

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

January 28, 2008

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, January 28, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. in City Hall. Tony Hertz, board member, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Richard Murray, Dirk Cheatham, Linda Wenning, Virginia Jorgensen, Robert Saueressig, and Paul Davis. Also present were: Mike Hoffman, Building Inspector; Jennifer Joas, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting. P. Davis made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by D. Cheatham – roll call from December 2007 members – all ayes. *Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.*

New Application:

1. **Tina Stambaugh – C. of A. for removal of existing deteriorated storage room located on east side of building; construction of two (2) walls to correct drainage problem; reconstruction of a two-story addition in place of the existing storage room. New addition will match existing roofline, windows, and one of the present exterior materials (weatherboard); Presently building has three types of exterior material: stucco, wooden clapboard, and weatherboard plus stucco – plan to unify siding material with weatherboard; new asphalt shingle roof; new windows; and rebuild of porch.**

Location: 118 Ferry Street

Zoned: General Business (GB)

Mrs. Stambaugh presented her application and presented to the board additional pictures, site plan, and new window pamphlet.

Mrs. Stambaugh said she thinks the photographs are the most helpful in explaining her project. She explained it is a three-unit apartment building located across the street from the Key West Shrimp House – faces the alley that is perpendicular to the Shrimp House. She said in looking at the front view of her building the portion of the building that needs repair is on the right which is the east side of the building. And, she said her main goal is basically to preserve the building. She further explained that the northeast corner of the building is deteriorated because of lack of maintenance by previous owners and there is a lot of debris, dirt, rock, and scrap metal – has been used as a little dumping ground that has accumulated up against the back corner. This area has held a lot of water and caused that corner, those walls, and the floor joists to rot. She added that also the roof has not been maintained, so there are a lot of holes in the roof as well as holes in the roof over the main structure – that needs to be replaced.

Mrs. Stambaugh presented interior photos that show the damage to the ceiling because of the water coming in.

Mrs. Stambaugh said her basic goal is to preserve the building just to prevent it from continuing to deteriorate.

The applicant said she has lots of ideas of what she would like to do – would like to salvage as much of the existing structure as she can – certainly does not want to rip it all off and then build something new if she doesn't have to. But, she said the reason she mentioned the potential demolition in her application was in case she got into the project and starting pulling off some of the interior wood paneling, which is loose – can see a lot of damage – if there is more damage than can be repaired – wants to have permission to construct new to be able to make it a usable building.

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
January 28, 2008

Mrs. Stambaugh said if the board would permit, she would like to reconstruct the building so that the roofline is consistent all the way across the whole building. On one photo Mrs. Stambaugh penciled in what the roofline could look like so that the whole front of the building maintains a consistent architectural style rather than having a hodgepodge on the end.

In viewing a photo of the rear of the building, Mrs. Stambaugh said it shows how the existing structure is a patchwork of sheet metal, plywood, and roofing material that has just been stuck on there in trying to keep out animals – would like to take all that off and make it consistent with the rest of the building.

Mrs. Stambaugh said just for a little background, she is open to any kind of suggestions or guidelines the board would like to give her. She noted she certainly does not want to do anything that is not in compliance with the Historic District. Mrs. Stambaugh noted she herself has sat on a historic preservation board in New Castle, KY and has been a member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, has attended many of those regional meetings – is sensitive to that and definitely would not do anything that is not in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood. She also said she is a historic homeowner – owns a house that is almost 200 years old and deals with all the issues of trying to maintain an old home in a historic manner.

Mrs. Stambaugh said she is totally flexible on how she is required to use the building in order to be able to preserve it. So, she said if she needs to change or restrict the use of the building in some way in order to be in compliance of the Zoning Ordinance she is happy to do that – does not have a problem with that at all. Further, Mrs. Stambaugh explained the building is presently used as a small apartment – two efficiency units (studio apt. and a one bedroom).

Mrs. Stambaugh said the portion of the building she would like to preserve and repair could be used either as a studio apartment or it could be used as an office space – wants something that is low traffic/low profile – open to suggestions from the board – no strong feelings.

T. Hertz asked Mrs. Stambaugh if the east property line is the fence. She answered that the east property line is more or less where the pipe fence is in the photographs, yes. She said the property line, when she purchased it was actually totally flush to the building.

Mrs. Stambaugh told the board if they would look at the footprint, on the northeast corner there is a little piece that juts out about three-feet wide and maybe about five-ft. long that is actually ... looks kind of like a lean-to. She noted it is not presently in use and doesn't think it has been in use for about 15 – 20 years. She said there is an old toilet and an old sink in there but it has been walled off so you can't even access it from inside the east side. Mrs. Stambaugh said there have been lots of animals in there. T. Hertz asked the applicant if that would be removed. She responded by saying she would like to take that all the way off – doesn't see that it is serving any purpose. Again referring to the footprint site plan, it is the little section that has diagonal lines through it – would like to take it all the way off – only change of the footprint of the building would be actually a reduction in taking off that little piece off. T. Hertz then asked if she wished to take off the roof of the little section next to it and add another floor. Mrs. Stambaugh answered she would like to replace the roof on the entire building. In trying to clarify, T. Hertz asked if she wants to take that one off and build the building up to the other roof. Mrs. Stambaugh said on the east end of the building she would like to raise to match into the existing roofline of the remainder of the building, if that is permissible. Mrs.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
January 28, 2008

Stambaugh said the roofline would be continuous all the way across rather than dropping down. R. Saueressig asked Mrs. Stambaugh if the building currently has a metal roof. She answered that it does have a metal roof. Her contractor interjected by saying Mrs. Stambaugh has had the roof coated with a tar/aluminum mix paint – put on a heavy coat – didn't seal – all of it is a tin roof even on the east end of the building. Mrs. Stambaugh again noted the roof has lots of holes in it and all around the edges is eaten up – not protecting the building. R. Murray asked Mrs. Stambaugh if any of the leaks are contributing to the inside water problems. Yes, per Mrs. Stambaugh – around the edges of the metal that has deteriorated and rusted away it has kind of pulled back and doesn't fully cover the walls and then there are some individual holes throughout the roof as well. Also, she said there are a couple of really bad ones – pours downs inside along the front window.

R. Saueressig asked if the building has a basement. Mrs. Stambaugh answered there is not a basement – there is a crawlspace.

Mrs. Stambaugh said drainage is a problem on the northeast corner – debris has built up and thinks if she can take off the lean-to part and access it more, she should be able to clean that out and dig out the rock and all the trash that has been thrown in there. She said she isn't exactly sure but is thinking that maybe a retaining wall along the lower portion of the exterior wall might be a way to approach that to divert the water away from the foundation. In addition, she noted the water is running up against the wall and into the floor joists.

D. Cheatham asked if the people living in the apartment dwelling behind this address are here tonight. Mrs. Stambaugh advised the residents of that apartment were not notified but the owner of the apartment was notified – that is Bob Suggett. Mrs. Stambaugh said she has also talked with Mr. Suggett and he had no objection to her project.

T. Waltz said on the lower floor – the first floor – is she extending it out toward the river? No, per Mrs. Stambaugh, on the footprint there is a dotted line and if it is permitted she would like to put on a tiny screen porch right there.

Mrs. Stambaugh said the building is not exactly flush on the front – looking at the footprint it juts out about three-ft. on the east end. And, Mrs. Stambaugh said if it is acceptable to the board she wouldn't mind maybe putting another five-ft. out there just to have a tiny screened area. If not, that is fine too per Mrs. Stambaugh. R. Saueressig asked if the porch area would extend out as far as the staircase. Mrs. Stambaugh answered that it wouldn't be nearly that far – probably be three-ft. less.

R. Murray asked Mrs. Stambaugh if she is required to put some kind of a commercial business in there, office or whatever, in order to comply with the zoning requirements, would that change her plans for any of the renovation. No, per Mrs. Stambaugh – doesn't think so. Then R. Murray asked Mrs. Stambaugh if she would have basically two apartments and the space on the east end. Mrs. Stambaugh answered yes as the way the building is currently set up there are actually two studio apartments on the first floor (or efficiencies) that can be either individual or as one – currently being rented as one. She noted the upstairs is set up as a one bedroom apartment.

In response to R. Saueressig questions, Mrs. Stambaugh said she wasn't planning on removing any of the existing exterior material on the three sides of the west end of the building, but the portion of the building she wants to repair – thinks that will be removed. R. Saueressig asked if the stucco on the north side will remain. Mrs. Stambaugh said it

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
January 28, 2008

will unless she needs to take it off. R. Saueressig asked if the stucco will continue onto the extension. Mrs. Stambaugh answered that what she was going to use was the same material that is on the first floor of the front of the building – has been told that is weatherboard – looks like sort of a rustic siding with vertical lines in it – like planking – possibly HardiBoard.

R. Murray asked Mrs. Stambaugh how many windows she will be replacing. She answered if she renovates the east end – there is only one window in that section now and that window would become a sliding door. But in looking at the side view most of the windows would go on the actual east end of the building where there presently are no windows, but would put in windows that match the existing windows. She noted all the existing windows currently in the building are on the front of the building (south side). R. Murray noted the window information Mrs. Stambaugh provided is for Pella windows and asked if they are wood windows. Mrs. Stambaugh answered the brochure she has tonight is for vinyl windows.

An audience member inquired about the roofing material wanting to know why the applicant wishes to go from metal to asphalt shingles, other than cost – standing seam roof for a long time – why change it to shingles? Mrs. Stambaugh said her decision was strictly cost.

No further questions or comments from the audience or board members.

Roll call – all ayes. ***Application approved as applied.***

Business – Old or New:

No old business.

New Business:

M. Hoffman advised the board members of two deteriorated structures (one on Baltimore St. and the other on Vine St.), asked the members to check them out and report back at the next HDBR meeting.

2008 Officers:

P. Davis made the chairman nomination of T. Hertz – seconded by D. Cheatham – roll call – all ayes. ***Congratulations to T. Hertz as the 2008 HDBR chairman.***

R. Murray made the vice-chairman nomination of Virginia Jorgensen – seconded by P. Davis – roll call – all ayes. ***Congratulations to Virginia Jorgensen as the 2008 HDBR vice-chairman.***

D. Cheatham made the motion to retain Joas & Stotts as the board attorneys and L. Waller as the board secretary – seconded by R. Murray – roll call – all ayes. ***Joas & Stotts retained as board attorneys and L. Waller as secretary.***

R. Murray made an announcement that since last September he has been on a task force for the purpose of selecting a contractor to put together design guidelines for this board and for public use. He advised the contractor was selected at the last meeting and the task force is currently in the process of trying to line up the additional funds to fully finance the contract. R. Murray said they are hoping the contractor will begin work about

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
January 28, 2008

March 1, 2008 and the whole project will be completed and ready to go to the Council for their approval by September. R. Murray feels it very important for there to be guidelines not only for the HDBR but for the public. R. Murray handed out to the board members a pamphlet explaining what guidelines are and why they are important. In addition, R. Murray advised he will keep the HDBR advised of the progress of the task force.

R. Murray noted there will be public meetings. Also R. Murray noted the HDBR will have a say into the guidelines – if the guidelines don't have the backing of this board, the guidelines won't go anywhere because it really should be this board that makes the motion to City Council for the guidelines to be adopted.

R. Murray advised the contractor hired for the project is from Nashville, TN – has put together design guidelines for forty other communities across the country.

No further business to come before the board.

D. Cheatham made the motion to adjourn – seconded by R. Murray.

BY ORDER OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW



Louann Waller, Secretary