

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

January 24, 2019

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a special meeting on Monday, January 24, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Valecia Crisafulli presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Sonny Ash, Owen McCall, Josh Wilber, and Betsy Lyman. Also present: Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.

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 from the board.

The following board members made comments: V. Crisafulli and S. Ash. Those comments are included on the spreadsheet within the minutes.

V. Crisafulli opened the floor for comments from the public. The following audience members made comments: Happy Smith, Bob Courtney, Mike Pittman, Tami Hagemier, Jan Vetthus, Dave Auxier, Dave Collins, Jerry Wade, Ken McWilliams, Donna Weaver, and Link Ludington. Those comments are included on the spreadsheet within the minutes.

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
General			I would suggest eliminating the glossary sidebar in an effort to reduce the size of the document (and save a tree). I have heard some recent comments that the guidelines are too large, insinuating that it is also incomprehensible. Not true, but worth thinking about, it will be used against them.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
General			The sidebar glossary can be moved to the back of the document and when that happens, it will eliminate some of the redundancy...making the document smaller.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
General			A glossary in the back will also allow for the guide to be reformatted into a smaller size. Leaving white space on the page makes for an interesting layout for a smaller document but for a functional one I think space is to be used for words. Clear titles and easy to find info is a priority.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
General			I would also suggest that for online use (to be encouraged) that each word that needs an explanation be linked to its definition in the glossary.		Donna Weaver (Write In)

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
General			An up-to-date list of endangered structures needs to be compiled. Maybe also a list of those that are about to go on the list...a pre-emptive list. Burned out buildings that would be missed if they were gone need immediate attention. If they go they leave holes in the fabric of the town, never to be filled.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
20	105		NOT RECOMMENDED (hope this title can be changed to Not Appropriate) Remove text in red 1. Demolition is not recommended if the structure is stable and preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation is practicable. 2. Demolition is not recommended if the removal of such a building would be detrimental to the character of the historic district. 3. Demolition by neglect occurs when if a building is allowed to deteriorate through lack of maintenance and is a self-imposed hardship that will not be considered a mitigating circumstance when determining economic hardship.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
20	104		There seems to be a great deal of talk about 'mothballing' a building when demolition is not approved but the building has promise. This does get tricky and much more thought needs to go into it. Maybe a time limit determined by the quality or potential of the building in question needs to be considered. Maybe an aggressive campaign to find alternative uses needs to be set up and funded. It would seem that there is a school of thought that if a building can't find a reuse fast enough, to take it down. More thought and the public's right an intact city (the reason they live or moved here) to has to happen before demolition...which is permanent.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
			Where can we find guidelines for maintenance of properties before disrepair happens and the building is threatened by neglect? There must be something in the city ordinances that can help to keep this from happening. Maybe the laws just need to be enforced. People who can't afford to keep their building up need to be notified and if they need financial help, the city should make funds available. It is for the good of all.		Donna Weaver (Write In)

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	XXIII	Any state or federal income tax returns relating to the property	Are you asking for personal tax returns of just the forms where the building may be mentioned? Tax returns are not public; this may be a problem for many.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
	84	The new building should not look old: imitating historic styles is inappropriate.	I somewhat disagree with this idea. No new construction can look old; in no way can it not be what it is...a new building. It is not an attempt to fool the public. Sometimes an older style of home IS what fits the area or space. Why eliminate a perfectly decent style of home just because there are others like it in the neighborhood.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
	84	Simplicity and modesty in design are encouraged.	A good idea. Not everyone can afford a decent architect and so they find a plan 'off the shelf.' Usually those are homes recently designed and have characteristics that are appropriate for suburban living...and then they look extremely out of place and are visually disruptive.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
	88	New Accessory Structures	It seems that a lot of leeway is given to 'sheds' that are on alleys. Our alleys and small side streets should not be thought of as lesser. They are a major part of the character of the town...many large cities have totally eliminated them...a great loss. We should expect the same standards for them as the major streets. They do get a lot of use by cars and folks on foot. Madison is not a façade...it is a real town. Unfortunately in the past, some pole barns have been allowed in, and when that is the building next to what you want to build, it's hard to say 'please reconsider'. That is where education comes in. Agricultural buildings belong on the farm, not in an urban setting.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
	89	New garages, sheds and other accessory buildings should not imitate the surrounding historic buildings.	I'm going to disagree here also. If a new building is to be compatible, it does need to somewhat take its style from the other sheds in the area. There are many styles to use and... form follows function.		Donna Weaver (Write In)

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
	91	New construction should not imitate other historic buildings. Commercial infill	Here again, I think it is useful to take the lead from other historic styles used in the area. Why reinvent the wheel? I'm not saying copy...I'm saying interpret, there is no way a new building in an older style will look anything but new.		Donna Weaver (Write In)
General			There's a lack of consistency in using may and may not as well as suitable and not suitable throughout this document. There needs to be consistency in terminology used.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
General			<p>1. How much public input was used in developing and these guidelines?</p> <p>2. Who is the author?</p> <p>3. What were the sources?</p> <p>4. What is the timeline for developing in finalizing these guidelines?</p> <p>5. What is the ratio of rehabilitated versus original historic properties in the Madison historic district?</p> <p>6. How many abandoned Historic properties are there in Madison?</p> <p>7, Why are all property is considered the same with respect to the guidelines?</p> <p>8. HMI has numerous homes restored to museum quality such as Shrewsbury Windle. Since the new guidelines classify any home is 50 years old being historic, these homes would fall under the same guidelines where museum quality work costing over \$2 million was done'</p> <p>9. What provisions have been made to assist with the new proposed Demolition guidelines? The following personnel are mentioned as providing input: architects, contractors, realtors, building inspector' preservationist' planning and zoning.</p> <p>10. Why are the definitions scattered throughout the narrative of the new guidelines? In addition to the narrative, a centralized glossary would be a benefit.</p>		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	7		In the awnings section, page 7, terminology needs to be consistent when using may and may not.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	8		Page 8, discusses color of the awnings, nothing in the current guidelines discusses color.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	9		The current document (page 9) discusses awnings and being related to the style of the building. This doesn't seem appropriate since use of most awnings are related to where the building is positioned regarding to the sun. We have intense heat in the summer time and awnings serve a purpose in reducing the amount of sunlight on a building façade.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro			In the awnings section, metal awnings were not listed as an appropriate material for midcentury homes.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	10		Mentioned the benefits of local designations: What's specifically is meant by incompatible changes?		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	11	last sentence	Uses the word special How can all structures be special? Are they equally special? L3.Definitions/glossary mentions the five R',s. More definitions and examples would be of benefit. Do the guidelines apply equally to all levels mentioned in the R's?		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	12		Please provide the details on the study on page 12 which mentions economic benefits. Page 12 mentions examples of success of historic renovation and rehabilitation. Specific examples in Madison would help. Specific examples/programs of tax credit for rehabilitation would also be helpful. Discussion of adaptive rehabilitation for modern lifestyle would also be helpful. There was no mention or topics covering energy efficiency, green materials, or recycling of materials. A detailed listing of local resources to assist downtown residents would be helpful. A group of successful homeowners in downtown Madison could serve as a resource for residents wishing to update or rehabilitate in their homes. Who determines whether a repair is feasible? Building inspector, contractor, architect, cornerstone, or the homeowner?		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 6

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	16		Contributing versus non-contributing homes was not discussed in the last sentence. This study was done some time ago and no mention of it was made and the draft so far'		Mike Pittman (Write In)
intro	17		Page 17 talks about the certificate of appropriateness. The statements are very broad and need to be more specific (right of way?). It also gets into building permits which may or may not be needed and does not serve a Purpose and the section. On page. 17 the approval of a CoA, The draft states incorrectly the board can table an application without the applicant's agreement. When does the 12 months date start, when the COA is granted or when received? Can an applicant request an extension? If so, what is the procedure? Page 17 mentions the historic board has jurisdiction over sidewalks		Mike Pittman (Write In)
intro	18		Page 18 talked about the application. No mention is made of the timing or the website as a resource. The building inspector and preservationist can be of great benefit prior to beginning of the application process. A suggestion would be to have their contact information in recommendation they be contacted prior to the application Process starting. Is the city going to provide all citizens a hard copy of the new guidelines? What about prospective landowners in the historic district? The current guidelines discuss a sketch or drawing of the proposed work. The draft guidelines talk about a structure plan in more detail than is currently required. New city building ordinances require detailed plans for building permits. This would seem to be an unnecessary cost since significant modifications can and are made during the application and review process.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
intro	19		Why is the requirement for sign posting listed on page 19? Are the requirements for time of 15 days - business or calendar? Why are photographs necessary since we have GIS, Google earth and possibly other sources that can be used? On page 19 and her scope, it talks about requiring a mortar recipe. What are mortar recipes? And what's recommended? Scope of the work can change at the meeting.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	20		Why is a site plan necessary at the level of detail showing on page 20? It notes the sewer and water utilities, exact lot dimensions, to the inch. All this information must be provided prior to any building permit being issued. Sketchers or approximations should be sufficient.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	21		On page 21 the third sentence discusses the compatibility with historic buildings. What does it mean and why is it in there? What are the ADA requirements? Why is enforcement in the introduction on page 21? Shouldn't the intro be a welcome and offer encouragement to new and prospective residents willing to improve our historic district? What about an appeals board when applicants disagree with the board ruling which is being used in Louisville, Cincinnati, Carmel and several other cities that have historic districts. Today, if someone wants to take issue with the historic district rulings, they have to file suit which has caused change of venue out of Jefferson county. This is not only costly, but takes time.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	22		The economic hardship policy on page 22 seems to be extremely onerous and costly. Not appropriate for an introduction.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	25-26		Page 25 and 26 discuss alternative materials. The coA requires currently that these materials need to be submitted to the board. The board should have a wealth of information on alternative materials. It doesn't seem that the applicants should need to provide additional materials over what currently exists. The matrix on page 26 puts all buildings into one category and seems to be confusing. A list of alternative materials that have been approved by this historic board should be available based on previous minutes. The lists in the introduction omit many of the previously approved materials such as vinyl siding and windows. Corrugated metal roofing and siding has also been approved. If cost is an issue, the historic board should be prepared to offer financial assistance to the applicant. This should be arranged prior to appearing before the board.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	20		Why is a site plan necessary at the level of detail showing on page 20? It notes the sewer and water utilities, exact lot dimensions, to the inch. All this information must be provided prior to any building permit being issued. Sketchers or approximations should be sufficient.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	21		On page 21 the third sentence discusses the compatibility with historic buildings. What does it mean and why is it in there? What are the ADA requirements? Why is enforcement in the introduction on page 21? Shouldn't the intro be a welcome and offer encouragement to new and prospective residents willing to improve our historic district? What about an appeals board when applicants disagree with the board ruling which is being used in Louisville, Cincinnati, Carmel and several other cities that have historic districts. Today, if someone wants to take issue with the historic district rulings, they have to file suit which has caused change of venue out of Jefferson county. This is not only costly, but takes time.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	22		The economic hardship policy on page 22 seems to be extremely onerous and costly. Not appropriate for an introduction.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	25-26		Page 25 and 26 discuss alternative materials. The coA requires currently that these materials need to be submitted to the board. The board should have a wealth of information on alternative materials. It doesn't seem that the applicants should need to provide additional materials over what currently exists. The matrix on page 26 puts all buildings into one category and seems to be confusing. A list of alternative materials that have been approved by this historic board should be available based on previous minutes. The lists in the introduction omit many of the previously approved materials such as vinyl siding and windows. Corrugated metal roofing and siding has also been approved. If cost is an issue, the historic board should be prepared to offer financial assistance to the applicant. This should be arranged prior to appearing before the board.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
Intro	28		On page 28 there's a list of alternative materials. No mention was made of poplar siding which is a commonly used as exterior siding in Madison. What's the difference between matte or satin finish? Why require similar installation technique to wood siding? Vinyl and corrugated metal we're left of the previously approved materials under siding. Neither of the replacement materials for siding are green products. They cannot be recycled.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	29		On page 29, color is mentioned under two categories as well as again corrugated metal and vinyl are not listed.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	30		On page 30, fiberglass and doors are not mentioned as approved replacement materials. Vinyl is not listed under windows		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro	32		On page 32, several of the bullet points under construction to avoided has been approved by the Madison historic district board of review		Mike Pittman (Write In)
Intro			What is the meaning of the "Note" at the bottom of the introduction pages? It would seem to indicate any topic mentioned can be changed without the Madison City Council approval. Many of the topics discussed are covered by current ordinances.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
3			Chapter 3 - seem to focus more on education rather than guidelines. References could be included for readers to find additional information regarding the topics covered under building materials. References for local resources and craftsman would also be helpful in this section. Simplify the discussion on mortar recipes and Portland cement. When is each product used and define correct use of different mortar recipes. Better define the board's intent on replacement of deteriorated siding.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
4			Discusses paint colors which is not covered by our historic guidelines.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
5			Lighting is a matter of style and personal preference. Fixtures can be easily changed and some historic lights cannot be repaired. The section should be removed.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Porch section: many of the porches and Madison have been added on to an existing structure at a different time. Flexibility needs to be built into the guidelines so the homeowner can design a porch that will complement their home.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
			Separate the recommended and not recommended items.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Barn metal roofing is mentioned as being not recommended. This is a commonly found product used in Madison for roofing. That comment is not appropriate in this section.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			To require chimneys to be replaced that are no longer in use and have no structure to support them remaining in a historic home, is costly and may increase the likelihood of leaks in new roofing. This recommendation should be removed from the new guidelines.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Flexibility needs to be added to the garage guideline on streets where the majority of buildings have existing garages on the street.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Door example shown is a 50's style entry door. This would be considered historic today.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Cannot be classified as being equal when looking at historic rehabilitation. Historic districts around the United States successfully classified their historic properties to allow flexibility in applying guidelines. They successfully have made decisions on certificate of appropriateness for different classifications of historic homes which meet the needs of the historic homeowners and the districts they serve.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Gain input from store operators and owners on the commercial guidelines that have been developed in the draft guidelines.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			The street guideline mentioned in the commercial area should be changed to the city ordinance which governs fence heights.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Language in the new construction and additions section needs to address the detailed building permit process that was implemented in 2015. Our current guidelines state that a sketch is sufficient for the historic board application. However, the draft new guidelines show very detailed site plans, down to the inch, and detailed drawings.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			More flexibility is needed on the section with the rear and side additions. Several homes and Madison are landlocked and have to make creative use of small areas when building.		Mike Pittman (Write In)

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
			In the section that discusses infill construction, in areas where there are no historic structures adjacent to a vacant lot, the developer should be allowed to build structures that meet their needs.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			In the section on moving buildings, a comment needs to be made regarding the cost of moving the utilities, telephone, cable, and power lines, as an issue that needs to be addressed.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			Under the vinyl window section, the statement regarding visibility on the use should read, vinyl windows are not recommended for use on the façade visible from the street . Vinyl windows may be used on the sides and rear of the structure.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			A survey of the citizens of Madison on the historic district board of review and the new design guidelines would be beneficial prior to the presentation to City Council. There have been several surveys done of Madison residents on various topics. This would seem to be valuable information to incorporate into the revised guideline process.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
			A survey of the existing homes in Madison's Historic District would be of great value in determining the classifications of homes and delineating which homes are governed by the HDBR and the new guidelines. It would also help identify abandoned or unsafe housing.		Mike Pittman (Write In)
20	101	flow chart	Add step that requires documentation of the property with drawings or photos be supplied to the historical society prior to demolition		Jan Vetrhus
20			Simplify language - expanding the demolition section does not clarify the language.	Eliminate Section. There are already state statute and ordinance that governs demolition.	Bob Courtney

Page 12

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
20			Would like the board to be more proactive on blight elimination and provide incentives to eliminate the blighted structures that are severely deteriorated. Board should encourage investment. City should provide incentives.		Bob Courtney
20		mothballing	Not sure where the concept is going...might cause additional disinvestment.		Bob Courtney
20	100	1 sentence, second P	Vacant lots are not the only thing that causes loitering. Blighted structures might cause this more than vacant lots. Blighted structures encourage vagrants, drugs, varmints, and disinvestment.		Bob Courtney
20	104	Demolitions (loss of any...)	reference to mothballing as a recommendation, should be removed because it says that no demolition will be approved		Bob Courtney
20	105	3	plenty of examples of people who cannot afford to renovate the structures due to the standards...might cause an unintended hardship on those people		Bob Courtney
20			Haven't addressed the issue that the building inspector and preservation coordinator do not have the authority to issue demolition permits without HDBR approval, this should be added especially in the case of unsafe structures.		Tami Hagemier
20	105	not recommended	remove not recommended under first bullet		Donna Weaver
20	105	3	rewrite		Donna Weaver
20			lack of phrased from NPS (following standards should be applied...) two phrases...economic and technical difficulty	language should be added to guidelines	Mike Pittman
20			guidelines need to clearer		Mike Pittman
20	100	3rd paragraph	public safety issue: this phrase should be changed because it shouldn't only be for public safety issue		Mike Pittman
20	101		chart is confusing		Mike Pittman
20	102		add specifics under criteria 3		Mike Pittman

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
20			lack of support of building inspector; this should be added within guidelines (role of building inspector should be defined)		Mike Pittman
20			add economic or technically feasible within the guideline language	add language through	Mike Pittman
20			add before and after photos of renovations and demolitions and new builds	add more photos for visual learners	Mike Pittman
20			Need focus groups and have them give input. This piece is missing. Houston is a good example		Mike Pittman
20			public survey to see people feel about historic district/guidelines		Mike Pittman
20			new architectural survey (San Antonio, TX)		Mike Pittman
20			Asked M. Pittman to explain technical feasibility (whether the elements can be rehabilitated today as some materials/methods cannot be used/available)		Sonny Ash
20			Against demolition and finds it difficult to replace the building that is harmonious with the surrounding area. Expand on alternatives to demolition		Happy Smith
20			addressed how blight is handled at the state/federal level: these programs consider historic character and cannot be used to demolish historic structures		Link Ludington
20			Neighborhoods are not built by tearing them down. Alternatives to eliminating blight should be included within guidelines		Link Ludington
20			it is difficult to replace a historic building with something new that is as good or even better		Link Ludington
20			agrees building inspector has authority to issue demolition permit but he also has the authority to tell someone they have to fit the building or at least board it up		Link Ludington
20			every effort should be made before allowing a demolition		Link Ludington

Page 14

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
20			Agrees with that you can't save every structure and it should be hard to do so but it should be allowed		Bob Courtney
20			Historic in the ordinance was cited - 50 years old and contains significant architectural features.		Bob Courtney
20			blight is not right; blight can be different in everyone eyes but to say people have to wait 30 years to get rid of it is atrocious		Bob Courtney
20			Create a list of endangered structures each year for downtown (create strategy of those structures) Be proactive and strategic. Create list of endangered assets and ask for investor help		Bob Courtney
20			Walnut street is one of the most historic blocks within the community. Much of it has been considered a blighted area. Would like to see the ordinance follows state statue and demolition should be the last action. Would like to see the ordinance to allow the city under the building inspector have a group of trained people that can stabilize buildings that does not damage the historic character.		Jan Vetrhus
20			Stated that his comments did not mean he thought that the neighborhoods have to wait 30 years		Link Ludington
20			Discussed what is going on in the neighborhoods not about the three structure		Bob Courtney
20			mentioned Mayor Riley who has spoken about blighted areas and how his community demolished the blighted structures (Charleston, SC) and had a plan for rebuilding		Mike Pittman
20			discussed how a building can look okay on the outside but once you get inside you see the lack of floor joists and supporting walls - Termite damage		Mike Pittman
20			have preservation coordinator as point of contact for programs		Mike Pittman
20			asked about number of demolitions in last year	(NMS: 17 applications in 2018 - 14 approved)	Dave Auxier

Page 15

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
20			just completed a renovation which was not perfect but the cost outweighed the selling price; compromise by allowing an imperfect renovation		Dave Collins
Economic Hardship			Inappropriate to have the disclaimer because the introduction is not general in nature.	disclaimer must be removed	Bob Courtney
Economic Hardship			section is very comprehensive; asking for tax documents is a lot to ask from a resident	V. Crisafulli added that these documents are not required	Bob Courtney
Economic Hardship	23	bottom of page	proof of applying for tax credits or other grants, assist., etc. can cost a lot of money but is not applicable to the average home owner		Bob Courtney
Economic Hardship	24	bottom two sections	remove 2nd bullet point from each section; should only apply if architecturally significant		Bob Courtney
Economic Hardship			confusing in ordinance but original architects of the ordinance was thoughtful in the distinction of the primary/secondary area and the guidelines blur the lines; not everything is architecturally significant	clarify if a non-historic structure in secondary areas have to come before board for COA (recommendation is that only needs to come if they want to demolish)	Bob Courtney
Economic Hardship			need to look at materials (ex. Wood windows vs other types) NPS standards does not prohibit vinyl as a material	revise section to reflect NPS standards on economic and technical difficulty	Mike Pittman
windows			studies referenced was in 1970s - needs to be updated		Mike Pittman
introduction		Madison's long term revitalization goals	needs to be defined and cited		Donna Weaver
			minimum upkeep requirements should be added		Jerry Wade
			need to consider the cost of renovating the interior when considering applications and the requested materials/demolition		Jerry Wade

Page 16

Historic District Board of Review

January 24, 2019

Chapter	Page	Location on Page	Correction/Comments	Reason for change	Comment from
			Added that 301 West St should be added to the list of asset building		Valecia
			Several maps should be included within the guidelines and labeled		Ken McWilliams
			delete alternative materials policy because it is covered in other sections		Ken McWilliams
			economic hardship should be in the appendix		Ken McWilliams
			lighting section should be eliminated because lighting is not historic		Ken McWilliams

V. Crisafulli mentioned that an advisory team will be formed at the next regular historic board meeting and when the advisory team meets it will be in a public meeting. No further business to be brought before the board.

J. Wilber made the motion to adjourn the meeting. - seconded by B. Lyman.

Meeting adjourned at 6:42p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Valecia Crisafulli, Chair

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator