa 1875 non-contributing commercial building. N. Schell showed photos of the current entrance of the building as well as brochures which show the manufacturer of the proposed entrance and door.

B. Lyman asked why this building was listed as non-contributing. N. Schell stated it was because of the metal front on the façade and there was probably brick underneath it and she believed it might have been done around the 1980s. Deb Fine was present and stated it was probably added before the 1980s.

B. Lyman stated she was impressed that the applicant was able to find a solid wood door and she had looked up the manufacturer and wondered how the applicant found them. D. Fine stated her husband had found it and added that her husband works for a company who does a lot of business with this type of company so he talked with them. D. Fine stated that they had added solid wood doors at Safari Chocolate Shop. B. Lyman asked if they were from the same company and D. Fine answered no. D. Fine stated they had gone to Architectural Salvage for the doors for the chocolate shop and they didn't have anything they could use that was older so they got brand new solid wood doors. B. Lyman stated this company was very impressive because they offer a lot of varieties, styles, and wood type.

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Check all that apply	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Doors & Entrances	X	39 - 42	40 - 42	M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – Yes P. Sanchez – Yes A. Roller – Yes R. Hopper – Yes
Windows*	X	60 - 63	56 - 59	M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – Yes P. Sanchez – Yes A. Roller – Yes R. Hopper – Yes

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the application for new solid wood door, sidelights, and transom as proposed.”

M. Dorsey amended his motion to the following:

“I move to approve the application at 124 E. Main St. for new solid wood door, sidelights, and transom as proposed.”

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved

B. Lyman Approved

M. Dorsey Approved

A. Roller Approved

P. Sanchez Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

R. Hopper stated the applicant has been approved and she would get the Certificate once it was generated and signed and mailed to you.

B. Lyman asked if D. Fine was going to do anything else with the front of the building. D. Fine stated eventually. She informed the board that they were working on the interior right now such as taking plaster off the brick walls and installing hardwood flooring. D. Fine stated that was the reason why to door has to be changed because the current door scrapes very badly and is to the point where it needs replaced.

- Brian Marshall – C. of A. to construct a 13-ft. x 31-ft. garage. The garage will have LP Smart siding, two (2) wood windows on the east façade, one (1) wood window on the west façade, metal garage door with carriage style hinges and handle on south facade, black asphalt shingle roof matching the house, 32-inch Fiberglass entry door on east façade, and a 20-inch porcelain lamp over the garage door on the south façade.

Location: **201 Plum St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

N. Schell stated that the house on the property is a circa 1840 contributing Federal style home. N. Schell presented photos which showed what the proposed garage would look like, wood windows, garage door, entry door, and porcelain light.

Brian Marshall was present. B. Lyman asked if the door was metal. B. Marshall stated it was fiberglass. R. Hopper asked if that was the same door which was in his past applications. B. Marshall answered yes.

Audience member Agust Eiriksson who lives at 803 W. Second St. was there to speak in support of this application. A. Eiriksson stated the owners should be commended for improving this property and the neighborhood and that the garage will look nice. A. Eiriksson stated the porcelain lamp was a nice touch however the garage is too tall for two reasons. First, it towers over his (A. Eiriksson) backyard and second, it is much taller than the garage right next to it. A. Eiriksson encouraged the board to approve this application with the height restriction that the garage should be no taller than the previous garage. A. Eiriksson wanted to thank the Marshalls for renovating this property and improving the visual appeal of this neighborhood. A. Eiriksson stated he was in favor of this application but would like the board to consider the height restriction.

R. Hopper stated in previous applications the height of the garage had already approved. R. Hopper asked if that still stood since it is a new structure. R. Hopper explained that in a previous application by Mr. Marshall it was approved to raise the roof four feet but it was only raised 3.5 feet which was also approved in a previous application. D. Sutter stated that was when it was a renovation and at the last meeting it was discussed that the board wanted to treat this as a new structure opposed to a renovation and therefore this application is on its own.

B. Lyman stated she wanted to talk about the fact that the applicant had determined where the lot line is and that the neighbors actually built on the applicant's property. B. Marshall stated that was correct. B. Lyman stated that both parties agreed that it is within the setbacks. B. Marshall stated it's not but its fine with him. B. Marshall clarified that the other building came over the setbacks but it didn't affect his project. B. Lyman asked if there would be any code restrictions in terms of a firewall or anything like that since the buildings are so close together. M. Johnson stated he has measured and it is at 41 inches which meets the setbacks. B. Lyman asked if there a firewall required. M. Johnson stated he read on the LP Smart Siding there is a recommendation and he has that documentation for the applicant when he comes to get a building permit. M. Johnson stated there was an exterior drywall or an X-Rated drywall which goes on before they put on the LP Smart Siding. B. Lyman asked for her own knowledge if there was a distance at which a firewall was required. M. Johnson stated in the City of Madison that distance was three feet.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

R. Hopper asked if the project met the guidelines for doors. M. Dorsey stated yes. B. Lyman stated she did not see where fiberglass doors were acceptable. N. Schell stated she believed the board should only go through the guidelines for new infill buildings not the guidelines for rehabilitation projects. B. Lyman asked N. Schell if the elements are not the same. N. Schell stated what the board looks at for infill is height, setbacks, scale and massing. N. Schell stated the board should consider materials but it is not specifically talked about in that section.

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

R. Hopper stated the materials are appropriate because they are the same as the house. B. Lyman stated she appreciated that B. Marshall was using the historic windows from the house. B. Lyman asked how many windows were going to be used. B. Marshall stated there was three to be used between the east and west side. B. Lyman stated she appreciated all the work the applicant was putting into this property. P. Sanchez stated on the Infill page “new buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of height” but she didn’t know what that means and asked for a clarification. N. Schell explained that if all the surrounding buildings are one story, a two story building would not be compatible. N. Schell stated for this project the surrounding properties include the applicant’s house which is two-story, the garage to the west is one story, the house behind the garage is two story, the garage behind the applicant’s house is one story, and the house behind that garage is one story. B. Lyman asked how you count the three foot raise. N. Schell stated she thought it might be counted as a half. B. Lyman stated so the garage would be a one-and-half story. N. Schell stated yes because it is going to have the loft above the first story. B. Lyman asked about the building to the west. N. Schell stated that was a single story garage. B. Lyman asked if that was the standard which they would be using. N. Schell stated probably, yes. B. Lyman stated so from her understanding the board was comparing the height of the applicant’s garage to his neighbors garage. B. Marshall stated the garage was barely taller than his neighbor’s garage and did not agree that the raised roof should be called a half because you cannot stand up in it. D. Sutter added that the current Zoning Ordinance states a structure cannot be taller than 45 feet in downtown and this structure is shorter than that maximum. B. Lyman asked what the height was. B. Marshall stated it was 3 to 3.5 feet taller than it was previously. B. Lyman stated so the original garage was about the same height as the neighbor’s garage and now it is 3.5 feet taller. B. Marshall stated no that the original garage was shorter than the neighbor’s garage. M. Dorsey stated he didn’t believe that 3.5 feet made that much of difference in term of compatibility.

Building Element	Check all that apply	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
New Construction – Infill Buildings		69-71	64-66	M. Dorsey – Yes B. Lyman – Yes P. Sanchez – Yes A. Roller – Yes R. Hopper – Yes

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the board approve the plan as submitted for 201 Plum Street for the infill new construction of this garage with all stated materials including Smart siding, carriage doors, asphalt shingles, historic windows and the side door. This COA is approved contingent upon meeting all zoning requirements for new construction.”

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

- R. Hopper Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- M. Dorsey Approved
- A. Roller Approved
- P. Sanchez Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

December 27, 2016

R. Hopper stated the applicant would get the COA when it was generated and the applicant could go ahead with his project. B. Lyman stated the applicant would need to get a building permit.

R. Hopper stated that concluded all the board's new applications and thanked everyone for their patience as the board moved through this new process that they have instituted.

Business - New or Old:

R. Hopper stated that last month the board saw a presentation for additional types of storm windows from Glass Unlimited and the board agreed to vote on that at this meeting. R. Hopper asked for a motion. B. Lyman asked for any comments from staff about this information. M. Johnson stated he would like to see a standard criteria approved. N. Schell stated it was mentioned at the last meeting that someone should do research on what a good definition of what types of storm windows the board approves. N. Schell stated we would use that definition as the standard and she stated she was in the process of researching what other communities call their standards for fast-tracks. L. Waller stated Melissa during her presentation called this style was the slim profile and Melissa noted that that company does make different profiles but recommended the slim profile for the historic district. B. Lyman stated she would like to take staff's recommendation to create a standard so that all models might qualify. B. Lyman moved to table the discussion till the next meeting. P. Sanchez seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

The motion to table the discussion was approved.

R. Hopper stated that N. Schell wanted to do an overview of the applications which has been reviewed by the HDBR and her office. N. Schell presented that 67 applications were submitted for the Historic Board in 2016 and 12 Fast Track applications were submitted. 50 of the 67 applications were approved and the all Fast Track applications were approved. N. Schell wanted to show that most of the applications which the historic board reviews are approved and the three which were denied were approved in some form or completely withdrawn. N. Schell stated that number did not include the applications which were approved at this meeting.

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Sanchez made the motion to adjourn - seconded by A. Roller.

Meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator

Louann Waller, Secretary