

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 18, 2019

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, March 18, 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, Susan Schmidt, Betsy Lyman, and Josh Wilber. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Devon Sharpe, attorney; and Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.

V. Crisafulli mentioned the board has a sheet which goes over the demolition process with the ordinance and state statute. V. Crisafulli stated she would like the board to apply the three criteria for the finding of fact on the demolition applications.

V. Crisafulli gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. Once the application is announced the applicant or representative will come up to the microphone to answer any questions. Each applicant will be asked to sign the gold affidavit on the podium which states the required signage was up for the required amount of time. N. Schell will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. V. Crisafulli added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

2/25/2019 Minutes:

V. Crisafulli asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on February 25th and had any corrections or additions.

S. Schmidt moved to approve the minutes – seconded by J. Wilber.

Roll Call:

S. Ash	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Schmidt	Approved
B. Lyman	Abstained
O. McCall	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved

Minutes stand approved.

3/6/2019 Minutes:

V. Crisafulli asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the special meeting on March 6th and had any corrections or additions.

O. McCall moved to approve the minutes – seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

S. Ash	Abstained
J. Wilber	Abstained
S. Schmidt	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved

Minutes stand approved.

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>O. McCall – Point 1 on page 56 states that these exteriors should be replaced only if necessary. It all comes down to if it is necessary and when I looked at this project it looks like the siding had not been primed. It might not have been done right to begin with but if it is in fact rotted now, then it should be replaced. The applicant has attempted to maintain this siding and now it needs replaced. I think it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I feel like this is a case where the board has to make a judgement call and I think that the applicant has justified the fact that the siding needs to be replaced. This is also on three sides of the house and not on the front so therefore it meets the guidelines.</p>

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. J. Wilber made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for 324 East St. for the use of Hardie board on top of the shiplap on three sides of the house. The front siding shall remain the same. This meets the residential guidelines on page 56-58”.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Disapproved
- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved
- B. Lyman Disapproved
- O. McCall Approved
- V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

- 2. Dana Riddle (Scott Lynch) – C. of A. to replace front wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows with a 6 over 6 grid pattern.
Location: **315 Central Ave.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed provided by the applicant. Scott Lynch and Steve Buchanan were present.

S. Ash asked if S. Buchanan if he installed the windows on 311 Central. S. Buchanan answered yes. S. Ash asked about the brand. S. Lynch answered Quaker. J. Wilber asked if the windows were original. S. Buchanan answered no and that he believed the original windows would have been 6/6. B. Lyman asked about the plan for the windows once they are removed and if the applicant would consider donating them to the Restore. S. Lyman answered he would consider that.

S. Ash talked about the mutin profile of the windows and why he supported the replacement of these windows. O. McCall stated the frames are not 80% deteriorated but they are not original. O. McCall stated he didn't see how the board could approve this application because they are not 80% deteriorated. S. Lynch stated he didn't think they had old glass and weren't original.

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

S. Buchanan stated the frames might be the only things that are original. V. Crisafulli stated she thought the windows were pretty deteriorated. S. Lynch stated the wood was holding the windows in place.

B. Lyman asked about the window opening size. S. Buchanan stated that the new windows would fit the existing opening.

S. Ash asked if the replacement window would fit the opening. S. Buchanan answered yes. S. Ash asked if the windows would be a true divided light window. S. Buchanan answered yes.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>J. Wilber – I don’t believe the windows are original and therefore it does meet the guidelines because the applicant is going back to the original design. The 80% rule was brought up and that windows should be repaired rather than replaced but in this case the windows are not original and are being supported by 2x4s.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree with J. Wilber. The windows are not original to the building and the replacements will be a better upgrade.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>O. McCall – On page 60 of the residential guidelines it states that original windows should be preserved. It also states that historic windows should be retained. These are historic windows and therefore this project does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Schmidt - I think it will be an improvement and will look closer to the original. I think it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree with J. Wilber and S. Ash.</p>

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. S. Ash made the following motion:

“I move to approve this project at 315 Central Ave. The contractor has agreed to replace the windows to a Quaker window which is a true divided light window which will fill the existing opening”.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Approved
- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- O. McCall Disapproved
- V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

- 3. Michael L and Laurie E Dorsey – C. of A. to replace existing wood sliding garage door with steel overhead door to look like a carriage style door.
Location: **613 W Main St.** Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

V. Crisafulli stated this application has been deemed incomplete due to the signage not being posted for the required amount of days.

- 4. Robert and Anna Helton – C. of A. to install wood shutters.
Location: **703 W Main St.** Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the shutters provided by the applicant. Robert Helton was present and stated that the shutters were found in his basement with photos of the house showing the shutters on the house in the 1970s.

V. Crisafulli asked if these shutters were the ones on the house. R. Helton stated that was his and his contractor’s guess. B. Lyman asked about how the shutters would be attached. R. Helton stated the guidelines state they have to be attached to the window frame and that was the plan.

S. Ash asked if the applicant had the photo showing the shutters. R. Helton stated it was at his house. S. Ash asked if the applicant could put a hinge on the window frames. R. Helton stated he was told he could by his contractor. S. Ash the shutters would not lay flat on the house because of the stone feature which supports the band above the windows.

O. McCall asked if the applicant had 14 sets of shutters in his basement. R. Helton answered yes. O. McCall asked S. Ash about the stone feature and if it could have indicated the presence of commercial windows instead of the current residential windows. S. Ash stated he wasn’t sure but it was possible. O. McCall asked L. Ludington to speak on that topic. V. Crisafulli stated the survey stated the building was historically a tavern. Link Ludington stated the building probably had masonry piers with double doors at each of the openings. The building was built around 1850 but remodeled with the residential windows in 1870s/1880s. L. Ludington expressed support to reinstall the shutters because he believes they were the original shutters installed when the building was remodeled.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Shutters	55	---	S. Ash – Yes I think it meets all the guidelines on residential guidelines on page 55. There has been documented and physical evidence provided by the applicant. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. The applicant is also willing to attach the shutters to the window frames. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for Robert and Anna Helton for their building at 703 W Main St. to reinstall the original restored shutters to the Main Street façade”.

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Approved
- J. Wilber Approved

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

S. Ash stated he had an issue with the work already being done because when he looked at the windows it looked like they just needed new paint. S. Buchanan stated he wanted to replace the windows because there are four different types of windows. S. Buchanan stated the two rear windows were just storm windows and the side windows are cobbled together. The front windows are not original.

S. Ash stated his concern is that the windows which are being replaced are wood and the applicant is not proposing to go back with the original configuration which was a 6/6. S. Buchanan clarified that the windows he was asking for were 6/6 aluminum clad windows.

B. Lyman asked if these were the same windows which were just approved for 315 Central Ave. S. Buchanan answered yes.

B. Lyman asked about the transom above the side doorway. S. Buchanan stated the whole door frame and transom was rotted. B. Lyman asked if the applicant planned to put the transom back above the door. S. Buchanan answered no. V. Crisafulli stated she didn't think the door was appropriate. S. Buchanan stated the door he was replacing was a steel fiberglass door and this one is a solid door on the side of the building. He wanted to install a solid door to allow for some privacy between the homes.

S. Ash asked if the door frame and the transom frame were one solid piece or separate frames. S. Buchanan stated he didn't remember. J. Wilber asked about the door material. S. Buchanan stated it was a composite frame and a fiberglass door.

B. Lyman asked about the material underneath the aluminum siding. S. Buchanan stated it was wood framing. S. Ash asked the sided area was originally a porch. S. Buchanan answered yes.

O. McCall stated he thought the windows were in very good shape and hoped the applicant would retain them. S. Buchanan stated the windows did not operate and he wanted the windows to match.

V. Crisafulli expressed concern that the work has already been done. S. Buchanan stated he tried to keep the water out with plastic but it didn't work and that was why he went ahead and installed the windows.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant had informed N. Schell of the emergency. S. Buchanan answered no.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Marci Jones, who resides at 917 W Second St., spoke in favor of the project. M. Jones stated her house adjoins this house and she was grateful that the applicant is fixing up this home because the last four owners have done the minimum amount of maintenance on this structure. M. Jones stated her house as the 6/6 windows and thought this house would look better with the same windows.

J. Wilber asked if all the windows have been replaced. S. Buchanan stated it was just the three in the back which he installed.

Mike Pittman, who resides at 420 Elm St., spoke in favor of this project and supported S. Buchanan on installing the windows prior to approval due to the amount of rain the city has received recently.

V. Crisafulli noted that no one is questioning the work done on this house. S. Schmidt asked if this structure would be a single family dwelling. S. Buchanan answered yes. S. Schmidt stated she thought it would look much better. J. Wilber asked if the applicant wanted to replace all the windows with the 6/6 Quaker window. S. Buchanan answered yes.

S. Ash asked how many 6/6 windows were left in the house. S. Buchanan stated one which is located in the porch area.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	S. Schmidt – Yes I do. J. Wilber – I do believe it meets the guidelines. I was concerned about the wood but the applicant has some wood with it being composite. The board allows Hardie board and therefore we would allow this replacement door.

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	<p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. I would ask if this happens again to reach out to N. Schell.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I am troubled that we are losing the transom because it is an important element. It should be retained.</p> <p>S. Buchanan stated the door was never original because it was an open porch. The door and transom has been added.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree with S. Ash.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – While I appreciate that this door was not original to this house, I do not think the proposed is in character with the house.</p>
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>J. Wilber – The residential guidelines are on pages 56-58. It does meet it. Removing the aluminum siding is great and using Hardie board meets the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>S. Ash – I am a real big advocate of wood windows and preserving the original windows. I do think that some of these 2/2 windows are in pretty good shape. The fact that they are still replacement windows and the 6/6 will look a lot better. I would like to see the applicant would keep the original 6/6 window.</p> <p>S. Buchanan stated he didn't think it was original because it was in the porch area. S. Ash retracted his last statement.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>O. McCall – I don't agree with that. I would be okay with the 6/6 being removed since it was not original. I think the others, even though they are not original, are historic and therefore should be maintained. It says on page 60-63 that historic windows should be retained.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree that it would be appropriate to replace the windows with the 6/6 windows.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I agree with S. Ash.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree with S. Ash.</p>

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion on the siding and doors. J. Wilber made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for 919 W Second St. for the side door to be replaced with the composite door as proposed which is in accordance with residential guidelines on page 39-42 and the aluminum siding to be removed and replaced with Hardie board siding which is in accordance with residential guidelines on pages 56-58”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

Roll Call:

S. Ash Approved
J. Wilber Approved
S. Schmidt Approved
B. Lyman Disapproved

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

O. McCall Approved

V. Crisafulli Disapproved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed.

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion on the windows. S. Ash made the following motion:

“I move that the windows can be replaced at 919 W Second St. The contractor has agreed to use 6/6 true divided light aluminum clad windows. The windows will fit the exact openings”.

Motion was seconded by J. Wilber.

Roll Call:

S. Ash Disapproved

J. Wilber Approved

S. Schmidt Approved

B. Lyman Approved

O. McCall Approved

V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

- 7. Brad and Rhonda Parker – C. of A. to build a 16-ft x 33-ft addition instead of the 14-ft x 33-ft addition approved by the board in April 2018. Install textured Hardieboard siding and round gable vent on addition.

Location: **120 East St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed drawings of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Brad Parker was present and stated they were asking for the extra space because the lumber they ordered for the addition was two feet longer than their approval. This would help make up for the three feet they had to come on off the property lines to meet the setbacks.

B. Parker stated the existing addition they were removing has the textured Hardie board and would like to install the same on the new addition.

S. Ash asked about the location of the gable vent. B. Parker stated it would be in the gable above the two French doors.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 – 58	---	B. Lyman – I am under the impression that the applicant is asking for the textured Hardie board siding and the textured siding isn’t as historic looking here because poplar siding was used. The textured Hardie board siding is only a slight texture so I would approve that. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons. This was given a COA before and the only change is the additional two feet and the textured siding.
Rear & Lateral Additions	68	62	

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

S. Ash asked about the dimensions of the deck expansion. N. Schell stated the building is 75-ft long, the new deck will be 50-ft and the staircase is 8-ft. It will be 35-ft from the alley. S. Ash asked about the width. N. Schell stated it will be 16.5-ft.

J. Wilber asked if the material was wood. J. Heitz answered yes. V. Crisafulli expressed appreciation for the addition of outdoor dining space.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Fire Escapes & Staircases	43	43	<p>S. Schmidt – I think that it does meet the guidelines. The commercial guidelines are on page 43. It will be a wood structure on the rear of the building. It will be a wonderful addition.</p> <p>J. Wilber – This will also be ADA compliant with a ramp. I think it meets the guidelines on page 43.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved for the project at 122 E Main St. for the deck and fire escape which will be all wood and ADA compliant on the rear of the structure”.

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

S. Ash Approved
 J. Wilber Approved
 S. Schmidt Approved
 B. Lyman Approved
 O. McCall Approved
 V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

10. Ron and Suzie Hollinger – C. of A. to replace vinyl/plastic siding on west wall with metal siding on garage. Install dryer vent on north alley wall.

Location: **310 Broadway St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed provided by the applicant. Suzie Hollinger was present and added that the siding is actually a vinyl soffit material which was never designed to be used as siding. S. Hollinger stated water has going in behind and is deteriorating the back board and bricks.

S. Hollinger stated originally they wanted to use Hardie board siding. In talking to Ashley Thomas with National Park Services about this project, since they have an OCRA grant, the material must also be approved by the National Park Service. S. Hollinger stated they would approve the use of vinyl material to be replaced with the same material.

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

The hope is to take all the material off and repair the brick. If the brick wall cannot be repaired, then it needs to be recovered. S. Hollinger stated that National Park Service will not approve the Hardie board siding but would approve using the vertical metal siding since it is similar in design to the existing material. S. Hollinger noted that this wall has minimal visibility from Broadway Street.

S. Ash asked if the metal was approved by National Park Service. S. Hollinger answered yes and that she had a verbal approval for the metal siding.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	J. Wilber – This is a strange one because it doesn’t have normal siding. The metal siding is not considered too much. The removal of the synthetic siding is appropriate. I wish the brick can be exposed but I understand. It is hard to argue with the parks department since they are part of preservation. I think it does meet the guidelines. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. I think it is consistent with the material that is on the rest of the structure. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. I appreciate the additional information. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be granted for the project at 310 Broadway St. to replace the vinyl plastic siding on the west wall with metal siding and to install a dryer vent on the north alley wall. This meets the guidelines on page 56-58”.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Approved
- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

- 11. Bernard Johnson and Tony Hammock – C. of A. to demolish existing structure.
Location: **1029 W Main St.** Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure provided by the applicant. Tony and Lisa Hammock were present. L. Hammock stated the majority of the floor was caved in and the rest of it was soft.

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

B. Lyman asked how the demolition would work since the building is attached to the neighboring house. T. Hammock stated he would begin by removing the roof and then work from there.

S. Ash asked if the applicant owned the adjoining property. T. Hammock answered no.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Criteria	Discussion
Demolition	removal would be detrimental to the historic district	S. Ash – It will not be detrimental. It will be a wonderful change. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.
Demolition	state of deterioration and disrepair	B. Lyman – I think that has been very well demonstrated with the pictures and the fact that people had to sign a waiver just to go inside the structure. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.
Demolition	alternatives to demolition	O. McCall – I cannot imagine an alternative. S. Schmidt - I agree for the same reasons. I don't see any alternatives. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that a COA for demolition of the structure at 1029 W Main St. be approved”.

Motion was seconded by J. Wilber.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Approved
- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- V. Crisafulli Approved

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

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

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

- 12. Kirk Grooms – C. of A. to construct pole barn style garage with metal siding and metal roof.
Location: **618 W Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed images of the property and the proposed structure provided by the applicant. Kirk Grooms and Steve Buchanan were present.

B. Lyman stated she didn't see any drawings showing where the doors would be located. S. Buchanan stated the location of the doors is on the drawing included with the application. N. Schell stated the garage door is along the garage door and the man door is on the opposite wall. K. Grooms added this building would not have windows.

S. Ash asked about the roof pitch. S. Buchanan stated it would be a 4/12 pitch. S. Ash stated he had an issue with this structure because it didn't look like anything else in the alley. S. Ash added that this proposes structure would look out of place.

J. Wilber asked if there was a building there before because of the location of the walkway. K. Grooms answered no. S. Ash stated he would prefer the building have wood siding and shingled roof with a carriage style door.

V. Crisafulli stated that if the applicant changed the design it would match the character of a carriage house. K. Grooms asked if she was talking about the door design. V. Crisafulli stated the materials of the structure. S. Ash added the pitch of the roof because it was very shallow.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant would consider extending this application to present an updated design. K. Grooms answered no. S. Ash mentioned the applicant only displayed one sign on the front of the building. N. Schell stated she believes that the applicant was only provided one sign and that could not be held against him.

O. McCall stated this would be built across the alley from a nicely landscaped backyard and encouraged the applicant to speak with that owner. K. Grooms stated he has already spoken with them and they are actually considering installing a similar garage in their yard.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Infill Buildings	69 - 71	64 - 66	<p>B. Lyman – The guidelines state that new buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of height and I do believe it will not be taller than the surrounding buildings. It should be compatible in terms of materials. This does not meet the guidelines because there are no other pole barn type metal buildings. I think the setback is okay. The scale and proportion also has to do with the openings and that are some problems with this structure. The roof form has a pretty low pitch and is not compatible with neighboring structures.</p> <p>S. Buchanan stated they could change the roof pitch to a 6/12 if that makes a difference. S. Buchanan added that the pitch could even be an 8/12 and they would be willing to install a carriage style door. J. Wilber asked the applicant if he would be willing to make those changes. K. Grooms agreed.</p> <p>O. McCall – Walking up and down that alley, there is an assortment of old and new buildings with various materials. There is nothing like this but there is also nothing that matches each other. I think it is appropriate in its variety. Therefore I would say yes.</p>

Page 17

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Infill Buildings	69 - 71	64 - 66	<p>S. Schmidt – I think it would fit within the guidelines especially with the addition of the carriage door and the roof pitch was steeper.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I defiantly think the carriage door and roof line have to change to be more compatible with the adjacent buildings. There has to be some character to this structure. The materials disturb me a little bit because I wish the metal was a Hardie board or something similar.</p> <p>S. Ash – I do not think the materials are compatible with the adjacent buildings. I think the building should have a Hardie board plank and the roof should be shingles. I think the door should be a carriage style door rather than a modern style door. I think the pitch should also be changed.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree with S. Ash.</p>

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved for the structure at the rear of 618 W Second St. as proposed”.

J. Wilber asked if the motion was as proposed or with the corrections the applicant agreed to with the roof pitch and the carriage door. O. McCall made the following amendment:

“I move that a COA be approved for the structure at the rear of 618 W Second St. as proposed with the correction on the roof pitch with a 7/12 pitch and carriage style door as discussed”.

S. Ash asked about the siding material. O. McCall stated the applicant did not agree to change the materials. B. Lyman asked about the roof pitch. S. Buchanan sated they could use whatever the board agrees with he could build. S. Ash stated a drawing with the roof pitch to scale would be helpful for the board. O. McCall asked if the applicant was willing to extend his application.

S. Buchanan asked what building the board was discussing because the one S. Ash proposed is a stick built building which is more costly than what is proposed. J. Wilber asked if the applicant would consider the extension. S. Buchanan stated it wasn't up to him but the applicant would be looking at \$30,000-\$40,000 for a garage. K. Grooms stated he wouldn't be paying that much.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

Roll Call:

S. Ash Disapproved
J. Wilber Disapproved
S. Schmidt Approved
B. Lyman Disapproved
O. McCall Approved
V. Crisafulli Disapproved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness failed. A Certificate will not be issued for the project.

V. Crisafulli stated the COA was denied and the application was welcome to file an amended application.

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

Extended Applications:

1. Broadway Baptist Church – C. of A. to replace 12 wood windows with vinyl windows.
Location: **615 Broadway St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

V. Crisafulli stated that representative from the Broadway Baptist Church has asked for an extension on their application.

V. Crisafulli asked for a motion. B. Lyman made the motion.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

- S. Ash Approved
- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Schmidt Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- V. Crisafulli Approved

The motion to extend the application passed.

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Ralph London	129 E Main St	3/4/2019	3 Signs (Hanging, Flat on Building, Window)
John and Lori Heitz	122 E Main St	3/13/2019	Storefront
Jessica Zink	630 W Main St	3/13/2019	2 signs (relocating hanging sign, flat on building)

Historic District Board of Review: 2018 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Craig, David Joe	1055 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the awnings • Retention of wood doors on the property as discussed • Installation of appropriate light fixtures • Retention of the concrete porch with the additional room towards the back, the porch columns being wood posts from top to bottom and the removal of the half brick post • Shingles on the roof of the house and porch 	Yes

Page 19

Historic District Board of Review

March 18, 2019

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Craig, David Joe	1055 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wood shutters if decided on having and attached to the window • Hardie board siding • Installation of aluminum clad wood windows on the other sides • Wood deck • Removal of the chimney 	Yes
Bateman, Ron	204-206 Plum St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build carriage house garage (standing seam roof and LP Siding) • Replace 16 replacement windows with aluminum clad 6/6 window • Add stone lintels on each side window • Replace the existing roof on house with standing seam metal 	Yes
Burrow, Michael & Cherie	311 E Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replace concrete steps • install wood shutters on three (3) windows • replace existing windows to restore windows to the historic 6-light window configuration with aluminum clad windows 	In Progress
Schaerli, Sandra	719 W Third St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build a 16-ft x 16-ft pergola over back deck 	Yes

Business - Old: Revisions to the Design Guidelines

V. Crisafulli asked for public comments. No public comments were given. V. Crisafulli stated N. Schell polled the board to see when they could meet to give board input. V. Crisafulli announced the special meeting will be Monday, April 15th at 5:30p.m.

Business - New:

N. Schell noted that she will be presenting amendments to the Rules of Procedure at the next meeting. These will be strictly administrative to fix items such as application fees which were changed in an ordinance.

No further business to be brought before the board.

J. Wilber made the motion to adjourn - seconded by B. Lyman. Meeting adjourned at 7:57p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

 Valecia Crisafulli, Chair

 Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator