

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

July 25, 2016

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, July 25, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall, 101 W. Main St., Madison, IN 47250. Ron Hopper, Chairman, called the meeting to order with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Ann Roller, Valecia Crisafulli, and Betsy Lyman. Mike Dorsey and Penny Sanchez were absent. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Tamara Broadnax, Preservation Support Staff; David Sutter, Board Attorney; and Louann Waller, Planning Secretary.

Minutes:

Pam Newhouse moved that the minutes of the May meeting be approved as published. Ann Roller seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Abstained because he didn't attend that meeting
B. Lyman	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
A. Roller	Approved

The minutes were approved as published.

Pam Newhouse moved that the minutes of the June meeting be approved as published. Ann Roller seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Abstained because she didn't attend that meeting
A. Roller	Approved

The minutes were approved as published.

Chairman R. Hopper stated that before the applications would be reviewed, Board Member V. Crisafulli wanted to make an announcement. V. Crisafulli said that as a part of the America's Best Communities there would be a workshop held in Madison tomorrow, July 26, led by Jeremy Fojut from Milwaukee, Wisconsin whose field is connecting people to the places where

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

they live and work and would be specifically addressing Mulberry Street and the potential for Mulberry to be a real draw for people, business and economic development there. She added that he would be giving a presentation at 2 p.m., at the Electric Lady, a business on Mulberry and then he would be leading an urban hike down Mulberry and would be getting participants to put together a 100 day plan for the street. She encouraged everyone to attend and passed out flyers.

New Applications:

1. William Jacobs – C. of A. to replace siding on entire house with vinyl where aluminum and vinyl currently exists.

Location: 126 West Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

T. Broadnax presented images and information about this contributing structure built in 1910 that is directly across the street from Bicentennial Park and discussed the items the applicant proposed to do.

W. Jacobs brought a sample of the vinyl siding which was passed among the Board members. He stated that vinyl siding was on the front façade of his house and the back. He presented a photo of the house showing what part of the front was vinyl and which part was aluminum. He stated that the vinyl has been on the house for 20+ years. R. Hopper asked if the applicant knew what was underneath the current siding. W. Jacobs said he believed it was board that was damaged extensively in the 1937 flood. He gave the Board a photo of the house at that time showing that it had been flooded. P. Newhouse asked if there is board underneath it all. W. Jacobs said the board is under the aluminum but not under the vinyl. The applicant also stated that there were no original windows in the home, no real doors in the home, none of the original chimneys, with only one remaining chimney that has been rebuilt.

P. Newhouse stated that it is still a contributing structure and that vinyl is not an approved material for the District. She asked if the applicant had looked at cement or Hardie board. W. Jacobs said yes, but it was quite a bit more costly. V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant had cost estimates. W. Jacobs said he didn't have the numbers but his contractor said it would be 30% more just for materials and then there would be paint and labor on top of that. B. Lyman stated that another approved material is Smart Siding and that it comes pre-painted. V. Crisafulli

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

acknowledged that the applicant believed the wood was damaged and asked if he had looked at it. W. Jacobs said that he had removed a small section of it and that it was damaged. He hasn't taken it all off and looked at it all, but he believed it was all damaged. V. Crisafulli said that in preparation of the meeting she was looking at the Guidelines and found some information that was a compromise on issues like this and that a compromise could be since the visual side of the house was so important, to put wood on the front even if there is another material on other parts of the house, and asked the applicant if that was something he would consider doing. W. Jacobs replied that he'd rather not and that it was his guess that would be quite costly. R. Hopper asked what about Smart board on front. W. Jacobs replied that he wasn't familiar with that, and didn't know the cost of it. B. Lyman asked if the applicant would be willing to investigate. W. Jacobs said he would rather move forward. B. Lyman stated that one thing she was thinking about was that the applicant had such a great house in a great location across from Bicentennial Park where all the visitors come to see Madison and it would be a good addition to the Historic District if the applicant would consider a wood-look siding. W. Jacobs said that he would prefer to go with vinyl.

A. Roller asked if there was a reason he wanted to take this siding off. W. Jacobs stated that it doesn't look good and is worn down and the aluminum in particular looks bad. He added that there was a garage behind his house that was built before he moved in that was completely vinyl. He also said that his neighbor's house was vinyl facing west toward Central Avenue, six of those seven houses are vinyl and the one that is not vinyl is vacant so it is consistent with the neighborhood. P. Newhouse said that it wasn't consistent with the Historic District Guidelines.

W. Jacobs read from the Guidelines and stated that while the application of synthetic materials is discouraged, it is not prohibited. P. Newhouse said that the synthetic product that the Board recommends is the engineered wood or the Hardie board. W. Jacobs pointed out that in the Guideline book there is a picture of a house at 314 Poplar Street with a caption that reads "Original exterior siding should be preserved and maintained and severely deteriorate wood should be restored with like materials as at 314 Poplar." He pointed out that that house has vinyl siding. He also had a photo of that house as it looks now. P. Newhouse said that she didn't believe that the Guidelines meant to show that house as an example of acceptable siding because vinyl is specifically prohibited. W. Jacobs replied that it was set out as an example. B. Lyman said that it was possible that the photo in the book was taken before the vinyl was put on. W. Jacobs said he took the picture he had that day and he knows the woman who lives in

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

the house. V. Crisafulli said that was obviously a mistake in the book. B. Lyman said that it was good that W. Jacobs pointed that mistake out.

W. Jacobs stated that he believed vinyl was cost efficient and it is what he would like to do. He also pointed out another photo from the Guideline book on page 20 at 211 W. Second Street that had vinyl siding. P. Newhouse said there were other statements in the Guidelines about vinyl siding such as "Vinyl siding does not successfully replicate the appearance of wood siding, in particular vinyl siding is at odds with the rich and varied surfaces of wood siding. Also vinyl siding is made from polyvinyl chloride and the manufacture use and disposal of this material results in toxic byproducts such as dioxin. Vinyl siding is not a "green" product and cannot be recycled."

W. Jacobs replied by saying if you go on the vinyl siding institute's website that it says it can be recycled, it is just not offered here in Madison. He also stated that Hardie board cannot be recycled. P. Newhouse stated that it lasts so long that's not a consideration. W. Jacobs stated that vinyl siding can last quite a while. He noted that the house pictured on page 20 has vinyl siding that has been on there 35 years. The vinyl siding that is currently on his house has been there for 20 years. P. Newhouse said it is the look of it also that's not right for the District. It just doesn't look right on an historic house. W. Jacobs asked what's historic on his home. P. Newhouse said the lines of it, the openings. W. Jacobs said that the windows on the front were approved by the Board a few years ago.

P. Newhouse said that she couldn't personally approve of vinyl siding. W. Jacobs said the cost of the other options was cost prohibited. He said that he needed to put a roof on that home and a couple of other things. V. Crisafulli stated that the Board appreciates that Mr. Jacobs wanted to fix up the house and that went without saying. She added that one frustration that the Board has had many times in the past was when contractors don't understand historic homes and the materials that are appropriate, and they tell the homeowner that the appropriate materials are too expensive without proving that without looking at comparables. She added that the Board didn't want him to do anything that was impractical but we've seen that the contractors are almost working for the vinyl siding people and thought that's where we were coming on this.

W. Jacobs gave the Board other photos of his house and garage. He stated that he had also been told that it would be difficult to deal with board around one of his window, but he didn't know why and that 80% of his home is already covered with vinyl siding. The Board members

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

circulated the photos and looked at them. P. Newhouse stated again that vinyl wasn't appropriate for the District and it was something she couldn't approve. W. Jacobs stated that it was already there. A. Roller stated that it would have helped if the applicant had comparables to look at. W. Jacobs said that he knew it was 30% more.

R. Hopper asked if Mr. Jacobs had talked to more than one person. W. Jacobs said he had talked to more than one contractor. R. Hopper asked if the applicant would be willing to investigate the other siding that the Board has approved. W. Jacobs said he would rather not, that he was ready to get going on the project and that he felt confident all the other products would be quite a bit more expensive.

R. Hopper asked if there were any comments from the audience.

Bruce Dunigan, 128 West Street said he was a next door neighbor. He added that W. Jacobs lived in a neighborhood where every house was vinyl and that it says in the Guidelines that vinyl is allowable, even though it is not recommended and that the biggest part of the Jacobs' house is vinyl. He added that he thought it would be a disgrace if the Board turned him down.

Curt Jacobs said that he was William's father so he was not an impartial advocate. He stated that in downtown Madison there were at least 500 structures that were aluminum and vinyl. He added that he had no idea how many of these structures the vinyl was added by the current owner or was inherited when the current owner purchased the house which was what happened with William. He said that he was familiar with the Board's dislike of aluminum or vinyl siding. He said he owned the house at 211 W. Second and that he put on the vinyl siding in 1980 without any kind of objection. He said that he didn't disagree with the Board's opinion about vinyl and aluminum siding necessarily that it is not consistent. On the other hand, he suggested the Board look at the house as it is now and offered that the Board had some opportunity here to make it look better than it does now. He said that it wouldn't look the way the Board wanted it, but it would look better than it does today and added that it wasn't an opportunity that the Board should pass by. He said the Board would have this controversy continually and that he didn't have the answer to it but there would be this cost problem which was an unintended consequence of the ordinance and the Guidelines. He said that he didn't think anyone stuck that in there thinking that it would make these buildings more expensive and that only wealthier people could own them and take care of them better. He didn't think that was anyone's intention. Mr. Jacobs said he would simply suggest that the Board consider

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

what the applicant wants to put on and decide if it looks better than the current home. He said he realized it wasn't the way the Board wanted it to look but if it would be better than what you have.

B. Lyman responded by saying that their seemed to be a misconception that the Board had its own ideas about what we liked or what we didn't like. When she was told about this Board and what she was charged to do, she was charged to follow the ordinance and the Guidelines and that was what we needed to go by. It wasn't something that we made up, it was written down and that we could change the ordinance, everyone has an opportunity to do that and go to the City Council and talk to them about changing the ordinance but before it is changed we are bound to follow it, so it's not what we want, we are following the Guidelines.

W. Jacobs said that he had a comment. He said that the Board wanted him to use Smart board that replicates wood and asked if that was right. Board members agreed. He pointed out that the Guidelines said to avoid wood grain products. B. Lyman responded by saying that the product was available in smooth surfaces that would look just like redwood siding and it was prepainted. V. Crisafulli said the Smart siding and other materials were not addressed in the Guidelines because they were so new. She thought the phrase that the applicant pointed out was to say that there were products that looked more like fake wood.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other comments. W. Jacobs asked if the Board felt that the picture he circulated looked good because it was one that was set forth in the Board's book to be an example. And while it is not encouraged, it is not prohibited and it would be similar to what he would put on his home. P. Newhouse pointed out that the sample of the material the applicant brought to the meeting didn't show that it looked like lap siding. W. Jacobs stated that it was similar to what was on the house now and he wasn't sure if they had made improvements from that. P. Newhouse again stated that she couldn't go with that.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked for the motion.

P. Newhouse moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that if the proposed project at 126 West Street, if constructed according to the application submitted on June 29, 2016, should not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness at this time. The proposed siding, vinyl, is not approved for use in the Historic District. Referencing the Madison

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

Residential Design Review Guidelines, page 56, paragraph 3 states: "Removal of synthetic siding (aluminum, Masonite, and vinyl that has been added to a building is highly encouraged, followed by the restoration of the original wood siding," and, p. 57, Paragraph 8: "Cement siding (Hardie Board) may be appropriate for the replacement of highly deteriorated wood." So she did not recommend a C. of A.

Seconded by V. Crisafulli

Roll Call:

B. Lyman	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

The motion to not approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will not be issued.

R. Hopper stated that the C. of A. was not approved and that the Board recommended that the applicant explore the type of siding that has been approved. W. Jacobs inquired what his appeal options would be. D. Sutter stated that decisions of the Board could be reviewed by the Circuit Court. He suggested that if W. Jacobs chose to file a petition, adding that he was not advising him what to do, he could contact an attorney to assist him through that process.

V. Crisafulli stated that another thing she thought would be helpful in addition to investigating the other materials that were suggested would be to bring in several cost estimates so that the claim of financial hardship was one that would have some validity and would be backed up rather than someone talking to you about it. W. Jacobs replied that he thought everyone knew that the other products were more expensive. He said thank you.

Page 8
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

2. Jan Vetrhus – C. of A. to demolish existing concrete stoop and add two concrete stoops, one at each front entrance; add a new cellar way entrance door; install new canopies over openings on the East and West sides; add a concrete stoop to the East side entrance matching front entrance.

Location: 815-817 W. Second Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

After T. Broadnax reviewed the details of the application with PowerPoint photos and information, the Board discussed the details of the plan with the applicant, particularly about the cellar door in the front of the house. Questions were raised about making sure it was secured with a deadbolt and designed not to cause a safety problem with those using the sidewalk.

Following the discussion, A. Roller moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on June 28, 2016 and discussed on July 25, 2016 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for Porches: Removing a front porch that has been where there was not one historically may be appropriate, as in this case; the deteriorating concrete steps will appropriately be replaced by casting concrete in place; the additional steps on the east side of the house would also be appropriate. Roofs: The installation of the 2 roofs over the doors on both the east and west side of the house would be appropriate as they are in keeping with the character of the house and would match the ones on the front. Doors and Entrances: Missing or severely damaged doors should be replaced with examples that replicate the original or similar doors. The replacement of the cellar door would be appropriate. The Guidelines are being met, therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

B. Lyman seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved

The motion was approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

Page 9
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

3. Don and Jill Wiest – C. of A. to build a side porch at the East side of the structure.

Location: 310 W. Third Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

After T. Broadnax presented images and described the project, the Board discussed it further with contractor Brian Martin. Questions from the Board included how far the structure would extend from the wall. B. Martin said the first set of columns would be 4 feet, just on the other side of the sidewalk and the second set would be another 4 feet so about 8 feet total from the side of the house. Comments were made that it wouldn't be very visible from the front of the house. B. Martin was asked if there was a porch there before. He replied he didn't think so. There were also questions about materials which B. Martin confirmed as those listed in the application. Following the discussion the following motion was made.

Betsy Lyman moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 310 W. Third Street, as submitted on July 5, 2016 and discussed at the Board meeting on July 25, 2016 is compatible with the Historic District's Residential Guidelines. A side porch is to be constructed on the east elevation of the house over the door following the plan submitted with the application. The porch will be made from wood that will be painted, with asphalt shingles similar to those on the house with aluminum gutters. The Residential Guidelines state on page 50 that "replacement porches should use materials and styles that are compatible with the building to which they are attached and when possible be based on historic photographic or documentary evidence." The design is compatible with the addition on the back of the house. Therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

The motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

4. Clarence Cosby – C. of A. to demolish unsafe structure on property.

Location: 887 Vine Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

T. Broadnax presented images showing legal documents that allowed Mark Johnson, Building Inspector, to represent the applicant. She then projected images of the structure and discussed the applicant's request to demolish the building.

M. Johnson said the structure was pretty well shot. He stated that Mr. Cosby was a resident of Washington, D. C. and his legal advisor from Indianapolis had contacted the City office to demolish the building. M. Johnson stated that there were several occasions when trash had been dumped there as well as TVs and that the neighbors had complained several times. He said that he understood there was someone who may be interested in buying the lot. He added that it was an unsafe structure.

V. Crisafulli said that she was definitely against demolishing properties in the District but if there was a structure that warranted demolition this would be one and that it wasn't appropriate for rehab. A. Roller stated that when she looked in the building she saw a gas can. V. Crisafulli stated to M. Johnson that she hoped he would stay in contact with the owner and that it would be nice to see it in good hands because as it is now, it is not contributing to the District.

R. Hopper asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Board or the audience. Hearing none, he asked for the motion.

A. Roller moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application for demolition of an unsafe structure submitted on July 5 and discussed on July 25 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for demolition. Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district. This is a noncontributing building. This building has been allowed to deteriorate through lack of maintenance and is unsafe. Therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Seconded by P. Newhouse.

Page 11
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

Roll Call:

B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

The motion was approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the building will be issued.

5. John and Maureen Wurtz – C. of A. to replace slate roof with new asphalt slate shingle roof to match new slate shingles on porch, coach and garden houses.

Location: 509 E. Third Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

T. Broadnax presented images of the building and informed the Board of the proposed project. Homeowner John Wurtz and contractor Roger Welch discussed the project with the Board. J. Wurtz said he started the project two years ago and originally had decided to retain the slate roof and that had proved to be a bad decision. He stated they had continued to have leaks that they tried to fix until a month ago when he was in the master bathroom and it was raining outside. The water started dripping through the vent in the ceiling so then he decided it was time to address the issue. He described how he wanted to take the same high grade simulated slate asphalt shingles used on the other buildings and put it on the main building so everything would match. P. Newhouse said that slate lasts a long time but has a lifespan. She wondered how old the slate was. J. Wurtz said the house was built in 1860. R. Welch said that it was originally wood shakes and then maybe 20 to 30 years after that the slate was put on, so it's 100 years or more. J. Wurtz said it was crumbling away. R. Welch said it was a constant maintenance problem. B. Lyman asked if the roof was originally constructed to hold wood shake shingles and then when they put on heavy slate, did they have to go back and reinforce the roof. R. Welch said that the original construction was done so well that it could hold the slate. He said he looked at the sheathing which was ripped at the sawmill and the bark was still on the boards. He added that there were a lot of the signs of its history and that it was well built so it could withstand the weight of the slate. B. Lyman asked if the sheathing would need to be removed. R. Welch said no, but additional sheathing would be added to give it a good, solid, smooth surface.

Page 12
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

V. Crisafulli asked if the pattern on the roof could be replicated. J. Wurtz said the pitch of the roof is very shallow and when you look up, if they put the type of proposed shingle on there, the pattern would not be seen. Also, he wanted everything to match and have a uniform appearance. J. Wurtz also said it would be expensive to do that. R. Welch said that anything was possible to be replicated at another man's dime but it really wouldn't be seen from 3rd Street, you need to go all the way down St. Michaels to get just a peek.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more comments from the Board or the audience.

Kevin Watkins, 804 E. First, asked if there was any effort to reclaim the slate for another use. R. Welch said that the roofer was going to get the slate. K. Watkins said he was just asking. J. Wurtz said K. Watkins could have them if he wanted them. R. Welch said that was a good question and that they had a good roofer, Derrick Dickerson.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more comments or questions. Hearing none he asked for the motion.

B. Lyman moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 509 E. Third, as submitted on July 5, 2016 and discussed at the Board meeting on July 25, 2016 is compatible with the Historic District's Residential Guidelines and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. The Guidelines state on page 54 that: "slate roofs, may be historic, though not original. They should be repaired with new slate to match. If deterioration is extensive, consider removing slate from the rear to the façade portions of the roof. If complete removal is necessary, the use of faux-slate materials may be considered." In this case the deterioration of the slate is extensive and the applicant will be replacing it with asphalt slate style shingles as illustrated in the application.

The motion was seconded by V. Crisafulli.

Roll Call

A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved

Page 13
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

The motion was approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

6. Michael Anthony – C. of A. to demolish north, level one cinder block to Fountain Alley; demolish dilapidated brick wall at Northeast property line; replace metal roof with dimensional shingles.

Location: 129 E. Main Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

T. Broadnax showed pictures and described the proposed project. The owner, Michael Anthony was there to discuss what he planned to do. When the photo of the brick wall was projected M. Anthony stated that he would not be demolishing that because he doesn't own it. He went on to describe how the west cinder block wall is very close to the brick wall and that he thought if he took down the cinder block wall the brick wall would eventually fall. He said that the person who owned it was in the photo shop next to him and she wanted to keep the brick wall because she used it as a background for her photography. He also stated that he was thinking of leaving up the cinder block wall on that side to help support it.

P. Newhouse asked why he wanted to take down the cinder block structure. M. Anthony said because it was ugly and to gain off street parking. P. Newhouse asked what was inside. He said two small rooms and a bathroom. He added that the floor is concrete. B. Lyman asked if he was going to remove the concrete. M. Anthony said he'd like to leave it for the off street parking. He said that he might put a carport there but someone told him that carports weren't allowed downtown.

V. Crisafulli stated that she had a concern about the wall. She said she agreed the building wasn't attractive, but questioned the legality of what happens if the brick wall comes down when the cinder block wall was removed. D. Sutter said that his advice would be for the applicant to contact an attorney. M. Anthony said he thought he and his neighbor could work it out between them. V. Crisafulli said that she would like the applicant to work it out with the owner of the brick wall before the Board acts on the project.

A. Roller asked if there was a gap between the cinder block and the brick wall. M. Anthony said at the bottom there is a gap of about an inch but at the top it was touching, then he added it was more than touching, more like pushing on the brick because the cinder block goes beyond the brick at the top. A. Roller asked if the applicant had talked to the owner of the brick wall. M. Anthony said yes. He said that he had told her he wanted to take down the brick wall because

Page 14
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

he thought he owned it. The neighbor had said that she wasn't sure whose wall it was but she liked it and wanted to keep it. A. Roller asked if he told the neighbor what he was going to do and that it might cause her wall to fall. M. Anthony said yes, he thought so, that they were out there talking for a few minutes.

V. Crisafulli said that she was not ready to vote on this. D. Sutter asked for clarity's sake what the applicant was proposing to demolish. M. Anthony stated the cinder block building back to the original historic building including the roof. He got up and pointed out the area on the projected picture.

A. Roller stated that she didn't think we could not vote on something because we anticipated a problem. She added that she would take our Board attorney's advice. D. Sutter said again that he would suggest that the applicant contact an attorney. He said he was getting into a tricky spot; that his role was to advise the Board. He added that based on the conversation the Board was having with the applicant and the things that were discussed; he would recommend the applicant contact an attorney.

B. Lyman asked D. Sutter if he would advise the Board not to take action at this time. D. Sutter said that since we have been down this road before there were two ways to do this based on the way the ordinance was written; action should be taken tonight unless the applicant agrees to table the application, and if he agreed to table the application, the Board could vote to table it, but if he doesn't agree, and the Board didn't vote, it will be approved. B. Lyman asked the applicant if he would agree to let the project be tabled until he talked to his neighbor. M. Anthony said that he had already talked with her and he knows she wants to keep the wall and asked if the Board wanted him to talk with her again.

V. Crisafulli said that one thing the Board could do is take action on the metal roof. The applicant stated that he had decided to keep the metal roof and wanted to delete that part from the application. He said however he had amended the application to add replacing the three windows on the third floor on the Main Street side of the building with wood windows. He noted that he had found that wood windows were more expensive than wood aluminum clad windows.

V. Crisafulli stated that the Board could approve the application for replacing the three windows tonight if he was willing to come back after he worked out the details on the wall with

Page 15
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

the neighbor. A. Roller said she had a question: if the applicant wanted to remove his cinder block building and the neighbor wants to keep her wall, then she was having a hard time understanding why we would wait to vote. D. Sutter said the Board was within their right to vote, his response was to the applicant about the consequences of removing the wall, and his advice to the applicant was to talk to an attorney. A. Roller said she agreed. D. Sutter said he had no idea what would happen once the cinder block wall was removed but had suggested to the applicant to talk to an attorney about what the consequences might be if it falls.

The applicant asked if the Board would allow her to tear down her brick wall. D. Sutter said through the application process the Board would determine if she would be allowed to do so. He explained again that the applicant could agree to have the wall portion of his application tabled so he could explore that with an attorney. But if he wished to have a vote on tearing down the building, he was entitled to that based on the ordinance.

R. Hopper asked if the applicant had the property surveyed to know where the property line was located. He added that the Board had an applicant who wanted to build a garage and the owners had to have the property surveyed to determine where the line was. M. Anthony said that he asked the realtor and the realtor said it was probably her wall because it looked like her interior wall on the west side. He added that he guessed they were all assuming it was her wall and that she said it was her wall, but it had not been surveyed.

P. Newhouse stated that it would seem it was the Board's responsibility to determine whether the applicant could demolish that building or not and it would be applicant's responsibility to get together with that owner and when the wall is to come down that someone needs to be there to shore it up, but that doesn't have anything to do with us. A. Roller said she agreed and said that the applicant is well aware of the problem and she was sure he would say something to the owner of the wall when he was ready to do it. V. Crisafulli said she wasn't prepared to vote on that portion but could vote on the windows. R. Hopper said he wasn't comfortable voting either until that was worked out but he could vote on the windows.

D. Sutter reminded the Board again that if the applicant wanted a vote on that portion of the application he was entitled to do so but if the general consensus was that the Board would look more favorably on that part of the application if the applicant was willing to table it, he might consider that. However, if the applicant wanted a vote tonight, based on the ordinance, the

Page 16
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

Board would vote tonight. D. Sutter said as a correction, it isn't tabling the motion; it would be extending the motion.

A. Roller asked V. Crisafulli why she was hesitant. V. Crisafulli said that if someone was going to do something next to a property she owned that was going to cause something to happen to our side, she would want to sit down and discuss what that person could do and what should I do to not have an extra expense, and then perhaps they could share in the expense. She added that that was what she would hope could be worked out in an amicable neighbor to neighbor setting. A. Roller said she didn't know how that was covered in the Guidelines.

D. Sutter asked the applicant whether he wanted to extend his application. M. Anthony said he didn't see where extending it would help. D. Sutter said he wasn't saying anything would be, but based on what some of the Board members were saying that he could seek additional information or more time. He noted that the applicant had a couple of questions and if he wanted those answers prior to proceeding, it would give the applicant time to do that. D. Sutter said that the question was whether the applicant wanted a vote tonight or to extend the application. M. Anthony said he wanted a vote tonight. He stated he would check with the neighbor and he would help her anyway he could. He could find someone to help her fix the wall and could leave his one block wall up for support for a while. He added that if someone was parked there and the wall came down, that would be really bad. He said that if it was his wall he would fix it.

R. Hopper clarified that the applicant also wanted to replace the top 3 windows on the front of the building with wood as part of his application. M. Anthony agreed that was what he wanted to do.

R. Hopper asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience.

Kevin Watkins this time giving his business address rather than his home address as the Red Bicycle at 125 E. Main said that there were a couple of utilities on the west wall, there was an electric meter or an electric service and there was a gas line. He asked what the intention for those utilities would be. M. Anthony said the gas line was coming out and he would stub it out at the main and that he was going to add two more risers to each floor so they would have their own electrical service. K. Watkins said that the service comes from the service post and across the patio on his building so he was wondering where that was going to be routed and how that

Page 17
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

was going to work. M. Anthony said he'd do whatever they say. K. Watkins said he knew how that worked and was just concerned.

Ron Hopper asked if there were any more questions or comments. Hearing none, he called for the motion.

B. Lyman moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 129 E. Main Street, as submitted on July 5, 2016 and revised through discussion at the Board meeting on July 25, 2016 is compatible with the Historic District's Commercial Guidelines and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. The applicant will be removing the cinder block building on the north or Fountain Alley side of the structure. According to the Commercial Guidelines on page 71, "Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district." In this case the cinder block building is not historic so it can be removed. Also, there will be a replacement of 3 third story on the south façade or Main Street side of the building with 2 over 2 wood windows. Page 56 of the Commercial Guidelines states that replacement windows should be of wood to match the original windows. So a Certificate should be approved.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

A. Roller	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Disapproved
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved

The motion was approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

R. Hopper said that M. Anthony would need a building permit from M. Johnson to do the work and a Certificate of Appropriateness would be mailed once it was generated and signed.

Page 18
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

7. Summer Marshall – C. of A. to cover asbestos siding with Hardie board siding on house addition; replace metal siding on garage with new metal siding; replace metal roof on garage with shingles, raise roof by 4'; replace main barn metal roof with shingles; replace back porch from roof line and extend by 3'; add 2 cast iron exterior lighting fixtures at front door entrance; replace concrete stoop at front door entrance; replace front door entrance overhang to be constructed with wood.

Location: 201 Plum Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

T. Broadnax projected photos and showed details of the project. She stated that recent photos showed that some construction had already begun, the siding in particular. She showed images of the garage and said that the roof will be raised 4 feet, metal siding replaced with additional metal siding and the metal roof replaced with shingles. She said that a building permit would be required to make sure the construction was in compliance with city ordinances.

Summer Marshall was in attendance to discuss the project. She stated she didn't know what it meant to have cement steps cast in place. R. Hopper said it meant they would build the step structure and then put the cement in it. She said whatever was appropriate they would do. B. Lyman said that was averse to buying a set of steps. S. Marshall said they would pour the steps.

B. Lyman asked why the applicant wanted to raise the roof of the garage. S. Marshall said for storage. B. Lyman asked if there would be steps to that area. S. Marshall said no, just storage for things like a Christmas tree. B. Lyman asked what kind of metal siding would be used, if it would be pole metal barn siding and if she had a sample. The applicant said she did not bring a sample. She said she would assume it would be something along the lines of barn metal siding, but her husband was not in attendance, and she did know what they would be replacing it with. B. Lyman said that it was her understanding that the windows had been changed on the addition that was already constructed. S. Marshall said there had been a Plexiglas window on the west side. B. Lyman asked if the size of the window had been changed from a long window to the smaller one that was there now. The applicant said yes for cosmetic purposes. B. Lyman asked if it was replaced with vinyl windows. The applicant said she didn't know what material the windows were.

A. Roller asked if the door had been eliminated. S. Marshall said there was a door there but on the inside the door was boarded over so cosmetically they decided to remove it and they also had removed it for useful purposes because inside they wanted a flat wall.

Page 19
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

B. Lyman stated that one of the things the Board is always trying to do is to make sure that people understand that reason why we have Certificates of Appropriateness and also the process and she understood the applicant had started this without a C. of A, and asked if there was a reason they did that, if they were unaware. S. Marshall said they were unaware and to secure the house from further damage. She added that the house was dilapidated and was leaking so they were just trying to secure it.

V. Crisafulli asked when they purchased the home. The applicant replied in June. V. Crisafulli asked if the realtor let them know about the Historic District requirement. She also asked if the applicant had ever owned a home in the Historic District before. The applicant said yes but they had never had to go before the Board. R. Hopper asked if they ever had work done on the other houses. She said they had shingles put on and painting. V. Crisafulli said they didn't have to come before the Board for that. B. Lyman said that in general, anytime there is a change to the exterior you are required to get a C. of A. before the work begins. The applicant said she was aware of that now.

V. Crisafulli asked who was the contractor and if he was local. S. Marshall replied Sandusky from Kentucky. M. Johnson stated that the contractor does a lot of work over here. V. Crisafulli said he should have known about the requirements. R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or the audience.

M. Johnson stated that he did talk with the former owner of the home last Thursday, Dean Adams, and the back part of the house (pointing to a projected image) had some sort of small structure on it that he hadn't done anything to. He said that the Board could see that part on the building from the picture. He also said that he looked inside and could see that the windows were vinyl and the original framing showed they had been larger windows. He said that the thing that drew his attention to that were the steps on the side of the house that are now steps to nowhere, and that there was a door there. The other thing he wanted to mention was that he thought was a mistake was that it was not Hardie siding on the house. S. Marshall said it was Hardie siding and they got it from Lowes. M. Johnson said someone needed to talk to the people at Lowes because this had been the second time someone called it Hardie board, and that it was LP siding, not cement board. He stated that Hardie board was cement board ¼ inch. He said their contractor should know the difference. He also stated that the applicant would need a building permit to finish the project and that his concern was also about the back porch,

Page 20
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

if it was appropriate with 6 by 6 posts and if it was far enough in the ground. He was going to have to find out. B. Lyman asked if the applicant had plans to dress the post. S. Marshall said yes, they would dress them. B. Lyman asked if the intent was to keep the back porch open. The applicant said when they purchased the home that portion was already caved in and enclosed like a sunroom type area so they plan to keep it open for access outside.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions from the Board or the audience.

Ben Canida at 801 W. First Street stated that he had owned the house across from this property for 6 years. He said during that time this place had been vacant and pretty much abandoned. The door the Board mentioned that the applicant had closed over; when they first bought the property there was a tree growing through it. He added that his contractor looked at this house for himself to fix up and said that he had too many concerns about it structurally and walked away from it. He added that he was not at the Board meeting to comment on the process, but he was thrilled that someone was moving into the block and fixing it up and it already looked tremendously better and he wanted to stand in support and commend the applicant for the work that has been done and the improvements that they have been made because it looks dramatically better. He said that the Board may have differences about the process and he understood that and that was between the applicant and the Board to address, but he was someone standing in support of improving the block.

V. Crisafulli stated that the Board agreed with Mr. Canida on that and she glad that the block was being improved because it certainly was. She added that we did have a problem with the process because that was what we were here to uphold. B. Canida said he understood that and that everything the applicants have done so far was at a very high level and things have been done very well and they look better so he appreciated that.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked for the motion.

V. Crisafulli moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the contributing property at 201 Plum Street to (a) cover asbestos siding with Hardie board siding on the house addition; (b) replace metal siding on the garage with new metal siding; (c) replace the metal roof on the garage with shingles, raising the roof by 4 feet; (d) replace the main barn metal roof with shingles; (e) replace the back porch from the roof line

Page 21
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

and extend by 3 feet; (f) add two cast iron exterior lighting fixtures at the front door entrance; (g) replace the concrete stoop at the front door entrance and (h) replace the front door entrance overhang to be constructed with wood. This application was submitted on July 5, 2016, and discussed on July 25, 2016. With respect to each of these items and the Historic District Residential Guidelines: (a) while the application of synthetic siding is discouraged, it is not prohibited. The Guidelines do not specifically deal with the appropriateness of LP engineered wood, since it is a relatively new material. This is not on the primary façade of the house, where preserving the original wood siding is encouraged. (b) the applicant is replacing metal siding with metal on the garage, when upgrading to more appropriate materials is preferred. However, the garage is not the primary building on the property. Raising the roof will not significantly alter the character of the structure. (c) the applicant is replacing the barn metal with shingles, which is an acceptable material. (d) the applicant is replacing the main metal roof with shingles. This appears to be the original material, and is appropriate to the district. (e) the new porch should be consistent with the historic appearance of the building to which it is attached, and the proposed porch must meet all setback requirements. (f) deteriorated or damaged historic light fixtures should be repaired using methods that allow them to retain their historic appearance. Missing or severely damaged historic fixtures should be replaced with fixtures that replicate the originals or other historic examples in appearance and materials. (g) the use of pre-cast concrete steps for front porches is discouraged and the applicant said that was not her intent; (h) replacing front door overhang with wood is consistent with the Guidelines. While a few of the aspects of this project do not meet the letter of the Guidelines, and the process has not been approved, most are consistent and the applicant has been interested in discussing these items with us. Since some projects have already been started or completed, the C. of A. should reluctantly be granted, since to do otherwise would be neither practical nor feasible.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion. R. Hopper asked V. Crisafulli about describing the siding as Hardie board and asked if she wanted to change that. V. Crisafulli said that she read Hardie board because that was on the original proposal and then changed it later in the motion. She asked if that made sense. Members of the Board agreed.

R. Hopper again asked for a second. P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Page 22
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25,2016

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Disapproved and stated it was because of the metal siding on the garage and that the garage was in such a visible location. She suggested the applicant use Smart siding and put the smooth side on the outside instead of the heavily grained part out because it would match the house so much better than putting pole metal siding on it.

R. Hopper said the application had been approved with the recommendation of one Board member and that S. Marshall could take that information under advisement. He stated that she would need to work with Mark Johnson for the building permit and the legalities of the footer for the porch. And that the applicant would get the Certificate of Appropriateness once it had been generated and signed and thanked S. Marshall for taking on this project.

8. Shane Smith – C. of A. to replace existing vinyl siding with wood siding; add front and back porch compatible in design and character; install half round gutters; build 12’x9.5” yard barn with metal roof and T1-11 siding at rear of property.

Location: 1124 W. Second Street

Zoned: Residential Medium Density (R-8)

T. Broadnax reviewed the project showing images and pointing out various elements. She stated that the applicant was proposing to rehabilitate the building to make it as original as possible. She stated that Mr. Smith was seeking the Board’s guidance on the design of the front and back porches so they can be consistent with the Historic District.

V. Crisafulli said this was a bit of humor but when she saw the outbuilding was going to be 12’ x 9’ x 5” she was imagining a very short structure. The applicant said it would be 9 and ½ feet. She added that this was just what needs to happen to shotgun houses in the District.

A. Roller said she was curious if there was a transom on the inside above the front door. The applicant said he would like to put one in. A. Roller said that sometimes they are still there. S. Smith said that there was currently paneling inside that room that covered the transom and that he would like to put one in there. A. Roller said he might find a surprise and she found one that was hidden by a drop ceiling.

Page 23
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

The applicant also stated that the front door would need to be replaced. He wanted to rescue it but it was just too soft and he wanted to find one as close to the current one as possible because he loved that front door. He said the back door can be rescued along with all the windows and that they all actually open. R. Hopper stated that the applicant could check with the ReStore, he wasn't sure if they had one like that at the store but that Historic Madison, Inc. took all of their materials up there and partnered with Habitat for Humanity.

B. Lyman stated that there were some great examples of porch designs for shotgun houses in town, that there were over 250 in town and that the applicant could look at the windows in his house to find a style that matches. She added that it could be Greek Revival or Victorian and to look for good examples in town.

The applicant stated that he didn't care if the yard barn had a metal or shingle roof that could be up to the Board. B. Lyman asked about the T-3 siding. The applicant said it would be T1-11. B. Lyman asked if that was they type with the faux lines. The applicant said it was basically plywood with the grooves in it and once you painted it, it looked pretty good. B. Lyman suggested that it would be great to make it real board and batten, but that was just a suggestion. She asked about the door. He said he was going to make one. A. Roller said that there was a machine in town that made standing seam metal roofs. B. Lyman said it was at Exterior Pro. V. Crisafulli asked if he was going to live in the house. He said yes.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions. Hearing none, he asked for the motion.

V. Crisafulli moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the contributing property at 1124 W. Second Street to replace existing vinyl siding with wood siding or the equivalent (the applicant said Smart siding); add front and back porches compatible in design and character; install half-round gutters; build a 12-foot by 9.5 foot yard barn with metal roof and T1-11 siding at the rear of the property. This application was submitted on July 5, 2016, and discussed on July 25, 2016. With respect to each of these items, the Residential Design Review Guidelines state: removal of added synthetic siding is highly encouraged, followed by restoration of the original wood siding. Smart siding is allowed although that's not specified in the Guidelines but the Board allows it; porches are one of the most defining characteristics of historic houses. New porches should be consistent with the historic appearance of the building to which they are attached. If the historic porch is missing, it

Page 24
 Historic District Board of Review
 July 25, 2016

is appropriate to replace it. The applicant is committed to using like materials and design features of the original porches. Half-round gutters are most appropriate. New garages and outbuildings should follow new construction Guidelines. An existing pad indicates that a former storage shed of some type stood on this spot. While more appropriate materials are recommended and preferred, this building will have no visibility from the street and limited visibility from the alley. For these reasons the proposal as submitted is deemed compatible with the Historic District Guidelines, and the C. of A. should be approved.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

A. Roller	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

R. Hopper said that the applicant would need to see Mark Johnson for a building permit and that he was approved by the Board and the C. of A. would be sent to him.

9. Robert Vanvleet – C. of A. to replace existing asphalt shingle roof with standing seam metal; install half round gutters; replace all existing wood siding with new wood siding; replace front doors with historic wood doors; replace existing wood windows with new wood windows, matching original dimensions; remove and rebuild front porches with original material; demolish concrete slabs, foundations, and brick pillars; build new foundation to accommodate new wooden porches; build traditional wood skirtboard, wood T&G flooring, and new wood columns to match existing columns; demolish shed addition at rear of East structure and rebuild to match existing shed addition on West structure; install horizontal lap siding to shed additions at rear of both structures to match main structures; existing deck at rear of East structure to be removed and rebuilt after main structure is complete; dismantle and rebuild stone retaining walls at rear of both structures on new foundations, consistent with original location and size.

Location: 214-214 ½ E. First Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Page 25
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

Brian Martin and Robert Vanvleet were in attendance to discuss the project. B. Martin said there was a lot of information on the application and he wanted to make clear that the two front elevations were going to remain as original as possible. That meant that the windows stayed, the wood siding stayed, all those details. He added that the application indicated those would be replaced but that was not true. All those details were going to remain as original as possible. He said that of course, anything that needed to be fixed or repaired or replaced would be. He also stated that most of the front of the house would be dismantled because the concrete structures and the brick columns have to go but that would be part of the process.

R. Hopper and the rest of the Board thanked the applicant and B. Martin for taking on this project. A. Roller asked if the brick supporting the porch columns would remain or if the columns would be solid wood to the ground. The applicant replied solid wood to a wood deck porch. A. Roller asked if the different spindles on one of the houses were the only difference between them. The applicant stated that the spindles on the house pictured on the right were taken from a baluster from a house on the far left and said they should have the post involved like on the left.

B. Lyman said it was so good that the applicant was trying to keep as much original fabric of the house as possible. While it could be taken down and replaced, it wouldn't be as good because there was so much more character to the original. She also asked about addressing the drainage issues on the left or east house because it was so close to the neighbor's house. B. Martin said was certainly part of the process. Technically the buildings don't touch, but added that there would be some issues there. The applicant said there was a 5 or 6 inch gap between the two buildings.

T. Broadnax reviewed the information about the houses for the Board. She stated they are contributing structures built in 1890. She projected images to show details of certain aspects of the proposal.

Robert Vanvleet provided pictures of two matching doors he plans to use to replace the front doors of each house. They matched and were of the same time period as the homes. B. Martin stated that while the front of the houses will remain as original as possible, changes have been made to the sides of the buildings and it will be a process of removing and seeing what was

Page 26
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

there, but the siding and windows would be replaced with wood to be compatible with the front of the house.

B. Lyman suggested that pictures be taken of the process. R. Vanvleet said he planned on doing that. B. Lyman said the pictures could be used to show others what could be done. A. Roller suggested the applicant come back and show us the photos.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant would be living in the house. He said yes and the other would be used as a guest house for friends.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or the audience. Hearing none he asked for the motion.

P. Newhouse moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 214/214 ½ E. First Street, if constructed according to the application submitted on July 5, 2016, is compatible with the character of the Historic District. Specifically: Windows are to be replaced with new wood windows, matching size, configuration and style of existing window openings; repair and restoration of north facades will include removal and rebuilding of wooden front porches, set on new concrete foundations. The porches will have traditional wood skirting, wood tongue and groove flooring, and new wood posts to match those which are to be removed. Barge board and "fish scale" details on gables to be retained; modern siding to be removed from west side of the westernmost structure and underlying siding is to be repaired or replaced with wood; shed addition on the rear of the west structure will be replaced with horizontal lap siding to match the main house building; shed addition on rear of the east structure is to be removed and rebuilt to match the existing west building rear addition; existing rear deck is to be removed and rebuilt after work on the main building is finished; stone retaining walls at the rear of both homes will be dismantled and then rebuilt on new foundations on the original site; existing asphalt shingles will be replaced with a metal standing seam roof; half-round gutters will be used on both structures. Specific Madison Residential Design Review Guidelines referenced are found on pages 39-42, 44, 49-52, 56-58, 60-61, and 68. These two Victorian shotgun houses are iconic in our Historic District, and the restoration of them is much appreciated, therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

V. Crisafulli seconded the motion.

Page 27
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

Roll Call:

R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

R. Hopper said that the applicant would get the Certificate of Appropriateness once it was generated and signed and that he could work with Mark Johnson to get the required building permits.

He stated that concluded reviewing the applications and asked if there was any Old Business. Hearing none, he asked if there was any New Business. V. Crisafulli asked that everyone remember the Mulberry Street event.

Brian Martin asked if he could make a comment. He said that as he had been to the meetings several times and part of the process, he wished and he knew that the Board would agree, that it was good that people were coming in and doing these projects, but he wished that there could be a little bit more information, better information, specifically from the contractors for the people who are coming here. He added that it made him nervous, and referred to the applicant who had the building on Main Street doing the wood windows. He said it was awesome that he was going to put in wood windows, but the applicant mentioned that they were going to be from Menards and that they should be custom windows. He added that if we looked at the windows, the middle one had an arched top and it would be great to have a little more information during the process of deliberating. He also mentioned that one of the last applicants didn't have a design for the porch and that was really important, especially when there was an opportunity to do something new on these structures. He also mentioned the application with the metal siding. He said it had been approved as metal siding but who knows what that was going to be. He added that the garage was not a contributing structure per say, but again he just wanted to mention that he would like to see more information coming from the contractors when they presented before the Board. He mentioned the price difference with the vinyl siding application, that didn't have any real information to back that up. He said that he knew the Board was aware of this.

Page 28
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

V. Crisafulli said we wanted that too and we were trying to get better. B. Martin again wanted to say that the Board was at the mercy of the contractors so the contractors should be providing better information when they came before the Board and he would like to see a push for that.

B. Lyman stated that she felt that was true. That it was more than just approving materials, that the details of trims and having samples would help sustain the District. B. Martin said the contractors should be proud of what they are doing and stand behind what they are doing and should even come and help represent the project and really be able to back up what they are doing and especially if they want to work on projects downtown. He stated that he felt it was a choice to live downtown and purchase a structure downtown, and he hears about hardships but it was a choice to take on these structures and know that the monetary difference was going to be there so having a contractor standing behind the process and doing it right was important.

B. Lyman asked B. Martin if he found most of his clients knew about the requirement to have a Certificate of Appropriateness or did he have to help them with that. B. Martin said he had been really lucky in that the people he works with have been very intelligent about the process and knew what they were doing. He added that generally people know, but it was a shame to see when people went under the wire or got started that way and although that person may do great work, it was important to stick with the process. The Board expressed their appreciation for B. Martin's comments.

P. Newhouse made a motion to adjourn. B. Lyman seconded the motion. R. Hopper asked all those in favor to say aye. Everyone agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Page 29
Historic District Board of Review
July 25, 2016

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Tamara Broadnax, Preservation Support Staff*

Louann Waller, Secretary

*T. Broadnax and B. Lyman prepared the minutes. A final review of the draft was done by T. Broadnax.