

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW**

Minutes

June 24, 2019

**The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, June 24, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Betsy Lyman presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Owen McCall, Susan Schmidt, and Sonny Ash. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Devon Sharpe – attorney; and Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.**

B. Lyman 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. B. Lyman added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

**5/28/2019 Minutes:**

B. Lyman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on April 15<sup>th</sup> and had any corrections or additions.

S. Schmidt moved to approve the minutes – seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

S. Schmidt	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
S. Ash	Approved

***Minutes stand approved.***

**5/29/2019 Minutes:**

B. Lyman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on April 22<sup>nd</sup> and had any corrections or additions.

O. McCall moved to approve the minutes – seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

S. Schmidt	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
S. Ash	Approved

***Minutes stand approved.***

**New Applications:**

1. Brenda Cornelius – C. of A. to replace standing seam metal roof with metal roof.  
Location: **119 E Third St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed a photo of the structure and showed an image of the changes provided by the applicant. Brenda Cornelius was present.

B. Cornelius stated the previous roof was damaged in the hail storm and she asked her contractor to install a standing seam roof. B. Cornelius added that she did not know she needed to come before the board prior to installing the new roof.

B. Lyman noted that the fasteners were concealed. O. McCall expressed concern about why this application was coming before the board. N. Schell noted that the contractor took down a standing seam and the new roofing material is not a crimped standing seam.



			guidelines on pages 69-71.
--	--	--	----------------------------

Page 3

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 24, 2019**

B. Lyman asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for CottageGreen LLC for the proposal for a new infill building at 613 Mulberry St”.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

- S. Schmidt      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- S. Ash            Approved
- O. McCall        Approved

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

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

- 3. Jennifer Kiesel – C. of A. to replace two lower windows and one upper window with aluminum clad wood windows.  
Location: **408 Presbyterian Ave.**                      Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

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

J. Kiesel stated they had scraped and reputtied this windows several times and now they are in disrepair. O. McCall asked if the replacement windows would match the existing. J. Kiesel answered yes. S. Ash asked if the grills were a pop on grill or part of the frame. J. Kiesel answered part of the frame. B. Lyman asked about the grid configuration. J. Kiesel stated the windows would be 6/1. S. Ash noted that the windows are in pretty sad shape and the rest of the windows are modern refit.

B. Lyman asked for questions from the audience.

**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	S. Schmidt – I do believe this project meets the residential guidelines on pages 60-63. They are going to be replacing the existing windows with aluminum clad which will match the existing windows. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons.

B. Lyman asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for 408 Presbyterian Ave. for the 6/1 aluminum clad replacement windows”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

- S. Schmidt      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- S. Ash            Approved





**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 24, 2019**

S. Schmidt asked about retaining the existing shed. S. Rousch stated the church would be keeping that shed because they use it to store mowers. S. Rousch added that this shed would be used to store chairs and decorations from the basement.

S. Ash asked if the church would be willing to use a gabled roof. S. Rousch stated he did not have the authority to make that decision. S. Ash asked if the applicant was willing to extend the application. S. Rousch stated he would ask the church and come back. N. Schell stated the next meeting was on July 22<sup>nd</sup> and the shed would not be able to be built until afterwards.

B. Lyman stated the guidelines state that the buildings should not be visible from Main Street and past applicants have been willing to hide the building with shrubs. B. Lyman asked if the applicant would consider that. S. Ash asked about the extension. S. Rousch stated if the application was going to get denied he would want to ask for the extension and added that the gambrel allows for additional storage where the gable would not. O. McCall stated that the applicant should not assume the application will be denied. S. Rousch stated he wanted a vote tonight and did not agree to the extension.

B. Lyman asked for questions 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>S. Ash – The residential guidelines on pages 69-71 state that new buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of height, materials, setbacks, scale and proportion. I think the setbacks are fine but the church design plays a big role on the material and scale and proportions.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I think that there is an existing shed on the site that is very similar to the proposed shed, I think it meets the guidelines. This is a movable structure. A Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree with S. Schmidt.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree with S. Ash. It will be visible from the west and very close to the church. It will not be similar in materials or roof form.</p>

B. Lyman asked for a motion. S. Schmidt made the following motion:

“I move to approve the infill building at 1100 W. Main Street as proposed”.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

- S. Schmidt      Approved
- B. Lyman        Disapproved
- S. Ash            Disapproved
- O. McCall        Approved

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

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

Page 7

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 24, 2019**

6. Jered and Kristin LaBolt – C. of A. to replace windows with aluminum clad windows on North side. Add porch roof over entry on North side. Add window over door on North side. Replace windows with vinyl clad on West and East sides. Remove side door on East side. Replace window on South side with vinyl. Replace doors on South and North sides.

Location: **833 W Third St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell showed existing photos of the structure and showed images of the proposed changes provided by the applicant. Jered and Kristin LaBolt were present.

S. Ash asked about the porch and stated the style of house would not have had a porch originally. J. LaBolt stated his house was a Folk Victorian and they typically had a portico or porch. S. Ash asked N. Schell if it was a Federal home. B. Lyman noted the setback of the home and added that maybe the front portion was removed. S. Ash stated the corbels on the sides were elements of a Federal style. N. Schell stated the time of construction given in the survey would align with a Federal style. S. Ash asked about the porch design. J. LaBolt stated it would have a 1/6 pitch and the columns would be a slight turned column with square caps. S. Ash asked if the applicant would extend this portion of this application to provide a drawing of the porch. J. LaBolt agreed.

S. Ash talked about the structural issues with installing a new window over the door on the north side. J. LaBolt stated they have had the project evaluated and it can be done. S. Schmidt expressed her appreciation for the applicants taking on this project. S. Ash discussed the new window would need to match the sizes of the other front windows and include a jamb and sill.

S. Ash discussed the cost of a wood window sash and asked if the applicants would consider using a wood window. J. LaBolt stated they have not looked into the wood but are looking into repairing the existing windows. J. LaBolt asked for approval for aluminum clad and wood windows. B. Lyman agreed that the board could do the approval for wood and aluminum clad windows.

B. Lyman stated the applicant is asking for vinyl windows on the east side and the board needed to discuss the visibility of the side windows.

B. Lyman asked for questions from the audience.

L. Ludington stated the building was probably built from the rear forward and not completed. L. Ludington explained that some buildings in Madison were built with the rear wing first then in the following years the front wing with the parlors and staircase were built. L. Ludington speculated that the façade of this building was not intended to be the front façade.

B. Lyman asked if the board could make a motion on the porch before going through the findings of fact or if they needed to wait until after. N. Schell stated it was up to the board.

B. Lyman asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move to extend the porch portion of this application until the July meeting”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

S. Schmidt      Approved

B. Lyman        Approved

S. Ash            Approved

O. McCall        Approved

***The motion to extend the porch portion of the application to the July passed.***

Historic District Board of Review

June 24, 2019

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 – 42	40 – 42	<p>S. Schmidt – The doors are going to be replaced with wood doors which meets the guidelines on pages 39-42. The windows on the front will be aluminum clad and the non-visible windows on the sides will be vinyl. We don't normally on the front but since these are on the sides and are not really visible they will be fine. I would agree that the board should grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for both the windows in accordance with the guidelines on pages 60-63 and for the doors.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. You can see the window openings on the sides but the angle is so acute that you cannot see the window.</p> <p>S. Ash – For doors and entrances, going from steel to wood is good. They did not show any examples of the wood doors.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">J. LaBolt stated they would be wood leaded glass doors with either a half light or full light.</p> <p>S. Ash – For filling in the door on the east side of the house with brick is no issue. With the vinyl windows, I am fine as long as the replacement windows match the original openings. I would agree with the new window on the front as long as it fits the items discussed earlier.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree with S. Ash. On the residential guidelines on pages 39-42, the guidelines state that they should be an historic pattern and I think the applicants are doing that since they will be wood. On the windows, I do not think the windows on the sides are visible and therefore I have no issue with the use of vinyl. The rear window is also not visible. I appreciate the fact that the applicants will consider both aluminum clad and wood windows. I believe everything meets the guidelines.</p>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	

B. Lyman asked for a motion. S. Ash made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for the project located at 833 W. Third Street for doors and entrances. The applicant has agreed to replace the steel doors with wood doors. The applicant is going to brick in the door opening on the east side of the house with period brick. On the windows, the applicant meets part of the guidelines on pages 60-63. The applicant has agreed on the north side to install a new window above the door. The new window will be the same size as the window to the right and the new window will have a jamb that will be no smaller than a 1-7/8 inch and will be set off the brick an inch to 2 inches from the face of the brick. The new window will fit the opening perfectly and will have a sill. The other windows on the west, south, and east sides will be vinyl clad because they are out of the public view. The two windows on the north side will be replaced with aluminum clad...”

S. Ash asked about the design of the windows on the front and if they would be 6/6. J. LaBolt stated they were asking for 1/1 aluminum clad windows to match the current windows. S. Ash stated he would only approve it if they would use 6/6 windows. N. Schell stated the board was in the middle of a motion and could not have discussion or questions.

S. Ash resumed his motion:

“The applicant should install a 6/6 aluminum clad windows on the north side. The windows cannot have a pop-in grill. The grill must be part of the frame. The applicant can also install a 6/6 wood window”.

Motion was seconded by O. McCall.





**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 24, 2019**

S. Ash stated he would like to see the wood windows preserved and to see 6/6 wood windows installed. N. Keen stated they would be open to that. N. Keen stated this application was mainly a fact finding to see if the bronze windows would get approved since they have not been used downtown. O. McCall noted that the bronze windows were very high end but not appropriate for this structure. O. McCall agreed with S. Ash on the 6/6 wood windows.

B. Lyman asked for questions from the audience.

L. Ludington stated he had some personal experience with this house and could confirm the house was built around 1840. L. Ludington added that the house was remodeled and modernized in the 1870s and the early 1900s which is when it was Italianized with the sheet metal cornice work. L. Ludington stated the house has not survived in its Federal form and the board should not insist going back to 6/6 windows without removing the sheet metal cornice work which was added later. L. Ludington stated this project is not a restoration of a Federal house it is a rehabilitation of a modified structure. L. Ludington stated there was nothing in the historic district ordinance that forces people to restore structures back to any particular time.

B. Lyman expressed her appreciation for the amount of wavy glass located within the existing windows. S. Ash stated that if the applicant wanted to install a 6/6 window, the glass could be removed and installed in a 6/6 configuration. O. McCall stated these windows were not original but they are historic and the guidelines ask the owners to preserve the historic windows. That is a superior choice than replacing them with 6/6 faux windows.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>S. Ash – I think this meets part of the standards because it depends on what the applicant plans to do. If the applicant restores the 6/6 side windows, then that would meet the guidelines. I don't agree with O. McCall on the 1/1 windows but I think the 6/6 are important. Restoring the windows to 6/6 would meet the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I would think that the wood windows with the wavy glass should be kept. That would meet the guidelines. If they were replaced with a 6/6 wood window that would also meet the guidelines. The brass would be an odd choice.</p> <p>O. McCall – I do not think the application meets the guidelines because it is asking to replace the existing wood windows with new bronze windows. That does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I am looking at number three. Windows should be repaired rather than replaced. If severe deterioration necessitates replacement, 80%, then new wood windows should be in-kind to match the original design and materials. I am hung up on that because the existing windows are not deteriorated. I do not think this meets the guidelines.</p>

B. Lyman asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that the application for a COA at 314 W Third Street be denied”.

Motion was seconded by S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

S. Schmidt      Approved

B. Lyman        Approved

## Page 12

## Historic District Board of Review

June 24, 2019

S. Ash            Approved

O. McCall        Approved

***The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed.*****Business - New:**

N. Schell presented photos on the changes that have taken place without a COA on 1037 W. Main Street. M. Johnson explained that he has issued a stop work order and the issue has been passed along to the attorneys.

**Business – Staff Report:**

## Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Christian Richards Wahl	320 Mulberry St	6/4/2019	Wood Hanging Sign
Jerome Vernon	428 Mulberry St	6/10/2019	Wood Fence
Scott Lynch	215 E Main St	6/10/2019	Aluminum Sign on building and window signs on 2 <sup>nd</sup> story balcony
Mark Richards and Sheila Lopez	203 W Main St	6/17/2019	2 window signs and 1 sandwich sign
Roland Newman	512 East St	6/18/2019	2 Larson storm doors
Chevel Bernius	624 W Third St	6/19/2019	4 Aluminum Larson storm windows and 1 transom storm window

## Historic District Board of Review: 2018 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Wilber, Josh and Rielly	506 W. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing window on back of house with aluminum clad sliding door.</li> <li>Demolish existing shed on northeast side.</li> <li>Install new gambrel shed and gazebo on the east and west side of the yard</li> </ul>	In Progress
DD & Z Properties LLC	312 Cragmont St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rebuild garage.</li> </ul>	Yes
Boncutter, Paulette	808-810 W Second St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Move door to west side of front facade.</li> <li>Replace existing door with a wood door.</li> <li>Replace vinyl windows with wood windows.</li> <li>Clean up demolished outbuilding.</li> <li>Rehab outbuilding with new garage door, new service door, and new exterior lighting and T1-11 siding.</li> </ul>	Yes
Schoenstein, Bob & Pamela	512 Walnut St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolish existing outbuilding.</li> </ul>	Yes

## Historic District Board of Review

June 24, 2019

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Newhouse, Pam and Larry	416 E Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing 3 windows on rear of house with new wood windows which are slightly longer.</li> </ul>	Yes
Bateman, Ron	204-206 Plum St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing 3 doors with new 6 panel wood doors.</li> </ul>	Yes
J&R Real Estate Holdings LLC	805 East St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build warehouse and lobby addition.</li> <li>Replace existing EIFS material with architectural horizontal siding.</li> </ul>	In Progress
Williams, Martha and Jane Hamon	711 E Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install covered addition to east side of garage.</li> <li>Install porch across north side of house with half of the porch to be enclosed.</li> <li>Small addition on front west side of house.</li> <li>Move window to front.</li> </ul>	Yes
Madison Horizon LLC (Denton Floyd Real Estate)	1001 W Second St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolish of building addition.</li> </ul>	Yes
Modisett, Karen	745 W Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a 19-ft x 24-ft carport with attached storage shed and install cement board siding on house if original wood siding is deteriorated.</li> </ul>	Not Started, extended at March 2019 meeting
Gray, Ashley and Marcus	951 Saddletree Ln.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolish existing accessory structure.</li> </ul>	Yes

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

N. Schell reported that she would have a new revision draft to the board and public by the July meeting.

No further business to be brought before the board.

O. McCall made the motion to adjourn - seconded by S. Ash.

Meeting adjourned at 7:32p.m.

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

---

Betsy Lyman, Vice-Chair

---

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator