

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Rear & Lateral Additions	68	62	<p>B. Lyman – The best approach is to site additions where they will not be visible from the street which is being done. This addition will be behind the fence. And where they will have the least effect on the building's overall form and plan. The rear of buildings is the best locations for the addition of rooms, wings, porches, or decks. The application is doing this addition on the back of the building as it states in the guidelines. The guidelines state “additions to historic homes should be located at the rear of buildings, not on the front or sides of buildings where they are readily visible from the street. Additions should be secondary (smaller and simpler) than the original building in scale, design, and placement. Additions should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights”. Those are being done. The guidelines state “Additions should not imitate an earlier historic style or architectural period” which is not being done. The recommended approach is for additions to reflect characteristics of the current period in design but compatible with the original building. This is being done and is avoiding extensive damage or loss of historic materials. The applicant is also using a historic window.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. K. McWilliams – I agree for the same reasons. T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons. M. Pittman – I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 624 W Second Street if construction according to the plans submitted on July 27th as we’ve seen them is compatible with the character of the historic district for the reasons cited during the Findings of Fact and are generally in harmony with the character of the adjoining properties in the district. So therefore, I move at we approve the COA for the applicant to build a 10-ft x 6-ft addition at the rear of the structure.”

Motion was seconded T. Stark.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Approved
O. McCall Approved
T. Stark Approved
B. Lyman Approved
K. McWilliams Approved
M. Pittman Approved
S. Schmidt Approved

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

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

J. Wilber stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed.

- 3. Betty and Ira Todd – C. of A. to replace front (north) porch with a shed style roof. Install awning over east side door. Replace aluminum siding with vinyl siding.
 Location: **745 ½ W Third St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Betty Todd was present. N. Schell noted that a setback variance has been approved for this project. B. Todd stated she knew vinyl siding was not ideal but she currently has aluminum siding and Hardie Board siding is too expensive.

K. McWilliams asked if the applicant had discussed the PACE grant program to offset some of the replacement costs. B. Todd stated they had but decided not to move forward with it. K. McWilliams asked about the age of the front porch. B. Todd guessed 50 years but it is not original.

B. Lyman asked N. Schell to explain the staff report regarding the awning. N. Schell noted the current guidelines do not allow for fixed permanent awnings. They only allow for canvas type awnings. N. Schell noted she believes the proposed awning is appropriate for this structure. B. Lyman asked about the staff comments on the porch design. N. Schell noted that while the porch is not original in its current form, she believed it would have had a flat roof similar to the porch next door.

O. McCall asked about how high the roof would go if it was sloped. B. Todd stated they would raise it only one siding slat which is about 8 inches. B. Lyman asked about the porch column design. B. Todd stated the columns would be 6x6 or 8x8 square columns. The iron work is about 8x8.

M. Pittman noted he used to be neighbors with B. Todd and supported the application for vinyl siding. T. Stark asked if the original weatherboard was underneath the aluminum siding. B. Todd answered that she did not know. M. Pittman guessed the aluminum siding damaged the original poplar siding based on his experience.

B. Lyman asked about the materials of the awning. B. Todd stated it would be wood and shingles. B. Todd noted she would like to have the porch roof like the proposed awning but not as steep. O. McCall asked about the depth of the porch. B. Todd stated it was about six feet and 16 feet wide. O. McCall noted a 1/10 roof pitch is not ideal for shingles. O. McCall noted that if the applicant added the roof at a pitch acceptable for shingles, that would dramatically change the look of the house. B. Todd stated she did not want that.

J. Wilber asked for public comments.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Awnings	35	34, 35	S. Schmidt – “Awnings may be added on buildings at traditional locations such as over windows and doors and attached to porches”. This is the case here. “Awnings should not damage the building or its architectural features”. This is the case here. “Awnings may be fixed or operating”. This awning will be fixed. “Awnings should be constructed of canvas duck or cotton and polyester blends and may be treated with acrylic. Vinyl is not an appropriate material for awnings”. While this does not, our staff has stated it is appropriate for this structure. The awing is inline with the guidelines.
Porches	49, 50	--	
Porch Columns & Railings	51, 52	---	
Siding	56 - 58	---	

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Awnings	35	34, 35	<p>S. Schmidt – As we talked about, this is not a new porch. She is just changing the roofline and the columns. “In most cases, historic porches visible from the street should be retained and maintained”. This porch is being retained but altered a little. “Porch details should be retained intact with repair work and replacement of missing parts, such as columns, posts, railings, balusters, decorative molding and trimwork, to match the original in design, materials, scale, and placement”. The iron columns are being replaced with wood. “Original wood weatherboard, clapboard, shingles, and board and batten should be maintained”. The house currently has aluminum siding and the applicant wants to use vinyl. “In cases where the historic siding has been removed, the HDBR may allow for the application of synthetic siding materials as long as the materials match the appearance of the original sheathing materials. While the application of synthetic siding materials is discouraged, it is not prohibited. To be approved, the application of synthetic sidings must not result in the concealment of, or removal of, original decorative detailing and trim. If synthetic sidings are applied, consider only siding the rear elevation or side facades. Preserving the original wood siding on the primary façade is encouraged. In cases where homeowners seek approval to remove and replace synthetic siding, a two-step process is recommended, postponing an application of new synthetic siding until the materials and quality of the lower layer is ascertained”. The property already has synthetic siding so there will be no concealment of original detailing or trim. The applicant does not want to go through the two-step process.</p> <p>O. McCall – There are some violations of the guidelines which the board might want to ignore. The main one is that the applicant has not gone through the two-step process to see if the original siding is under there. The guidelines state vinyl is not permitted. As far as the columns go, to perfectly follow the guidelines, this house would have originally had turned columns. The guidelines would allow for that however the wood columns are an upgrade over the current iron columns.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I agree with S. Schmidt for the same reasons.</p> <p>T. Stark – I agree with O. McCall for the same reasons. The 1/10 pitch roof increase is appropriate for this structure.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I agree with S. Schmidt for the same reasons. The guidelines do not prohibit vinyl siding and the two-step process is only recommended not required.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree with T. Stark on the roof pitch. I think the guidelines are lacking on the awning and I think the applicant is asking for something more permanent and is appropriate.</p>
Porches	49, 50	--	
Porch Columns & Railings	51, 52	---	
Siding	56 - 58	---	

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Infill Buildings	69 - 71	64 - 66	<p>O. McCall – This is on page 69-71 of the residential guidelines. “Where historic buildings have been lost or where there are vacant lots, new construction is encouraged to add to the streetscape and promote economic development. Infill construction in Madison’s residential areas should be compatible with adjacent buildings in scale, height, materials, orientation, shape, placement, and rhythm and proportion of openings. Contemporary designs are encouraged but replicas of historic designs may also be acceptable. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of height. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of materials. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of set back. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of scale and proportions. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of roof form”. This project will meet those elements. “New construction should be oriented toward the major street. New garages should be built at the rear of a dwelling or set well back on side elevations”. This is a garage and should not be oriented towards the street but rather the alley which it is. This project is consistent with the guidelines.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I agree for the same reasons. T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons. M. Pittman – I agree for the same reasons. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt – I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the application for a COA for John and Mary Ellen Bargerhuff for the project at the rear of 619 W Main Street as submitted.”

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- T. Stark Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved

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

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

J. Wilber stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed. J. Bargerhuff asked about using vertical Hardie Board siding. Board members noted the plan was approved as submitted. N. Schell noted the orientation of the siding was not included within the plans and therefore he can use whichever he likes.

Old Business:

K. McWilliams stated he would like the board to include all changes to non-contributing homes for staff review. B. Lyman asked if this would be for all elements. K. McWilliams answered yes. M. Pittman asked about demolition. N. Schell stated staff cannot review demolitions, additions, moving buildings, or new construction. O. McCall and S. Schmidt expressed agreement. B. Lyman asked for staff comments. N. Schell stated she didn't see any issues with the proposal. She noted for the board the city was in the process of hiring another preservationist. N. Schell stated the board would vote on this at the next meeting to allow for proper public notice.

N. Schell passed out the board's Code of Ethics and asked the board members to review it prior to the next meeting. She has received some concerns about board member conduct during the last couple of meetings.

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Tim and Sandra Lauk	902 W Second St	7/1/20	garage door
Judy Koehler (CottageGreen)	200 Cottage Lane	7/9/20	3-6' Wood fence
Girls INC of Jefferson County	113 W Third St	7/22/20	Sign
Tommy and Cheryl Campbell	812 W First St	7/23/20	Roof
Pizza Uncommon	301 West St	7/27/2020	Sign

Historic District Board of Review: 2019 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
LaBolt, Jered and Kristin	833 W Third St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> add porch roof over entry on North side 	Yes
Centofante, Terese and Daniel/Stephanie Hellmann	182 E Fountain Alley & 131 E Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> remove two windows on northwest side and install two aluminum clad wood windows with bricks to fill in remaining openings. Remove chimney. 	Yes
Eckelbarger, Ethan	1005 Park Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> build wood pergola, deck, and fence. Replace fire damaged aluminum siding with vinyl siding. 	Yes
Devore, Dean & Wendy Baird	818 E First St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> place a 8-ft x 12-ft shed in backyard. 	Yes

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

July 27, 2020

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
McGarry, Chris & Ruthie	712 W Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> replace windows on sides and rear of home with aluminum clad. Add two windows on west side and one window on east side. Change existing single window on east side into a double window. All windows will be 4/4 double hung windows. 	In Progress
Williams, Le Ann	227 W First St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> replace aluminum siding with LP Smart siding 	No, textured siding

No further business to be brought before the board.

M. Pittman made the motion to adjourn - seconded by S. Schmidt.

Meeting adjourned at 6:53p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Josh Wilber, Chair

Nicole M Schell
City Planner – Preservation Coordinator