

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

said that they probably would be. He added that they had talked about it already and since then he had gone around downtown Madison and saw quite a few convex awnings. V. Crisafulli said yes, unfortunately that was true. S. Hookey mentioned the one at the Girl's Club was a long half-round awning and he was pretty sure Tim from Teton got approval for that. V. Crisafulli agreed that Mr. Hookey was correct. She stated that one of the things the Board was absolutely committed to doing in 2016 was to ask as much as possible that the Guidelines be followed because of the special character of this District, so if that would be agreeable to do the shed awning there too, that would be great. S. Hookey stated that he would ask the Elders if they would be agreeable to that. He stated that they looked at several different options and these were the two options that they chose. He said that he wouldn't pretend to speak for them so he would ask if that would be an option that they would be happy with.

P. Newhouse asked if there was a reason that they decided to go with the curved one. D. Friedrich stated it was because of the aesthetics of it. He said that he had given them a couple of different renderings of what the doorways would look like with different styles of awnings and they sat in a board room and talked about it and these were the designs they chose.

V. Crisafulli asked if they had a copy of the Guidelines when they looked at the renderings. Mr. Hookey stated that they did not have a copy of the Guidelines. She said that one of the things that she knew about this Church was that they cared a lot about its history, and that it was two hundred years old last year if she wasn't mistaken and the members have taken a lot of care to preserve the historic character of this building and she really thanked him for that and she knew how important this building was in contributing to the downtown. She said that she had every faith that the Elders would want to do the right thing here.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other comments or questions. P. Newhouse said that she agreed with Valecia that the shed style would be more appropriate and actually more aesthetically pleasing there and it made more sense to her. B. Lyman stated that with the angular style of the building the shed style would mirror that look and that she wanted to echo the comments about the care that has been taken with the Church. She said she had watched Rhonda Deeg redo all of the stained glass windows and she knew that was a significant amount of investment that was made to restore them and it is a beautiful structure and a true landmark in the District. She thanked Mr. Hookey for its care.

R. Hopper asked if S. Hookey would have to go back to the Elders to get their approval, or did he want the Board to amend the application and make it in the style that is compliant and then if they say no, then Mr. Hookey would have to come back before the Board. S. Hookey said that would probably be the way to go. R. Hopper said that way Mr. Hookey wouldn't have to reapply and come back for a second time. Pastor Hookey agreed.

R. Hopper then asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. Hearing none, R. Hopper said that the motion would state that both awnings will be shed-style awnings on both doors. He asked for the motion.

V. Crisafulli moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 202 Broadway to install awnings over the west and south doorways of the building with the following conditions: 1) the awnings should be a shed design that fits the door openings, 2) the installation of the awnings should not damage the historic materials and features of the building. It should further be noted that the canvas material proposed is appropriate to the historic commercial structure. The reference is the Commercial Design Review Guidelines page 34.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
A. Roller	Approved

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

V. Crisafulli Approved
M. Dorsey Approved

Application was approved in accordance with motion and vote.

2. Jerry and Andrea Dunlevy – C. of A. to construct a new, detached 1 ½ car garage on northwest corner of lot. Modified setback proposed since December application (denied)

Location: 603 E. 2nd Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Peter Ellis, a representative for architect, Donald Ball, spoke for the applicants. J. Butler presented information about the property. She stated that since the applicant was before the Board in December the members were familiar with the property at 603 E. 2nd Street. It was built in 1915 and is a contributing structure within the Historic District. She presented PowerPoint images showing the general area of the proposed garage. She stated that on-site measurement had been done as there had been some discussion in December that the measurements were inaccurate and that previously she had used measurements from aerial photography and submitted applications. She showed that both the neighboring property to the north and the primary structure that face St. Michaels Street are at 30' 9" from the pavement edge of the street and pointed out in the photo where that had been measured. She stated that the application had been modified to show that the proposed garage, in order to fit infill guidelines, be placed no further toward St. Michaels than those two primary facades of the neighboring structures.

R. Hopper said that he appreciated that the applicants worked this out so that it was compliant with the setbacks of the guidelines. He asked if Mr. Ellis had anything else to add. P. Ellis asked if the Board members had an opportunity to look at the revised drawing. The members indicated that they had. He said the last time he had appeared, the proposed garage was 3 or 4 feet beyond the primary façade of the Dunlevy's existing house and the plan had been adjusted. He said that both facades of the Dunlevy's house and the neighbors' to the north roughly line up with each other within an inch or two. He said that the garage will be in line with the facades of both houses. He also stated that it is the applicants' intention that they be 100% in compliance with the Ordinance and the Guidelines. He added that they have gone through the Guidelines and looked at them and he did believe that was true. He also said other than that, there had been some question as to where the property line was last time he came before the Board. He said the property line had not been surveyed. At the last meeting it was discussed that survey lines were typically part of the permitting process for new construction and he felt that was something that the Board didn't really want to get involved in. He said that every single building application goes through the Building Department and the Building Inspector reviews each application and this particular application was showing that it would be in compliance with the Ordinance and it is showing specifically a 3 foot setback from the property line, wherever it is. He added that if there was some kind of question about it as part of this application, the garage is definitely going to be 3 feet off of that property line. So the applicants and the architect really believe this is 100% in compliance.

Ron Hopper asked if there were any questions from the Board. B Lyman stated she took some time to go with M. Johnson, J. Butler and Mr. Ellis and watched them make these measurements. She said it was very instructive for her and she appreciated the opportunity to do it. She stated that M. Johnson sprayed out the lines and followed all of the measurements to make sure the garage really would fit. She said that it will be a tight fit. She also said that she appreciated the architect and the landowners' efforts to be compliant with the infill standards. V. Crisafulli stated that she agreed and thanked Mr. Ellis.

Building Inspector M. Johnson said that those measurements were based off a fence and that he suggested a survey be done to be sure of the location of the property line.

R. Hopper asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience.

Paul Gourley, 320 St. Michaels, from the audience and neighbor to the north came forward. He looked at the aerial photo that was projected on the screen and stated that there would be 6 feet between his house and the garage which would be 3 feet from the property line and then 3 feet to the garage. He added that he appreciated being allowed to have a voice in this manner. He said that the applicants had

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

complied but to him it was like trying to stuff 10 pounds into a 5 pound bag and that he worried about the visual continuity along the street. He also stated that he worried about the people backing out of the driveway because people drive up and down the street fairly quickly. R. Hopper thanked him for his comments and asked if there were any other comments or questions.

V. Crisafulli asked Mr. Gourley if he had windows on that side of his house. He said no. Mrs. Gourley answered that the windows were on the front but not on the side.

P. Newhouse stated that she appreciated the design. She thought it went well with the house and it was beautifully done.

R. Hopper asked if there was a motion.

B. Lyman moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 603 E. 2nd St. to build a new detached 1 ½ garage on the northwest corner of the lot if constructed according to the plans submitted on January 5, 2016, and discussed at the Historic District Board of Review meeting on January 25th, 2016, is compatible with the character of the Historic District and is in accordance with the Residential Guidelines for New Construction/Infill standards for buildings, page 69 which states in part that “new buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of set back and new garages should be built at the rear of a dwelling or set well back on side elevations. It is the Board’s understanding that the western façade of the proposed garage will be set back at least 30’ 9” from the edge of the pavement on St. Michaels Street and will not project forward of the western facades of either residences immediately to the north and south of said garage. Therefore, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

V. Crisafulli	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved

Application was approved in accordance with motion and vote.

Extended Application:

3. Larry and Valecia Crisafulli - C. of A. to install awnings over entranceways at rear addition, 1st and 2nd floor

Location: 108 W. Main Street/103 W. Fountain Alley **Zoned:** Central Business District (CBD)

R. Hopper stated that the next application was an extended application and since it involved one of the Board members, V. Crisafulli would not be voting on the application.

J. Butler stated that this application’s primary address was 108 W. Main Street and displayed PowerPoint images of the front of the building and said it was built in 1870 and is a contributing structure in the Historic District. She showed renderings of what the proposed awnings would look like on the doorways located on back of the building at 103 W. Fountain Alley.

Larry Crisafulli, 832 W. Main Street, came forward to discuss the application. He stated that he felt the design was in compliance with the guidelines. R. Hopper said he thought so, too. P. Newhouse asked what color the awnings would be. Mr. Crisafulli they hadn’t decided yet but they would probably be dark like the trim. He said they won’t be white as indicated in the photo. P. Newhouse said good. She asked who would be doing the work. L Crisafulli said they didn’t have a contractor yet. P. Newhouse asked if the material would be canvas with an aluminum frame similar to the type the Presbyterian Church was

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

using. L. Crisafulli stated that it was their intent to do something so that fifty years down the road when it is tacky to have those awning and they take them off they will look like they had always been there. R. Hooper asked if there were any other questions from the Board.

L. Crisafulli stated that he really appreciated the work that this Board does. He added that when you make an investment downtown, you do so knowing there is an Ordinance in place and the downtown stays the way it should stay. And he hoped the city would be aggressive in pursuing noncompliance in addition to approving compliance because every time something noncompliant goes in the value of their property goes down and he thinks that is really important.

R. Hopper stated that one of the goals for 2016 was to get a process in place so that doesn't happen or if it does happen there would be consequences to the person or homeowner.

L. Crisafulli said that the people who are compliant are making a big investment and if someone next door is not compliant, it hurts that investment. R. Hopper said he understood and thanked Mr. Crisafulli for those comments. R. Hopper asked if there were any comments or questions from the Board or audience. Hearing none he asked for a motion.

P. Newhouse moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 108 W. Main Street/103 W. Fountain Alley, if constructed according to the plan submitted on December 8, 2015 is compatible with the character of the Historic District and the architectural details are in character with same. Specifically, the additions of the two canvas shed awnings conform to pages 34, 35 of the Madison Commercial Design and Review Guidelines that state that the shed awnings are most appropriate for most commercial buildings in Madison and they should be of canvas duck or cotton/polyester blend, also the awnings must appropriately fit the door openings below and must be installed so that installation does not damage historic materials and features of the building. A Certificate of Appropriateness should therefore be granted.

B. Lyman seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

Application was approved in accordance with motion and vote.

New Business

R. Hopper welcomed Mike Dorsey as the Board's newest member. He asked if Mike wanted to make any comments. M. Dorsey said he was glad to be on the Board. He lived downtown at 613 W. Main and he appreciated the historic value downtown and wanted to help maintain it. V. Crisafulli suggested that Mike share information on the other house he had been working on because she felt that was a significant part of his background. M. Dorsey stated that last year they purchased a house at 414 W. 3rd Street for his daughter and son-in-law. He said they proceeded to pretty much gut and rebuild the inside of the house and painted and cleaned up the outside and fixed some of the eaves and it turned out nicely.

R. Hopper said that he wanted to put on the public record an acknowledgement of a former Board Member, Graham Thieman. He stated that a Certificate of Appreciation had been prepared for him and Mr. Thieman chose not to come to the meeting to receive it so R. Hopper went to his house to deliver it and got a tour of the Thieman's house on West 2nd Street that they are redoing. He said that he appreciated Graham's participation on the Board and wished him well with his projects.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

R. Hopper then said that since this was the first meeting in January of this year it was time to elect officers for the Board. He said he would entertain recommendations.

B. Lyman said that she moved that Ron Hopper be nominated as President of the Historic Board and Valecia be Vice-President. R. Hopper stated that he had talked to B. Lyman and he had agreed that he would continue as the Chairperson. V. Crisafulli stated that she agreed as well and thanked Betsy. R. Hopper inquired as a point of order if the Board could vote for both at the same time or did each position need to be voted on separately. D. Sutter, Board attorney, stated that it might be best to do them independently that way the Board would be voting on each individual candidate. R. Hopper asked if there were any other nominations. Hearing none, P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call was for Ron Hopper's Nomination:

A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved

Nomination was approved in accordance with motion and vote.

B. Lyman moved that Valecia Crisafulli be nominated as Vice-President of the Historic District Board of Review. P. Newhouse seconded.

Roll Call:

M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

Nomination was approved in accordance with motion and vote.

R. Hopper said he didn't have any more new business and asked if J. Butler had anything to add. J. Butler stated that she thought the Board needed to set a time for an Executive Session regarding setting out a plan for non-compliance review and enforcement. She added that the Board could do that in an Executive Session but that the meeting would have to be publically advertised. She said an Executive Session could be held after the next meeting or at a special meeting before then. V. Crisafulli stated that she was going to be out of town for the February meeting and that was the only meeting she was going to miss, and added that was a discussion she really cared to be a part of so she would appreciate a special meeting if it could be arranged. R. Hopper stated that he didn't mind another meeting and we could do it before the next meeting. He asked if setting up a non-compliance procedure was something the Board could do or was it something that needed to be approved through City Council. D. Sutter said that in order to have an Executive Session there are certain things the Board can talk about, that the Board members couldn't talk about everything. He said that there were certain things that were acceptable in the Statute and one of them was to discuss potential litigation or litigation so he thought that as part of that discussion the Board could certainly discuss how the members were going to handle specific cases. He said that there were two specific items right now he thought that could be part of that conversation. He added that in an Executive Session the Board should be able to discuss potential litigation and how the Board will handle non-compliant issues going forward that are currently before the Board. R. Hopper said his other question was if it was the Board's responsibility to vote on the process of non-compliance and approve it or does that have to go beyond our Board for approval. D. Sutter said that was dependent on what the Board decides. He said there were certain things that this Board could decide within the Guidelines and within the Ordinance that would not need approval but

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

depending on how the Board feels about going forward there may be some things that would need to go before Council and that was dependent on how the discussion goes.

J. Butler asked that as the Board's attorney, would D. Sutter need to be at the Executive Session. D. Sutter said yes, he would certainly like to be there. Other Board members agreed. R. Hopper asked if J. Butler could send out an email with potential dates. J. Butler said she would do that tomorrow. R. Hopper stated that the meeting needed to be advertised. L. Waller stated it needed to be advertised 48 hours before the meeting, excluding weekends and holidays. R. Hopper said that would give some wiggle room as far as times and dates.

V. Crisafulli stated that she would be leaving on the 10th of February and return on the 27th. A. Roller stated that she would be gone February 2 and return the 17th. J. Butler stated that she would be leaving this Friday and would be back February 8th. R. Hopper stated he wasn't going anywhere. B. Lyman said she wasn't either. R. Hopper said the meeting date and time would be determined through the email, and that even if it will not be held before the next meeting, the Board can certainly plan the meeting for a future date.

V. Crisafulli said she wanted to note that this was one of the things that we had on our list of goals for 2016 so she thought that this would start the process of getting some of our systems in place and that she thought that Board felt this was important. She stated that she had started researching other historic boards' non-compliance examples, looking at their policies and procedures, and there were a lot of examples that the Board could review. She said she would continue to do that research and she would send her findings to J. Butler so she could get them out to everybody. J. Butler said that was great place to start current best practices. V. Crisafulli agreed and said that the Board wouldn't have to reinvent the wheel on this as she was finding other good examples to go by. D. Sutter stated that he thought the ultimate goal is to make it as user-friendly as possible. He added that in fairness to anyone who is potentially going to be an applicant and come before the Board, having a system in place and making that very clear to them will be helpful not just in enforcement, but just in general knowledge as far as what to do and what this Board's expectations are. The Board said they agreed. V. Crisafulli said she would like it not only user-friendly but also fair to all concerned so that someone doesn't feel that they are being held to a different standard than other people, and that she felt both of those issues were important.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other new business or old business. B. Lyman stated that she knew other Board members had submitted goals for 2016 and asked if there could be a process for discussing those goals and deciding what our priorities would be. R. Hopper suggested that could be one of the things when the Board had their Executive Session. J. Butler said she thought that was a good idea and those could be discussed at that meeting. D. Sutter said the Statute was specific about what the Board is allowed to discuss and what they are allowed to do. He certainly understood why the Board would want to discuss that in Executive Session, but he thought the Executive Session had to be specifically about potential litigation and/or actual litigation based on the types of things that are happening. He added that it might be helpful if the Board wanted to discuss those things at a public meeting or if the Board wanted to hold a workshop that was publically noticed and advertised and appropriately held. He said that could happen at a public meetings, but he didn't think it would be an allowable topic to discuss in Executive Session.

J. Butler said that she had compiled a list of goals in a document but hadn't wanted to considered it finalized but she could email that to everyone so the Board members could see what was suggested so far and if the Board wanted to talk about it at the February meeting they could or continue to think about priorities within the list. She added that was what she thought should be done first. B. Lyman stated that she would like to see the goals prioritized and maybe certain Board members assigned if there is research to do or anything like that.

J. Butler suggested that if the Board wanted to come up with a subcommittee, that was something she was interested in such as a Technical Review Committee so that a technical analysis of a site, such as a site visit for measurements, with M. Johnson or herself, maybe two individuals or three to make it a subcommittee, the technical analysis of a project could be reviewed before it comes before the Board. She said that B. Lyman had been interested in joining her and M. Johnson on the site of the revised

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

application and added that she thought it was great. She stated she knew the Board members were required to visit the sites and take a look at them and if the Board thought they would like to have a Technical Review Subcommittee she would welcome that. She said it wouldn't be on every application. R. Hopper stated that he thought if it was more than two Board members, it had to be advertised because it would be considered a meeting. J. Butler agreed and thanked R. Hopper for reminding her of that. R. Hopper said that the Board could have a subcommittee of two with J. Butler and M. Johnson and that would be something to think about.

B. Lyman asked if the Board was deciding that at the February meeting they would be discussing the goals. J. Butler stated that she would send the Board members the goals in document format and if the Board wanted to plan on discussing them and prioritizing them at the February meeting they could. V. Crisafulli said that since she wasn't going to be at the meeting she would be happy to send in her priorities. R. Hopper said okay.

D. Sutter said that one thing that M. Johnson brought up that was a good point was that depending on what subcommittees the Board creates with certain things to decide on, legally the Building Inspector is allowed on these properties, but whether or not if Board members can come on the properties may be up to the applicant, whether they feel comfortable doing that. He added that he would be sure that the Board look at all aspects before we decide, and that he would appreciate being kept in the loop just so we don't commit ourselves as to something that we might be unable to do or allowed to do. Several members said that was a good point. J. Butler stated that in general a technical review could probably still be done looking at the paper applications. The site visit wouldn't have to be on the property even for the technical analysis, so the Board could work with that. She also stated that it goes back to the suggestion of having her meet with two people each month and that it could be on a rotating basis. It didn't have to be a set subcommittee but just to have some discussion prior to the meetings. R. Hopper said it sounded like a plan and then asked if there was any other old business.

B. Lyman stated that she didn't know if this was old or new business but as part of the 2016 goals we had talked about doing some kind of informational or PR work to help residents learn a little bit more about what we are doing, why we are doing it and how we do it. She added to get the discussion going she had created a draft of a brochure that she wanted to distribute. She said that this would need to be looked over by the Mayor and probably Andrew Forester for review it, but it is something that was completely in draft form. She suggested that the brochure could be put on chairs for people who come to City Hall for the meetings. She added that the Board could look it over and discuss at the February meeting.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other new or old business. V. Crisafulli said that since we had a short meeting tonight, we had an opportunity to discuss more things. She asked if we knew what was the status of bringing our seventh member on Board and wondered where we were in that process. J. Butler said that the gentleman was not here who most recently indicated some interest in being on the Board. She added that she had left him a message to remind him that he was invited to come tonight but she hadn't had any response from him yet. V. Crisafulli said that once we had the new person on board she thought it might be good with two new members that we build into one of our sessions some training on Board procedures and how we act as a Board. She suggested that D. Sutter could pull together somethings for that. D. Sutter agreed. V. Crisafulli said great. M. Dorsey said he agreed.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other new business or old business. Hearing none, he stated that he would entertain a motion to adjourn. V. Crisafulli suggested R. Hopper mention something about his play. R. Hopper said that he was going to be in play with the Madison Community Players and said there was a flyer on the bulletin board so if anyone wanted to come and see Blythe Spirit, it was sort of a comedy with an undertone of spirits and séances and what not. He said it was being performed over Valentines weekend: Friday, Saturday at 7 pm and on Sunday as a brunch and that it was a dinner theater at the Livery Stable. He invited everyone to think about coming and seeing the Community Players in action.

He asked if there was a motion to adjourn. V. Crisafulli said she so moved. B. Lyman seconded the motion. A voice vote indicated that all were in favor.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
January 25, 2016

Meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Jess Butler, Preservation Planner

Louann Waller, Secretary