

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW**

Minutes

April 22, 2019

**The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, April 22, 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, John Collins, 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 announced that O. McCall, N. Schell, and V. Crisafulli attended the state preservation conference in Evansville and will be giving a report at the next meeting.

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.

**Minutes:**

V. Crisafulli asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup> and had any corrections or additions.

S. Schmidt moved to approve the minutes – seconded by B. Lyman.

**Roll Call:**

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

**Minutes stand approved.**

**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)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Robert Bass was present and represented the Broadway Baptist Church. N. Schell noted that the applicant has amended their application to install 2/2 vinyl windows to match the original design.

R. Bass stated the windows would be flush with the sills.

J. Collins asked about the mutin style. R. Bass stated they would be external. S. Ash asked if the 2/2 would be vertical. R. Bass answered yes. V. Crisafulli asked if the church had considered using wood windows or repairing the existing windows. R. Bass stated the church spoke to Mr. Marsh regarding the windows and his recommendation was to replace the windows. The conversation was primarily regarding using windows which were 2/2 rather than repairing the existing windows. R. Bass stated due to extreme cost of that custom wood window, the church has decided to go with a 2/2 vinyl window with thermal panes for energy efficiency.

S. Ash asked if the church had applied for a PACE grant. R. Bass stated the church has decided to finance this project itself and would not be applying for grants. O. McCall stated he thought the church could just repair the sills which are rotten. R. Bass stated it was considered and the church has an estimate to fix the windows. J. Collins asked about the age of the current windows. R. Bass stated they had been there since he has been a part of the church. They are not original.

## Page 2

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

D. Sharpe asked if any of the board members had direct communication with the applicant. S. Ash stated he had. D. Sharpe asked if that communication would affect his ability to be impartial on this application. S. Ash answered no. D. Sharpe stated from now on if board members would like to communicate with an applicant to do so through N. Schell and not talk directly with the applicant.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>J. Wilber – Replacement windows should match the original windows. The proposed vinyl would not do that. The idea of this part of the guidelines is to have the applicant repair the windows rather than replacing them. The church has a quote for repairing the windows which tells me they can be repaired. I don't think the proposal meets the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I would also state under windows in the commercial guidelines page 56-59, number 5 “replacement windows should of wood to match the original”. I am looking for a wood material.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>J. Collins – 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>

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

“I move to deny the COA for this project at 615 Broadway St. as stated in the Findings of Fact. Vinyl windows are not on the approved materials list”.

Motion was seconded by J. Collins.

**Roll Call:**

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

**The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed.**

O. McCall stated that the Cornerstone Society has put together a list of companies which rehabilitate wood windows. This list is available for anyone in the audience.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 22, 2019**

**New Applications:**

- 2. 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)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Bill Ohlendorf was present and represented the applicant. B. Ohlendorf stated the existing door is very hard to open.

B. Ohlendorf stated that M. Dorsey had chosen a door which had previously been approved and added that the company he is working with could not fix the existing door due to its condition. S. Ash asked how the door opened. B. Ohlendorf stated there was a 2x4 wrapped in metal and the door slides behind the metal. B. Ohlendorf stated he didn't see any wheels.

J. Wilber asked if the new door would be an overhead door. B. Ohlendorf stated he thought so and offered to call the applicant. N. Schell stated it would be an overhead door.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	<p>S. Ash – I do not. It says in the guidelines that a door must be 80% deteriorated. Historic doors should be preserved or replaced in kind. I think it fails to meet the guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I think this is a tough one because there aren't any guidelines on garage doors. We are looking at residential doors and entrances. The board had previously passed steel doors on garages so I think based on the absence of clear guidelines for garage doors that we don't have a basis to make a finding.</p> <p>O. McCall – I hadn't thought about that. If it is not in the guidelines then I would agree with B. Lyman. I think the proposed door is okay however I love the existing door.</p> <p>J. Collins – I agree with the comments that have been made. I would prefer to see the door repaired but given the lack of specific guidelines on garage doors, I believe it should be allowed.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I think it is important to be able to get in and out of your garage. While it would be nice to keep the historic door, the practicality of the door is important.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I agree with B. Lyman.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I also agree with the side of practicality. The door is not visible from the street and while it is visible from the alley, I think S. Schmidt is correct in that the practicality of opening the door is important.</p>

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

"I move to approve the COA for 613 W Main St. as discussed in the Findings of Fact for the residential guidelines on doors and entrances on pages 39-42".

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

S. Ash Disapproved

Page 4

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

J. Wilber	Approved
S. Schmidt	Approved
B. Lyman	Abstained
J. Collins	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.

3. Veronika Feltner – C. of A. to replace shingle roof with metal roof.  
Location: **322 W Third St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Veronika Feltner was present. V. Feltner stated that several homes near hers had similar metal roofs including the property right next door.

S. Ash questioned whether a metal roof would work in this home due to the low roof pitch.

B. Lyman asked about the board reviews non-contributing buildings in regards to section 151.33 of the ordinance under non-rated buildings in primary areas. "The construction of a new building or structure, and the moving, reconstruction, or alteration, conspicuously affecting the external appearance of any existing nonrated building, structure, or appurtenance thereof within the primary area shall be generally of such form, proportion, mass, configuration, building material, texture, and location on a lot as will be compatible with other buildings and spaces in the historic area, particularly with buildings designated as historic." N. Schell cited the definition of non-rated buildings within the ordinance. "Those buildings and structures not classified on the historic building map as historic." B. Lyman asked if this building should be considered under section 151.33 of the ordinance. D. Sharpe answered yes.

J. Collins stated he did not think this change would be a conspicuous change due to the low pitch and the limited visibility from the street. J. Collins stated he shared S. Ash's concerns about this type of metal roofing material on this home due to the low roof pitch.

V. Feltner stated the shingles were currently leaking due to the hail storm. V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant had considered standing seam. V. Feltner answered yes but the bids were triple the price of the proposed materials.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Lloyd Feltner stated he thought the contractor was going to check the wood structure underneath the shingles prior to adding the furring strips and the metal roofing material. L. Feltner added that a neighboring house, which also has the same material, has a low pitch roof.

L. Ludington, president of the Cornerstone Society, spoke about the statement regarding non-rated buildings. The issue of non-rated buildings has nothing to do with the National Historic Landmark survey which is cited at the beginning of each application. It has to do with the 1982 survey which was done to create the historic district ordinance. L. Ludington stated the city should resurvey the district.

V. Crisafulli stated she had heard that same thing from the state conference. O. McCall added that districts should be resurveyed every 10 years.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53, 54	47	<p>B. Lyman – This is a tough one because it is, as staff has pointed out, a non-contributing building. When I look at the ordinance and it states we need to look at the area, it is a really historic streetscape. I feel that a barn metal roof on a building which is a residence does not fit with the streetscape.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree with B. Lyman on that one point. On the other hand, I have looked at this house and as J. Collins pointed out, due to the low pitch and how far back the house sits, it is hardly visible. I am not concerned with it.</p> <p>J. Collins – I share O. McCall’s viewpoint. Even though I am not in favor of barn metal roofs in general, the fact that this is a non-contributing house and it is not, in my mind, a conspicuous change I do not think the ordinance applies.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I also feel like the roof is not a conspicuous change. Since the cost of the standing seam is triple, I feel like it is appropriate.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I would agree with the comments O. McCall made. The existing roof is not a historic material and the guidelines state if it is no longer practical, it can be replaced with an appropriate substitute material. Being that it is non-contributing, there are other houses in this area with exposed fastener metal roofs. I think it is appropriate.</p> <p>S. Ash – I think that even though this building is non-contributing structure, I think the roof is contributing to the overall look. The metal roof and the exposed fastener metal roof are not appropriate.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I feel like this is not a conspicuous change due to the lack of visibility. For that reason I feel like this proposal can be supported. I wish the applicant would take another look and get another quote on the standing seam metal.</p>

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

“I move to approve the COA for 322 W. Third St. as discussed in the Findings of Fact, in accordance with the residential guidelines on roofs on page 53-54”.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

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









## Page 10

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

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

8. Brian Marshall – C. of A. to replace windows on East side. Replace wood siding with cement board siding.

Location: **715 E Main St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Gary McGinnis was present and represented the applicant.

G. McGinnis noted that the south window on the east facing façade was no longer on the structure and the photo in the presentation was an older photo. G. McGinnis added that some of the siding could be salvaged and would be used to repair the rear siding. The proposed siding for the east façade is the smooth LP Smart siding. G. McGinnis stated the first two windows on the east façade would be the ones replaced with the aluminum clad windows.

N. Schell stated the brochure provided by the applicant was the Quaker aluminum clad windows. B. Lyman asked if the windows would have external or internal mutins. N. Schell stated she thought they would be external but was not sure. G. McGinnis stated he thought they would be internal. S. Ash stated he wished the applicant would take the siding off the back of the house and repair the east side. G. McGinnis stated there were only a few good pieces on the east side. S. Ash asked about the front of the house. G. McGinnis stated it was being repaired including the gingerbread on the porch.

S. Ash stated the windows looked to fine. G. McGinnis stated the windows were falling apart and are missing the nails. There are thumb tacks holding in the glass. O. McCall stated he agreed with S. Ash and thought the windows could be repaired with new glazing. G. McGinnis stated the south window on the east wall is no longer in the house. O. McCall asked when the window was removed. G. McGinnis stated he wasn't sure when it was removed and added that this house has been empty for several years.

O. McCall stated the condition of the house gets worse as you move to the rear of the structure. O. McCall stated he thought the siding was in good shape and looked like it needed to be repainted. O. McCall noted that the lower boards had been replaced previously and were rotten. G. McGinnis stated there was water damage below the windows and the studs had to be replaced. G. McGinnis added that you could push your finger through the siding.

S. Ash asked if it was possible to install a restored or salvaged window in the front. G. McGinnis stated it could be made but the applicant does not want to pay for that window. S. Ash stated he did not think the proposed window with the interior mutins was appropriate. G. McGinnis stated he wasn't sure the applicant was using the window with interior mutins because he did not see the brochure he gave to N. Schell.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Siding	56 – 58	---	<p>J. Wilber – Under the siding guidelines on page 56-58, Smart siding is an approved material and can be used to replace the wood siding. Since the applicant is planning on using some of the wood on the house, I think that is a good thing. I do believe that meets it. Under windows, residential guidelines pages 60-63, I believe it meets it if the mutins are on the outside. If that is the case with the aluminum clad windows that are proposed then that would meet the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree on the siding since the original siding is being retained on the front of the house. I think using the Smart siding on the east side is acceptable. The windows should be a wood window on the front of the building.</p> <p>G. McGinnis agreed with S. Ash and stated he would love to see that also but the applicant has decided to go with the aluminum clad. N. Schell noted that the application was not to replace the front window but only the east facing windows.</p> <p>S. Ash – Given that information, I would agree with the true divided light aluminum clad windows.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree. The residential guidelines on page 60-63, number 5, states snap on mutins do not effectively replicate the appearance of historic mutins and should not be used. The board also has to determine if the windows are 80% deteriorated and we are not allowed to go on the properties.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>J. Collins – I agree for the same reasons. Guideline number 5 mentions snap on mutins but the same would apply to those sandwiched mutins. I think that should be added to the revised guidelines.</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	

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

“I move to approve the COA for the siding and the windows as discussed in the Findings of Fact. The replacement windows will be a true divided light aluminum clad window. This project is located at 715 E Main Street”.

Motion was seconded by J. Wilber.

**Roll Call:**

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

Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

**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.

- 9. Jane Vonderheide – C. of A. to replace windows.  
 Location: **207 E Main St.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Jane Vonderheide was present.

S. Ash thanked the applicant for proposing wood windows. J. Vonderheide thanked the city for having the PACE grant which will be making this possible. O. McCall asked about the wood type. J. Vonderheide stated the windows would be made by Roger Welch and she believed they would be Mahogany single pane wood windows. B. Lyman asked if the openings would change. J. Vonderheide answered no and added that R. Welch believed the pulleys were still in the openings.

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	S. Ash – It absolutely meets all the commercial guidelines on page 56-59. The windows are being replaced with restoration wood windows. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. J. Collins – 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 207 E. Main St. to replace the windows on the second floor with true divided light 2/2 wood windows which conforms to the commercial guidelines on pages 56-59 and as discussed in our Findings of Fact”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

- S. Ash            Approved
- J. Wilber        Approved
- S. Schmidt      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- J. Collins        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.



Page 14

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

V. Crisafulli thanked the applicants for their work on Main Street and for expanding their business. L. Folkner stated they are hoping to completely restore the building by receiving a PACE grant. N. Schell added that the application also lists they want to remove the molding above the doorway.

B. Lyman asked for an explanation on that portion of the project. L. Folkner stated the portion that would be removed is the decorative scrolls which are sitting on top of the door frame.

S. Ash stated the upper windows are a rare architectural feature since they are a 9/9 window. S. Ash agreed that the glass looked like it was falling out but wasn't sure about the condition of the frames. L. Folkner stated they were trash and some of the frames and glass are missing.

J. Wilber asked about the design of the replacement windows. L. Folkner stated he wanted to install the same windows as the windows in their other building. L. Folkner noted that Jack Patchin created their other windows. S. Ash asked about the design of those windows. L. Folkner stated they were all different but thought the front windows were 1/1. S. Ash stated he would hate to see the 9/9 removed. O. McCall asked if S. Ash would like to see them replaced with the same design or restored. S. Ash stated he didn't know the condition of the existing windows. L. Folkner stated that the windows were about ready to come out due to water getting into them. The brick wall is bowing and the entire window unit has been compromised.

J. Wilber asked about the storefront window. L. Folkner stated he wanted to install a solid pane. S. Ash stated he thought the storefront window maybe older than it appears. L. Folkner stated he had some historic photographs of the building and the storefront was originally two windows. The existing window and door are not original.

O. McCall stated the board is very relaxed on the 80% deteriorated rule and didn't see how any 80% deteriorated windows would exist. O. McCall stated he thought the windows should be restored. J. Collins stated the inability of the board to see the window up close or from the inside makes it difficult for the board to make the determination that they are 80% deteriorated. J. Collins suggested the board accept estimates from professionals on the restoration of the windows and if the estimate is not practical then board could approve the replacements. V. Crisafulli noted that the issue of the 80% rule has come up at several meetings.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant would be willing to extend the application until someone can get inside to inspect the windows. L. Folkner stated he would rather get it approved at this meeting but was willing to extend it to the next meeting. N. Schell noted that the applicant does have a PACE grant application pending and it does require an approved COA prior to the meeting.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

L. Ludington stated he was familiar with the building and has been inside the building. L. Ludington state the existing 9/9 windows are not historic and go along with the faux colonial remodeling which was done in the 1950s/1960s. L. Ludington stated he thought the building probably matched the building next door with the cash iron façade. The 9/6 light sash in the 1870s were changed out to a 2/2 or 4/4 light sash. L. Ludington noted that he was the chair of the PACE committee and encouraged the historic board to approve the application in some fashion.

O. McCall asked L. Ludington if he thought the 9/9 window was a faux original. L. Ludington stated he didn't think they were original and added that the windows were probably removed in the 1870s and then again in the 1950s/60s. B. Lyman asked about the storefront window. L. Ludington speculated that it would have matched on the western building and would have had solid plate glass windows. V. Crisafulli noted that the western building had 9/9 upper windows. L. Ludington stated that building was also modernized.

L. Folkner presented a historic photo of the building which his wife just retrieved from their store. V. Crisafulli stated she thought the photo showed a 2/2 windows in the upper half of the building. J. Collins stated it has gone from an original small pane divided light window to a first stage modernization of a 2/2 window and then an attempt to go back to an original window with the 9/9 windows. J. Collins stated he wasn't sure of the goal of this application. V. Crisafulli noted that the building owner was installing solid wood windows and didn't think the board should put any obstacles in front of him since the board likes to see solid wood windows.

Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

S. Ash stated the board not having access to inspect the windows was what causes the issue. V. Crisafulli noted that the board had discussed having a window inspection team. V. Crisafulli noted the Findings of Fact would be based off the original application for solid wood windows, replace the storefront window, and remove the crown molding over the door.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows  Storefronts	60 – 63	56 – 59  52-55	<p>O. McCall – I do. As L. Ludington pointed out the most reasonable explanation for this building that is was returned to smaller lights later on in the attempt to make it look colonial. The original windows are long gone and so it would be appropriate to replace the windows rather than restore these modern windows.</p> <p>J. Collins – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>S. Ash – In light of the historic photograph, I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I am unclear about how many lights the upper wood windows will have.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">L. Folkner stated he would like to match the 1/1 windows in his other building. S. Ash stated he was agreeing to the 2/2 windows. Sonia Folkner noted the photograph showed a 1/1 window. L. Ludington stated the photo, which is a 20<sup>th</sup> century photograph, showed a taller upper sash than the lower sash. This suggests that the sash was probably the original 9/6 sash with the mutins removed.</p> <p>B. Lyman – It sounds like the applicant is asking for a 1/1 wood window on the upper windows and a solid pane storefront window. (L. Folkner agreed). This does not conform with the guidelines because it asks for the windows to retain historic appearances and I don't believe a 1/1 is a historic appearance for this building.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I feel that this does meet the guidelines because it will be a wood window and I think the property owner wants to do right by this structure and follow as close as possible match that building historically and the adjacent building. I am fine with the 1/1 windows.</p>

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

“I move to approve the COA for 322 W Main St. as discussed in the Findings of Fact under commercial guidelines pages 56-59 on windows. The applicant has stated he wants 1/1 on the three upper windows and a large pane glass on the storefront window. The applicant will so be removing the crown molding from the door”.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

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







**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 22, 2019**

S. Ash stated he had an issue with the metal siding and the metal roofing. S. Buchanan stated the neighboring properties have the same material as the proposed structure. S. Buchanan stated the Findings of Fact from the last meeting stated it needs to be compatible with adjacent buildings and this would be the same material as the adjacent buildings.

O. McCall stated that the structure would look very different from the house and matching the house pitch is not important. It is more important to match the pitch of the neighboring structures along the alley. O. McCall stated he believed the proposed structure is appropriate. S. Ash stated he thought the neighboring structures were wrong to begin with and the pitch of those structures should have been steeper. V. Crisafulli stated the board could not change the context.

V. Crisafulli asked for comment from the audience.

Don McKay, who resides at 614 W Second St., spoke in favor of this project. D. McKay noted that he thought the proposed structure would match the others in the alley since this property and one other are the only ones who don't have a structure along the alley.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Infill Buildings	69 - 71	64 - 66	<p>J. Wilber – Infill guidelines on pages 69-71 says it should be at the rear of the structure and this is. New buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings and I think it is compatible with the adjacent buildings including the correct setbacks.</p> <p>S. Ash – I do not think it meets the guidelines. It says in the residential guidelines on page 69-71 that it is encouraged to add to the streetscape to promote economic development and I think this will bring down the neighboring prices since it has metal siding and a metal roof. As far as being compatible with adjacent buildings, it is somewhat compatible with the two garages on the sides but they are wrong to begin with. It is not compatible with the primary structure. This structure would be better off with Hardie Board siding.</p> <p>B. Lyman – It says that new garages should be built at the rear of the dwelling which has been done. It is compatible in terms of setbacks however I am not sure about the compatibility of the scale or the materials. I have no problems with the metal roof, I just don't think the metal siding is compatible with the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>O. McCall – I disagree with B. Lyman because there are a variety of structures along the alley. There is nothing in the alley to match because there are different time periods and materials within that alley. I would have a hard time staying it doesn't fit in with what is already there. I think it is appropriate.</p> <p>J. Collins – I agree with B. Lyman. I don't think the roof pitch needs to match the house. My issue is with the siding. I think using barn metal siding anywhere downtown will detract from the neighborhood.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I feel that it does meet the guidelines. I understand the issue with the metal siding but I feel like since most of the neighbors have a garage including the neighbor who is present at the meeting, it is fine. The applicant has made adjustments from his first application by adjusting the pitch of the roof.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree with B. Lyman and J. Collins.</p>

Page 20

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

S. Buchanan asked if there was one of the seven guidelines that are not met then the board could vote to deny the application. V. Crisafulli stated that was up to the board but that it was an option.

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

“I move to approve the COA for 618 W Second St. under residential guidelines on pages 69-71 for infill buildings as discussed under the Findings of Fact”.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

### Roll Call:

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

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness failed.***

### Business – Staff Report:

#### Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Kevin & Linda Malloy	816 W Second St	4/1/2019	Iron and Wood Fence
Zack W. Hatton	523 E Third St	4/15/2019	Iron Fence

#### Historic District Board of Review: 2018 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Adams, Mark	902 W First St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace 5 existing wood windows</li> </ul>	Yes
B & H of Madison, LLC	407 E Vaughn Dr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing siding with smooth Hardie Board Siding</li> <li>Replace up to 5 windows that will be either aluminum clad or wood windows</li> </ul>	Yes (Siding) No (Windows)
City of Madison (Rockin Thunder Jet Boat Rides)	100 E Vaughn Dr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a 10-ft x 10-ft portable wood kiosk.</li> </ul>	Yes

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
<b>Parker, Brad and Rhonda</b>	120 East St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove existing enclosed porches.</li> <li>Build new 33-ft x 14-ft addition on back.</li> <li>Build new 33-ft x 10-ft deck on back of addition. Materials to be used include Hardie Board siding, steel doors with transom, and trex composite.</li> </ul>	In progress
<b>Ohlendorf, Susan and Bill</b>	416 W Second St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enclose rear porch with windows and doors.</li> <li>Build small overhang over porch door.</li> </ul>	Not started
<b>Chambers, Kathleen</b>	317 Mill St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a 12-ft x 28-ft wood carport and a 8-ft x 4-ft wood shed attached to the carport</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>Springhills Investments, Inc. (Arnold &amp; Theresa Long)</b>	796 Presbyterian Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a 15-ft x 22-ft garage setback off the street beside the existing mobile home</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>Bennett, Dealton (Jody Bennett)</b>	103 Walnut St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing siding with cedar siding.</li> <li>Replace existing windows with aluminum clad wood windows</li> </ul>	In Progress
<b>Jacobs, William</b>	126 West St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing aluminum and vinyl siding with smooth LP Smart siding.</li> </ul>	In progress with textured (approved)
<b>Boswell, Andrea</b>	413 Presbyterian Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing front door with wooden door.</li> <li>Replace existing steps with wider poured concrete steps with wood and/or wrought iron railing.</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>Strouse Properties LLC</b>	112 W First St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolish existing southwest portion of building and chimney.</li> <li>Add second story addition over the structure to create a two story brick carriage house style structure. Materials include: aluminum clad windows, brick siding, and wrought iron railing.</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>City of Madison</b>	500 W Third St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolish existing concrete block structure.</li> </ul>	Yes

## Historic District Board of Review

April 22, 2019

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Hollinger, Ron & Susie	310 Broadway St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install new wood double front door.</li> <li>• Install two double doors and two single doors on second story on north side. Install new wood door along alley.</li> <li>• Install wood and wrought iron railings and trip step to second story openings. Install coach lighting by first story entries.</li> <li>• Add limestone to existing limestone sill.</li> </ul>	In Progress
Searcy, Phyllis Ann (Meshelia Storm)	724 W First St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add three (3) wood square columns to front porch. Replace existing porch light.</li> </ul>	Yes

### **Business - New:**

V. Crisafulli stated that as the board has gone through the process to revise the guidelines, items which fall under either the rules of procedure or the ordinance have been brought up. V. Crisafulli appointed B. Lyman and O. McCall to a procedure committee and V. Crisafulli and J. Collins to an ordinance committee. B. Lyman asked about Rules of Procedure and what items are included within this. D. Sharpe stated he would discuss that at the subcommittee meeting. B. Lyman stated she brought it up since the board was to vote on amendments to the Rules of Procedure at this meeting. It seems like the changes are defined under the ordinance. D. Sharpe stated that should probably be addressed in both the ordinance amendments and the Rule of Procedure amendments.

N. Schell presented amendments to the Rules of Procedure. Those changes are listed below:

- Amendment to "OFFICERS, STAFF, AND DUTIES" section titled: "Staff:" to read as the following:
  - "Relevant city employees, designated by the Mayor, shall serve in a staff capacity to the HDBR. The staff shall consult with applicants for Certificates of Appropriateness prior to their appearance before the board, and shall present written analyses to the board. The staff shall make presentations and reports to the HDBR and follow up on other actions as determined by the HDBR. The staff shall not be eligible to vote on matters which come before the HDBR in any regular or special meeting."
- Amendment to "CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS" section titled: "Filing Fee:" to read as the following:
  - "A fee as determined by the City of Madison, through the Plan Commission Fee Schedule, shall accompany each application from any applicant, other than the City of Madison, with each request for a Certificate of Appropriateness."

J. Collins asked if the ordinance cited the staff of the building inspector. N. Schell answered yes and advised the board that she is not staff of the building inspector. V. Crisafulli mentioned that issue should be corrected in the ordinance but this change would correct it now. N. Schell clarified it would only correct the Rules of Procedure not the ordinance. B. Lyman stated the board couldn't change something against the ordinance. D. Sharpe stated it needed to be corrected in the ordinance.

Amendments to the Rules of Procedure were tabled.

### **Business - Old: Revisions to the Design Guidelines**

V. Crisafulli asked for public comments. No public comments were given.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 22, 2019**

No further business to be brought before the board.

J. Wilber made the motion to adjourn - seconded by J. Collins. Meeting adjourned at 8:37p.m.

**BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

---

Valecia Crisafulli, Chair

---

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator