

## HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 28, 2016

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, March 28, 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, Ron Hopper, Valecia Crisafulli, Betsy Lyman. Absent was Mike Dorsey. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Jess Butler, Preservation Planner; David Sutter, Board Attorney; and Louann Waller, Planning Secretary.

### Minutes

Ron Hopper asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes from last month and if there were any corrections or additions. Pam Newhouse made a motion to approve the minutes as published. Ann Rolley seconded the motion.

### Roll Call

R. Hopper	Approved
V. Crisaffuli	Abstained (she was not present at the last meeting)
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

The minutes were approved as published.

### New Applications:

#### **1. Fountain Holdings, LLC (Bob Courtney) – C. of A. to remove enclosure of carport; replace exterior storm windows; replace chain link fence; add shutters**

**Location: 424 E. 4<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

Preservation Planner Jess Butler presented information about the property and showed pictures of the structure on PowerPoint. She stated that on this property the structure was non-contributing to the Historic District. It was built in the early 1960s. She stated that the application was to open up what has been closed, an original carport which was supported by Guidelines to take the structure toward its original state. J. Butler also said there was no change to the footprint. The windows have been added to the application to install vinyl windows and storm windows that are aluminum. There are currently aluminum storms at the home. It is not a staff approvable storm window so that was before you for that. J. Butler stated that there were a lot of pictures of this property and that the applicant brought a board of pictures. She also said that the chain link fence was being replaced with a fence that can be staff approved in the side and rear yard, that would be a wood fence and she would approve that on fast track, and that the application has been specified and modified to state that this portion you see of chain link fence about five feet will be made to match the wrought iron design currently in the front yard so, front and side yard. And the shutters are no longer a part of the application; they are not installing shutters as originally they thought.

R. Hopper asked Mr. Bob Courtney if he had any comments. B. Courtney said yes and introduced himself by saying, Good Evening, Bob Courtney with Fountain Holdings. He stated that he had lived in Madison all his life; that he grew up actually just around the corner from this property which is located at the corner of East Fourth Street and Fourth Street. He added that he grew up at 606 Walnut Street which is really just about a block away, a block west and almost to that corner exactly. He said that we acquired this house really toward the end of last summer, started doing the exterior clean-up of the home, a home that had essentially been abandoned for four or five years and had not been occupied by any resident. He showed photos on poster board and stated I do have a picture over here to show you what the property looked like when we started, because I think it is important to see what happens to properties when they are essentially abandoned as you know. This picture here in the center shows you that this particular structure had been overgrown with lots of debris, trash, weeds in particular. It was a real detriment to the community. The picture that Jess had shown before which is this one shows after we had cleaned off all of this debris which was covering about 50% of the property. It did expose that there was a former carport there that had been enclosed with sliding glass doors. I do want to clarify too that our request is to; we are not going to put exterior storm windows in since we have modified our application to install new windows in the structure. The pictures here will show you I think a good representation about what happens sometimes when properties get abandoned and the negative influence it has on the community. You can see here that the property was littered trash and was

**Page 2**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

essentially being occupied by vagrants and wild animals over the course of the last four years. There is a depiction here of what the basement looks like, this is of the kitchen, these are, this is an example of the windows, 6 over 6, the new windows will also be 6 over 6, I'll talk about the window selection here in just a second. This is a picture of what the interior of one of the windows look like, the original windows to the home, again when this was constructed probably around mid 60s, 1960s, were essentially just a plain pine window that had been stained and varnished, not energy efficient, single pane and there was an aluminum storm window that covered the sashes and you can see also where the vines had gotten through the soffits and into the windows as well. Back here again, just another depiction of what we are trying to do to clean up this property, this will give you an example of what condition this home was in when we acquired it and essentially we have removed about ten tons of trash and debris that was inside the home and again it was being occupied because it was not secured, it has been occupied by vagrants and wild animals. Another depiction, this is actually a property on the corner just a block west that has boarded up windows and of course we're asking to replace the windows on this particular property. The fence that Jess mentioned, there are two sections of it, there's a chain link fence that's on the south side of the property which we will remove and put a nice six foot privacy fence there on that end and then there's a section of the wrought iron that had been replaced at some time over the history of the property that was replaced with chain link and we will remove that section to about five or six feet long and put a new portion of fence in that matches the wrought iron that goes around the perimeter of the property. This home is on the corner. It's a high traffic area because of people coming down Telegraph Hill and up East Street. I don't believe it is a high pedestrian area. It is on the corner and I think it deserves to look nice because it is surrounded by other nice homes. I would also like to point out, the impact on this neighborhood, particularly that property, over the course of the last five years this home because of the condition that it's in its assessed value dropped 70% and I think that's pretty indicative of what happens when we don't care for these properties downtown and I'm an advocate of trying to buy properties in all downtown, again this is our tenth one that we will be working on that I think will dramatically improve the neighborhood and the neighbors who I have talked with are supportive of the rehab that we are pursuing with this property and again, removing the carport enclosure will give it, I think, premium off street parking which you don't have in downtown very often and again it should, we are going to be painting the exterior, adding new windows and a lot of the investment will be on the interior, upgrade the home back to a very nice modern structure. I'll pause there for a second before I talk about the windows to see if anyone has questions on what we are proposing to do so far.

R. Hopper said to B. Courtney, just to clarify you said are not going to put storms on? B. Courtney replied to answer your question, we've decided to make the investment to put new windows in and not increase the cost to put storm windows over top of the new windows.

V. Crisafulli said thank you very much for cleaning this derelict property. B. Courtney said thank you. He added that there were a lot of these around town and you know we should do what we can to encourage people to buy them and fix them up because it will restore, I think, some real positive elements to a neighborhood. Any other questions and I'll talk about the windows?

P. Newhouse asked Mr. Courtney, the fence, the shadowbox, where is that going to be now? B. Courtney answered the south property. P. Newhouse was looking at the photo projected on the screen and asked Mr. Courtney if he meant connecting to that front part of wrought iron? B. Courtney replied the rear part, next to the carport there's a chain link fence that runs along between our house and Michele Rucker's home. P. Newhouse said okay, so that and then that chain link in front there, that will just be wrought iron? B. Courtney said that will come out. That will be wrought iron. It will be similar to what is there so it won't look so obvious that, you know, that portion of the original fence was removed.

J. Butler said that she did need to clarify that the fence regulations would require it to be three feet until it's the rear yard of the house, and then added, which sounds like what you are talking about. Where that taller fence exists, it would only be able to be three feet projecting out from the house forward to the street. B. Courtney said okay, that's no problem. J. Butler said that was the guideline. But it can be six feet once it is back of the house.

B. Lyman said that it looked like there was a partial brick wall that maybe blocked part of the carport at one time and asked if she was seeing that correctly. She said that she saw two sets of sliders, one was higher than the other. B. Courtney said yes, they had essentially created a stud wall when they framed that in. He added that all of the original iron corner supports are still there so essentially all we need to do is disassemble the sliding glass doors and take out that front brick, it's about 18 to 20 inches tall, just

**Page 3**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

remove that and then it will be a full driveway. He stated that as you can see the driveway went all the way into the carport and that's a pretty sizeable carport that would easily store one large vehicle, but that front brick wall will all come out and that will open again and actually what we will be exposing is the original iron that was used for the corner supports and the iron is exactly the same as what is on the porch so if you see on the front porch there, you'll see that decorative iron as a corner support is actually very similar to what's already there for the carport and we won't have to do anything but essentially paint that.

B. Lyman asked if they were also going to take out the side wall of the carport on the other side. B. Courtney said that they planned to leave the sidewall in there because he thought that could add a little character. He stated I don't think that we need to remove that, in fact, the sidewall looks like it was original to the house because the iron supports are at the top of that up to the ceiling of the carport.

B. Lyman said it sounds like they left a lot of the original parts in. B. Courtney said they really did. There were many of the elements of the house that are intact but they essentially just kind of worked around them so it will minimize what we have to do on the exterior. The bulk of the investment will be upgrading the interior and it has a full basement, too.

B. Lyman asked if the 6 over 6 windows were original to the house. B. Courtney answered yes. He added that in fact that he had a picture of a portion of the window and said so you can see Betsy that it is a pine window that had been stained and varnished and it is in really bad condition. He added that there were 21 windows in the home and to try and upgrade the home we felt it was better to make the investment of putting a new energy efficient window in rather than leaving the single pane windows in and the fact that this home is a modern home and felt that it would also be consistent with the neighborhood because the majority of the homes in that neighborhood although they are a lot older than this, I'd have to say the majority, not all, but a majority have vinyl clad windows. As it relates to the windows itself, we have done a lot of research on the windows and we want to put a good window in, not a cheap window that's off the shelf at one of the big Lowe's or Home Depot, so we've been working with Glass Unlimited for a Polaris Window, it's a custom made window, dual pane, energy efficient. It is vinyl clad but it is welded and it's also insulated, the vinyl cladding is also insulated, it's called a thermal weld window and I don't know if Jess had passed it around and circulated it to everybody.

V. Crisafulli said she did.

B. Courtney said it is actually a very good window for that particular property, and it's going to be a sizeable investment to replace 21 windows, even with a vinyl clad window, but of all the windows that I have looked at and we looked at least a dozen different types of windows for the budget that we have and the quality of window that we wanted to install, the Polaris really seems like it is one of the better windows. And again we're doing Glass Unlimited is the distributor for Polaris and it will look very nice, it will be energy efficient and it will be consistent with the other homes in the neighborhood.

P. Newhouse asked if the dimensions of the window spaces going to be the same. B. Courtney said that they were not changing any of the dimensions of the windows and added, we'll also have a grid inside the window for the 6 over 6 so again we'll custom make these windows. We'll order them and they will be custom made to match the existing openings for each of the windows and there is a lot of windows.

B. Lyman asked if they would be true divided lite or will there just be bars in there to make it look like it? B. Courtney answered that he thought that this particular window that they had selected, it is a vinyl grid that is attached to the window. I don't think it is manufactured inside the glass. But it'll look like a 6 over 6 window from the street.

P. Newhouse asked if it would have some depth to it or just a piece of tape. B. Courtney answered that it is vinyl so it's not tape, but it's like a vinyl snap-on.

V. Crisafulli asked if B. Courtney had done any comparison with aluminum clad wood windows. B. Courtney said the answer to your question is yes. He added, the cheapest, I wouldn't say it was a better window, but I did look into an aluminum clad window, it was probably almost twice the cost of this custom vinyl clad window and the

**Page 4**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

range went from twice to three times the cost to five times the cost to go up to an aluminum clad window or a wooden window. It was very expensive.

V. Crisafulli asked if he had that information for the Board. B. Courtney said yes, he added that he didn't have price sheets but he looked at Jen Weld, Reliabuilt, Larson, Comfort Built, Pella, Anderson, Hurd and Polaris and the least expensive aluminum clad window which I think is a Jen Weld or Hurd was probably in the \$500 - \$600 range. The quote I received from American Windows down in Charlestown ranged between \$900 to \$1500 for aluminum to wooden windows; and for the number of windows and again the modernness of this home, we wanted a good high quality energy efficient window and I think that we are getting a good quality window even though it is vinyl clad.

B. Lyman asked if the current storms were in bad shape. B. Courtney said they were in bad shape. He added that first of all it's just plain aluminum around there, some of the glass is broken in the windows, they don't slide up and down very well, screens are torn. This window will have the screen as well, it's a double hung window, the windows that are in this house are also double hung so we're not going from double hung to single hung, we're not cheapening anything. I think we are actually improving on the windows that are there even though it is a vinyl clad. Again for the dozens of windows that we looked at there, it's a, I think it's the right window to use for this particular structure and will add years and years of energy efficiency to the home.

Ron Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board. V. Crisafulli said she had one comment here. Knowing that our guidelines do not address very well buildings, structures that are non-contributing in the historic district and this house is one of those, I think as we look over the next few months about ways to improve our Guidelines and make them clearer to the public I think that we do need to spell that out much more clearly in the Guidelines. And I think that will be very important.

B. Courtney said, the Historic Guidelines don't address modern structures very well at all. V. Crisafulli said that is true. B. Courtney said and maybe that was intentional because they are not contributing to the historic district. V. Crisafulli said although the conundrum now is that a lot of those are over 50 years which meet the 50 year rule for being historic and your house is certainly in that. B. Courtney said right, but if you, you're right, I mean I think the National Park Service would follow that definition but the ordinance actually says it's historic if it is 50 years old and has contributing features that are architecturally, architectural features that are worth preserving and I don't think this structure falls into that category so the ordinance actually delineates not just age but characteristics of the property that are worth preserving which I think is the right focus to have honestly. It sounds like whoever drafted that ordinance put a lot of thought into that ordinance for not only what they wanted to preserve but where they wanted to preserve it and I agree with you Valecia that as you start evaluating Design Guidelines and perhaps even the ordinance and maybe taking a comprehensive approach to what are the goals of the historic district board of review relative to preserving properties that have important characteristics in downtown Madison while at the same time attracting capital to remove blight to some of our neighborhoods and that's again, this is a great neighborhood in a high car vehicular traffic area that is essentially was allowed over years to become blighted and again the assessed value dropped 70%. Our job is to fix this up, restore the character to the neighborhood and also be an economic benefit to the community is a nice home that will be properly accounted for on the tax roles, so there are all kinds of benefits to doing what we are proposing. V. Crisafulli added that I think your idea about the section to address 1960s houses is certainly appropriate for the guidelines. Is it your intent to rent the property or to resell it? B. Courtney said we will resell this.

P. Newhouse asked, how many bedrooms, how many baths? B. Courtney answered that it was 3 bedrooms, it is like a typical ranch honestly, it's a three bedroom, two bathroom ranch although, unique to downtown Madison I think is the fact that this has a concrete block dry basement that also had a bath in the basement which we're not going to fix that up, it's too far gone. The bath in the basement is in really, really bad shape, but upstairs there's a lot of potential to create a really nice comfortable living space with the amount of bedrooms and bathrooms that are on the main floor and it's single story too so and coveted off-street parking. Which is always nice, downtown, you know what I'm talking about. Ron Hopper asked if the Board had any more questions or comments. B. Lyman said that she just wanted to make a statement and that David, this is probably a question for you. She added I was

**Page 5**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

examining our ordinance for nonrated buildings and as I understand you have a nonrated building in a primary area of the Historic District. Then she asked B. Courtney, do you agree with that? B. Courtney said it is in the very tip of the primary area. B. Lyman said just right on the edge. B. Courtney said right on the edge darn it. B. Lyman laughed and said you can see the other side. B. Courtney said yes. B. Lyman said so, it states that 151.33 on the non-rated buildings in primary areas that if you're, I'm sure you are familiar with this, but I was just going to read it, that construction of a new building or a 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 district, particularly with buildings designated as historic. She asked Board Attorney David Sutter, is that our guidance?

D. Sutter said that's what the ordinance says. B. Lyman stated that is what the ordinance says. D. Sutter said that as far as your guidance, I mean there are a number of things that can guide you with decisions, certainly we do have, I mean there are guidelines, I certainly understand Mr. Courtney's position with regard to his property, but yes, that's how the ordinance is written, yes. B. Lyman said I know we have talked a lot about whether they are historic or nonrated and I guess that we are talking that this is a nonrated building in a primary area and this is what is said that we should be following. D. Sutter said that is correct. V. Crisafulli said, but that last phrase, particularly for buildings that are deemed historic seems to give a little bit more weight to those. B. Lyman says yes, it says will be compatible with other buildings and spaces in the historic area particularly with buildings designated as historic. I just wanted to make sure we were all on the same page with that.

B. Courtney said that he agreed with B. Lyman's comment. He added that he was trying to find the application to the building, if you could expand. Hopefully you're saying hey if this was a historic property in the primary area you might have a different opinion about the windows. Hopefully that's what you were trying to say.

B. Lyman said that she was just stating this is a nonrated building in a primary area and that's our guidance. P. Newhouse said well, there are two words that we always kind of fight over and that is conspicuous change, so to me, to put these kind of windows on a 1960s ranch house, there's no conspicuous change. As a matter of fact it may be for the better so I'm not conflicted by that at all.

B. Courtney said the he would also say that the ordinance also talks about the importance of stabilizing property values and not making alternations that would be in conflict with other properties in the area. And that's why I was trying to point out that the majority of the homes in this particular part of town, while it is primary based on the map have gone through the replacement windows process over whatever period of time and the majority of them are vinyl and I would say that, I would go one step further and say that some of the best kept properties in that area have really great owners who take care of their property and the windows look fine.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions or comments. Then he asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. Hearing none, he asked if we had a motion.

P. Newhouse moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 424 East Fourth Street if constructed according to the plans on submitted on February 10, 2016 and modified on March 28<sup>th</sup> is compatible with the character in the Historic District and adjoining properties. The house built in the 1960s is not rated as contributing to the Historic District, however it has integrity of its own from that time period. It would be appropriate to return the southeast room back to its original use, a carport, and replacing the windows with vinyl as proposed by the owner could be allowed in this instance due to the non-historic status of the structure as long as the original window spaces are maintained. A wrought iron fence will replace the chain link fence that runs from the southeast corner of the house to the sidewalk and a wood shadowbox fence will replace the chain link in the rear of the house. If these proposed changes are followed, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. A. Roller seconded the motion.

**Page 6**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

**Roll Call:**

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

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

**2. Curtis M. Jacobs – C. of A. to Enclose existing carport for garage, and installing 7’x18’ overhead door; add 8’x15’ addition on east side of garage with 7’x6’ overhead door; replace screen with windows on porch and connect porch to garage with addition**

**Location: 718 Fillmore Alley**

**Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

J. Butler presented a PowerPoint of photos on this property. She stated that she wanted the Board to have the hard copy of the floor plan so she gave a copy to them so the members could pass it around. She stated that this house was built in 1980, it is listed in the District survey as noncontributing. There are two perspectives, one from Vaughn Drive and the other from Fillmore Alley. The application has a change in footprint with the house but the only area for the change in the footprint is between a current existing porch and a bumped out carport area being applied for enclosure. So that being said, it would not be visible from the right of way where the change of footprint is proposed to happen as you can see in the site plan there. She projected an image on the screen and said this would be the proposed Fillmore Alley perspective of the two garages. And then added I can let the applicant speak to what otherwise what might be a part of this project, but again, it is a noncontributing structure and the primary application is to enclose the current carport. Also part of this application is to build a deck on the Vaughn Street side of the building. You might call it a front, I like to on the Riverside. And in the Guidelines a deck is not supported, so much as a porch, but this is an exception in my viewpoint from that because it would naturally be a deck on a house like this and not a ground level porch. So that is the other part of the application.

C. Jacobs said why don't we start with the garage in the back. What we are proposing to do is to simply put sides on the existing carport. It will be a cement board kind of construction. We haven't really decided if it will be clapboard or shingle. There will be a window in the side which will be identical to the windows that are already in the house. Added on to the east side of the original garage, of the carport, there will be a small garage which will be, can be used for a golf cart, jet ski, something like that. It would have no windows except in the front which faces the south. This garage would be visible from Fillmore Alley but not from Vaughn Drive. As the Board members were looking at the plan, C. Jacobs stated that just to the left there is where the new structure, if there is a new structure, would go. It would blend in very well with the current design of the house.

B. Lyman asked if an architect designed the house originally. C. Jacobs said, yes an architect did do this originally, the name escapes me, it was an architectural firm from Cincinnati. B. Lyman said it looks like the lower level or what you would say is the basement view from Vaughn Street has the mirror image of the windows from the upper level. C. Jacobs said that was true and there was a window like that on the back of the porch and that is what would go on the side of the garage.

A. Roller asked if the deck was going to be between those windows, on the little part out to the left. C. Jacobs said it would be out to the right, as you look at it. B. Lyman said on the Vaughn side. C. Jacobs said that deck will be 16 feet wide and 8 feet long and it will project basically, it will just extend the porch. Where you see the two windows now, it will come out from there and will be 16 feet wide.

J. Butler said the picture that C. Jacobs had submitted was of your western side neighbor and their porch. C. Jacobs said right. J. Butler asked if the porch would be similar to that. She added that in speaking with C. Jacobs representative at the time of the application it would be either wood or wrought iron posts and then probably composite decking like Trex material. C. Jacobs said that's true. He added that most of the houses along there either have decks or a patio. This is the porch, the deck will be out here, on the riverside obviously. This room would then be extended back to the garage.

**Page 7**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

B. Lyman said so it would be an enclosed way that you can walk between the garage. C. Jacobs said well the garage would just but up to it, there would be a door to the garage. In other words, this room will basically double in size. Why they ever left this little notch, but I'm not an architect. The windows in the new room will be the same size as the screens in this room and be very similar to the other windows in the house. They may not be quite exactly the same size, but as much as they can. Of course, these windows will go away. The windows in the side nobody can see them but the neighbor and the windows in the front, well one will be a window and one will be a door to access the deck. He asked if there were any other questions.

V. Crisafulli said she had a comment on this one. She stated given the fact that this is another noncontributing structure in the District and particularly the situation we have here, I think that the important character of this house is what you see from the river and what you see from Vaughn rather than Fillmore. And so is it your intent, am I correct that it will be in keeping with the other houses along there? C. Jacobs said yes, I guess what you see from the river, you would see this deck which will not, it will stick out 8 feet. It will not really go in front of those windows the big windows there. V. Crisafulli said it will be on the right. C. Jacobs said it will be on the right as you look at it and I do not, I don't envision, let's say I envision the railing to be as inconspicuous as possible. V. Crisafulli, you know I hadn't thought of this before but as we take another more thorough look at our Guidelines, maintaining the river character along there, at some point might, we might want to figure that in too because I think that is an important part of our heritage and I appreciate those structures along there. C. Jacobs said it would be our intention to make the changes as unobtrusive as possible.

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

B. Lyman moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 718 Fillmore Alley if constructed according to the plans submitted on March 1, 2016 with additional materials submitted on March 22 and discussed at the March 28, 2016 Board meeting is compatible with the character of the Historic District. Specifically the project includes enclosing the existing carport on the north façade of the house to create a garage that has a 7' X 18' overhead door and an 8' X 15' addition on the east side of the garage that has a 7' X 6' overhead door. Also on the south façade of the house, the porch screens will be replaced with wood windows and a new addition will be constructed to connect the porch with the garage. The architecture of these additions will match the existing house and materials will be of wood and cement board. This project conforms to page 68 of the Madison Residential Design Review Guidelines which states that additions should be of a compatible design in keeping with the original building's design, roof, shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights. Also a new 8' X 16' deck constructed on the south side of the house with treated lumber conforms to page 64 of the Guidelines which states that decks are acceptable at the rear façade. A Certificate of Appropriateness should therefore be given. It was seconded by Pam Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

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

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

**3. Scott Lynch – C. of A. to replace roof and siding with Hardie Board; add windows to south side; install new concrete or composite decking on covered slab area; place landscaping to define property lines**

**Location: 103 E. Vaughn Drive**

**Zoned: Open Space (OS)**

J. Butler displayed pictures and described the project. She said I promise we'll get to contributing structures, but this is not one. This is non-rated; it is not on the registry at all. Again it is at 103 E. Vaughn

**Page 8**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

Drive and really the application is to make this into a much more hospitable character structure, to apply Hardie board siding and standing seam metal roof, enhance the chimney with stone, stacked stone and install two windows on the south façade and new decking under the canopy portions. So that is the application. It will change the character of this shelter building, but then it is a non-contributing structure and I'll let the applicant speak to additional details.

R. Hopper asked what the purpose would be once it's finished. S. Lynch said a gathering area. R. Hopper said just part of the park. S. Lynch said yes. V. Crisafulli asked if Mr. Lynch was working with Friends of Hargan Matthews Park at all. S. Lynch said no. V. Crisafulli said that they were doing that adjacent area I think and that might be a great partnership for you on this because they are doing just wonderful plans and I think that would enhance what you're doing. I'll give you their contact information.

S. Lynch said that he was flexible on the windows. I just wanted to get some natural light and the standing seam roof would match the one down the street with the new restaurant facility. P. Newhouse asked what color the roof would be. S. Lynch stated kind of that burnished tan.

P. Newhouse said that she did have a concern about your shutters; that may be the least of things. I do feel that you need to have louvered shutters there. Right now it shows some sort of another style, but louvered shutters are compatible with the District. S. Lynch said absolutely. A. Roller said shutters that visually look right on the windows, the scale should be right. Just so they would look like they would close and fit the window. S. Lynch said sure.

B. Lyman asked what was this before. S. Lynch said that he understood the Cox family owned all of the property including the Mumbles and that there was a saw mill there and where the silos is where they stored saw dust. B. Lyman said that's what this was built for originally. S. Lynch said I understand there was a saw mill there a long, long time ago. B. Lyman asked what the inside was like, stud wall? S. Lynch said no it was block. A. Roller asked if it was used for storage. That's what it was? S. Lynch said I guess. A. Roller asked if there was a chimney now. S. Lynch said no. We're going to add that. It will be stacked stone.

V. Crisafulli said that this would be a great addition to the adjacent park. S. Lynch said it would tie in well with the events and things and we'll do some fun stuff with it. J. Butler said it would be a great opportunity for public art on the silos or grain bins, muralized.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Hearing none, he asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. He asked if we had a motion.

P. Newhouse moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 103 E. Vaughn if constructed according to the plans submitted on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016 is compatible with the character of the Historic District and adjoining properties. This is not an historic structure and the property is zoned open space (OS) but it is sited on a conspicuous lot on Vaughn Drive along the river, therefore it is important that the renovation follow certain guidelines of the Historic District. Specifically reference number, paragraph number 151.33 Nonrated buildings in primary areas of the Historic District ordinance states in part that the alteration conspicuously affecting the external appearance of any 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. Therefore the use of Hardie Board siding is appropriate and the proposed metal roof is acceptable as are the creation of windows on the south façade. If decorative shutters are installed they should be louvered in style reflecting the type that is commonly seen in the Historic District and they should be correctly proportioned to the window size. Under these guidelines a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. B. Lyman seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

A. Roller        Approved  
 B. Lyman        Approved  
 P. Newhouse    Approved



**Page 9**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

V. Crisafulli     Approved  
 R. Hopper        Approved

V. Crisafulli said she would send S. Lynch the contact information. B. Lyman thanked Mr. Lynch for making this investment.

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

**4. William Peckenpaugh – C. of A. to remove and replace 24 existing windows (wood for wood); repair front doors; tuck point building; repair brick in NW corner**

**Location: 207-215 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Street**

**Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

J. Butler presented information about the structure. She said this shared wall construction or duplex is a contributing structure within the District, built in 1840. The application is primarily repairs. But there will be replacement of 24 windows on site. That is a wood for wood replacement and the applicant submitted the design of the wood windows to go into these 24 openings. There is brickwork, repaired front door, brickwork, a lot of tuck pointing, painting will be a part of the project and we've discussed that of course does not need your review so I'll let the applicant take it from here.

W. Peckenpaugh said that it was basically the purple mansion of First Street. It has been the occasion of not very reputable place of business. The owners bought this a few years ago. They do plan to paint it. We actually have some swatches on the front. We had to go ahead and fix the corner of the building before it deteriorated worse and repairs would have been more extensive.

V. Crisafulli asked if Mr. Peckenpaugh was the contractor. He replied yes. He then said that they intend to sink several thousands of dollars into this property and try to improve its worth.

A. Roller asked if Mr. Peckenpaugh had taken the pictures. He replied yes. She stated that she wanted to say how much she appreciated the thoroughness of this. We could really see the deterioration. Quite often we don't get that and I really, really appreciate that.

Mr. Peckenpaugh said I guess that is basically it. They are not going to try and do anything that's not within the ordinance or anything like that. They just want to get your blessing.

V. Crisafulli said please let them know how much we appreciate replacing wood with wood windows. That's the right thing to do on this building and we really appreciate that investment that they are making there. W. Peckenpaugh said that they have found if a wood window is treated with a process called AuraLast. V. Crisafulli asked where he found that. Mr. Peckenpaugh answered that believe it or not, Lowes found that. It's fairly new to the world of construction but turns out to be about twenty years old.

B. Lyman asked if the building had stone sills. Mr. Peckenpaugh said yes. B. Lyman asked if his intention was to keep all the openings the same size, along with the trims. Mr. Peckenpaugh said that is correct, they'll be the appropriate size to just pop in there.

P. Newhouse said she thought the stone stoop was so nice, the front stoop. Others said that was on the next house, but this had a nice one, too.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or from the audience. 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 property at 207 – 215 W. First Street as submitted on March 17 and discussed on March 28, 2016 to remove and replace twenty-four existing wood windows, replacing with wood, repair the front doors with wood and tuck point the building and repair the brick in the northwest corner in sensitive manner with mortar that matches the original in appearance and composition. References: the Residential Design Review Guidelines, page 87, note that the use of Portland cement is

**Page 10**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

not appropriate due to the hardness of the mortar versus the softness of the brick. And you are aware of that. Seconded by B. Lyman

Roll Call:

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

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

**5. William Peckenpaugh – C. of A. to remove and replace 4 windows (wood for wood); remove and replace front steps; repair box gutter; remove and replace shingle roof; repair both chimneys and front door; replace side door with wood door; repair fascia and soffit**

**Location: 907 W. Main Street**

**Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

J. Butler reviewed the application. She stated that the owners of this property were here and talking about how they would like to be on TV earlier if you have questions. V. Crisafulli said she thought they ought to come up here. J. Butler said that this structure was built in 1850 and is contributing to the Historic District. It's similar in scope, much of the work, much is repair and the primary change to the aesthetic of the front façade is going to be this new stoop. She asked if the Board could see the projection of that drawing. The Board replied yes. She continued to say that this is a forty-eight by forty eight stoop and she did want some clarification on how far out into the, is it forty-eight inches out into the sidewalk? Mr. Peckenpaugh said yes. J. Butler said that currently it was at thirty, so she did verify with the street department that forty-eight inches would be fine. There is ten feet of sidewalk but I wanted to make sure we got there okay at forty-eight inches. So that is a redesigned stoop and the windows will be changed out with wood, the same product as with the last structure and here are some of the area of focus of attention of damage is pretty apparent and the applicant can answer additional questions.

W. Peckenpaugh stated that again, because of the leaking problem in the front they had already repaired the box gutter. It does have another layer that has to go up under the gutter. The roofing will be shingle for shingle so it is within the guidelines. Actually the façade of the front of this building is fairly unique because the front of the building yellow part on up is all galvanized metal, hard to find. Sconces were tricky thing that were hard to get figured out. The dedication these folks have to get into this project, again to put several thousand dollars in downtown Madison. I understand that this was at one time a church. But they are going to try and repair what they can, we're going to try and repair the front door rather than a replacement. The front windows, again, have severe damage to them, a lot of rot, insects invasion. So we are going to replace them with wooden windows and they will be 2 over 2 so they will look exactly like the ones that are there. The front stoop is kind of a hazard in two ways, one if you are walking down the street the other if walking out the door. It has like 9 ½" risers on there. I don't even attempt it without someone to help me. And our idea of bringing the stoop out and split it in the center both ways so that we can get in enough steps without intruding out into the sidewalk and we'll make the railing in the front wrought iron but the middle section will be removable so that you can take furniture in and out. V. Crisafulli said that was smart.

A. Roller asked what is the little thing; when you look at the house to the left, that little thing that sort of sits out. Do you know what I'm talking about? It has some sort of decorative thing over it? As you face the house if you just walk to the left a little bit there is something with a door on it. W. Peckenpaugh said that like many residences in Madison, it is an add-on at some time. A. Roller said okay. W. Peckenpaugh added that it has a bad piece of metal up on top of the transom?. Roller asked if that was going to stay though, were they going to leave that? Mr. Peckenpaugh said yes. The owners are going to fix that area themselves; they'll cut my wages off at some point.

J. Butler said that she had talked to the owners of the property about what they could do over there to meet the fence guidelines on that side of the house.

**Page 11**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

V. Crisafulli asked if the owners were going to be living in the property or are they planning to rent. Oh, they plan to live in it. B. Lyman said hats off, I mean this is a really significant building in a very main part of town. V. Crisafulli said it was seen the minute you come down to down from down 7 and coming in 56 as well. B. Lyman said it was fantastic what the owners were doing. V. Crisafulli said that she really appreciated the fact that you all are replacing the wood windows with wood. Thank you. Mr. Peckenpaugh said the homeowners were going to also paint this building.

B. Lyman said that she did have a question about the 2 over 2 because she saw on the application W. Peckenpaugh had kind of drawn the muntin in, and asked if he was going to get true divided lite windows? Mr. Peckenpaugh said they won't be divided they will have a piece on the outside. B. Lyman said a muntin that you. They won't be an in-pane sort of thing. B. Lyman said that she saw, that she was noticing on the specs of the windows that he was ordering them without trim so she asked if his intention was to recreate all the trim that is there? Mr. Peckenpaugh said right. And again, the windows are, the trim comes on the windows, it doesn't have a brick mould or anything on it so it is sort of much like we had on the last property. You have limestone bases. B. Lyman said it seems like the jamb is the trim on this so you are going to make that the same. Mr. Peckenpaugh agreed. B. Lyman said okay.

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

V. Crisafulli moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 907 W. Main Street as submitted on March the 7<sup>th</sup> and discussed on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016 to remove and replace four wood windows with wood windows, remove and replace the front steps modifying the stoop to have wrought iron rails, repair the box gutter, remove and replace the shingle roof, repair both chimneys and the front door, replace the side door with a wood door and repair the fascia and soffit noting that these particular features are character defining to a contributing structure in the Historic District and they may be repaired or restored but not lost or otherwise modified. Additional references in the Residential Design Review Guidelines page 27 note that much of the work proposed is ordinary maintenance and repair which if performed to restore the same as nearly as may be practical to its original does not need a COA and on page 87 note that the use of Portland cement again is not appropriate due to the hardness of the mortar versus the softness of the brick. Seconded by A. Roller.

**Roll Call:**

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

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

**6. Earthen Stone (Julie Brown) – C. of A. to add new floor joists, stone foundation, and sill plate; replace siding with like material; remove/replicate scroll work; finish footer/foundation to west addition; frame out over north addition foundation; roof with standing seam (if economically feasible) or shingle; rework old windows or replace with wood.**

**Location: 118 W. 5th Street**

**Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)**

J. Butler reviewed the application for the Board. She stated that it was built in 1860 and is a contributing structure and as J. Brown had said, it was one the Board was familiar with. It was that the Certificate of Appropriateness issued before had expired at this point, so it needs review. Everything is to be like materials and replications of what's missing in terms of the details of the architecture. There are a couple of new windows being proposed, new openings and the location of one is to be centered versus off centered where it sits now, so that's a consideration that the Board has before them since Guidelines do want the openings to remain, but I think there were some original openings that have been filled in so where these are, opening them back up would be entirely supported by guidelines. There is an addition on the north side of the house being proposed, a porch is being removed, the shed roof porch that you see a little bit of here, but that addition is not visible so much from Fifth Street so the applicant

**Page 12**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

can discuss if anything has changed from the original COA. They are rebuilding one of the chimneys which is a good thing and you can see where it did exist.

J. Brown said it is a big project and her priority right now is to work on the foundation and the back, frame it up as we had originally planned. A. Roller asked if J. Brown was going to put stone over that concrete block. J. Brown asked what she meant. A. Roller said the foundation. J. Brown said that they had to jack the house up because right not the joists are laying in the dirt. That's where they were. A. Roller asked if there was some stone block in the back outlining. J. Brown said yes, that was going to be the garage. She added that they had already started on a lot of that, but right now they have it supported and they need to add another beam through, he wants to lift it like 12 inches so that it is like to the street height and then he is going to fill those pockets with stone and then lay down a sill plate because right now it doesn't have one. And then the addition that was over there on the side and its foundation was just bricks laying on its side with like 2 foot of dirt and the rest of it was sand so we've removed all that and put a foundation in block and then put up more block and then he is going to stone it and back fill. That's my priority right now is to get that part down and then frame up the back where the addition will be for the kitchen.

P. Newhouse asked if J. Brown had a long term time line for all this. J. Brown said, long time, that it is just going to be, that they both worked full time so it just going to be. P. Newhouse asked if it was going to be a residence when she was done. J. Brown said maybe. I don't know yet, But we do all our own work most of it and so except for some of the utilities. So we will be redoing the windows, there will be aluminum clad windows in the back, but that's on the Creekside, but on the front it will be reworked windows and probably two wooden storms on there too. We're going to take the scroll work off and replicate it like we've done that before on another house out of I don't know what kind of wood he's going to use but one that is long standing and that matches completely because there is nice scrollwork on the front and on the addition so we'll have to cut that out because it was already damaged so he's going to do all that. V. Crisafulli said that was an important feature as you know on the house. J. Brown said yes, they were going to cut it out to have a pattern and then he is going to scroll that back out to match it to be identical. The window that he was talking about is on that side, on the west side right there where that octagon window is or that six figure window. There was a window to match the one on the front, the one that is closest to the road, so that framing had that kind of window there, somebody at some point they put that six sided window in. We're going to take it back and rebuild the window to match the one that had been taken out and then he wants to add a third one just to make it symmetrical, or to make it nice, there wasn't a window there, to make that side look nice and put that metal window in. B. Lyman asked that it looked like she had drawn in 4 over 4s and if that was what was throughout house. J. Brown said that whatever was there, they were going to match it. She thought it was 4 over 4s. B. Lyman said that's kind of what that drawing looked like on that side there and asked if that their intention. J. Brown said yes. B. Lyman asked about the gothic window on the front and asked if that was glass above there. J. Brown answered, the scroll? B. Lyman said the top the arch. J. Brown said that was wood. She said that wasn't in too bad of shape. The whole front wasn't in too bad of shape and that she was going to scrape it but she wants to get the foundation gets finished before she puts scaffolding in and then finish scrape it. And then I don't know if we'll have to redo the, I don't remember what it's called, redo the vent or not. But that's a window there and we'll put back the window panes back in. V. Crisafulli said that this was a wonderful structure. J. Brown said it is and she has every intention of getting this done. V. Crisafulli thanked J. Brown for putting in wood windows with wood and being sensitive to that. J. Brown said the standing seam, they were trying to find a product that was affordable and if they can't, they would use shingles, but that her intention was to find standing seam. She said she's heard of one that is decently priced and where they could do the labor and install it so.

Ron Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board and then if there were any questions of comments from the audience. Building Inspector Mark Johnson said first of all Julie, I would like to compliment you on what you've done with your personal house over on Broadway, the exterior of it looks great. It took a little time to do that and I complement you on that. The fact is we have a new Trilogy Building, the residents are on the top floor now, they see that property. I receive complaints so far and I've kind of softened that a little bit because I know this has been since 2012, that structure has been sitting there up on steel somewhat an unsafe structure according to the building codes. And I have filled out that document out a couple different times and we were going to come before the Board or

**Page 13**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

we were going to do something and it didn't happen but I know that, that part of town with the new business there, Welch Build Works is in progress of being progressive down there and taken pride in what is going to go in there. There is no doubt in my mind that you can do what you say you are going to do, okay. You and your contractor proved that over on Elm Street with a structure that he was involved with raising it up, he raised it up and he put it back down. And there is no doubt but it didn't take five years to do it. Like I said, I have an unsafe structure sitting there, the liability issue of that, there is kids to the east there. We have lucked out that nothing has happened there, we have lucked out that we haven't had any high winds or anything to topple that thing over. So this last time I told Jessica that if we're not in here going forward with this I'm going to recommend either demolition of it or someone to buy it and get this project going. So I thank you for coming in. At least tempting to go forward with this but it can't be five years. I mean the project could be, I don't care about the inside, but we've got to get that thing sitting on a foundation and then structurally safe.

R. Hopper asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. V. Crisafulli thanked M. Johnson. R. Hopper asked for the motion.

A. Roller moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on March 8<sup>th</sup> and discussed on March 28, is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for the following: I just listed everything; foundations, the original foundation material should be preserved and maintained and should be repaired and maintained and keeping; siding, original wood, weather board, clapboard, shingles and board and batten should be maintained, architectural features, original architectural detailing such as gingerbread, trim board should be preserved and maintained. Roofs, original roof forms should be preserved and maintained, original material should be preserved or replaced, if not practical replacement with an appropriate substitute material is appropriate. Windows, historic windows should be retained, maintained and if needed repaired. Additions, additions should be where they will have the least effect on the buildings overall form and plan and should reflect the characteristics of the current period and design. The Guidelines are being met, therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

**The motioned passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.**

R. Hopper advised the Applicant to work with M. Johnson on the safety issues because that was not something under the Board purview.

R. Hopper stated that concluded our applications and asked if there was any old business. Hearing none he asked if there was any new business. An audience member came forward to speak. R. Hopper asked him to state his name.

Mike Pittman, 420 Elm Street, 403 West 4<sup>th</sup>, the garages, 1014 W. 1<sup>st</sup>. It has been an interesting five months. Many of you have been involved in some of the meetings I've been in with my wife. But I thought a lot about what I was going to say because Ron, you addressed us after the application was approved in the December Historic Board but I thought that rather than trying to rehash history I'm looking forward. And I think that one of the things that I think that is very important is that the Historic Board does have a Code of Ethics. And I think that the Code of Ethics is very important. And it is three pages long in case you haven't seen it, it is on the website. It was done in 2011 by Ginger Jorgensen and she was Chairman. I sat where you are Ron when I was Chairman, I've sat where you are when I was on the Board and it's a tough position. But there are certain elements that I think are important that we all adhere to in roles, especially dealing with the public. When you look at the code of ethics, two stick out in my mind, that I'd like to just read to you so you are aware of them and you can go on record as heard them. In the HDRB's Historic District Board of Review, the HDBR and staff shall treat all citizens fairly, impartially and with respect and refrain from discrimination or harassment of any kind. That's number

**Page 14**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

two. On down the page is one I think is very important. I think really needs to be adhered to. The HDBR staff and staff shall avoid dishonesty, never misrepresenting facts or distorting information or achieved desired outcomes. And I think these are two real important things that you all need to think about and look at in your future dealings with the public, with other preservation staffs and with the City Officials. Thank you.

Ron Hopper said thank you for your comments. Are there any other comments or any other...

(Note: As Board Member Crisafulli responded, Mr. and Mrs. Pittman left the City Meeting Hall)

Valecia Crisafulli said I have a comment on that. Mr. Pittman, I have served on a number of public boards and I will have to say that I have never served on a Board where I feel like the members of the Board are as attuned to being ethical, being honest, and representing as fairly as they possibly can the people that come before them in attempting not to discriminate. I think what we have found in our work, and one of the reasons that we are addressing the guidelines right now, is that our guidelines are not clear in many places and so that causes us to have questions and I think in the past has caused us to us to perhaps be inconsistent in votes and it could be perceived that we are not treating the public fairly, that's what we are trying to clear up. But I will have to say that this Board that I am privileged to serve on and to serve with, I don't know any more ethical people who think and put the time in and I would have to say that the behavior of people coming before this Board has not always been to treat this Board with the respect that I think the kind of work that it puts in it deserves. And um, not only the Board but I'd like to commend Jess Butler who serves as our staff, who puts in the time to research all this and who has been highly ethical and concerned about treating citizens fairly and quite honestly I don't think it's fair to not respond to an implication that we haven't tried to be as fair as we have, we can.

Ron Hopper replied well said. I agree. Thank you.

Betsy Lyman said I agree as well. Thank you for saying that.

Ron Hooper asked for other new business. We have a new form that we are going to vote on.

J. Butler said yes. I do not have a projection of the form but we reviewed and changed the layout of the application. She asked if B. Lyman had a copy with her. She said she was sorry she didn't. J. Butler said that the Board had all reviewed that. She said she could go back and get one but that would be a print copy and then asked if everyone had had the chance to review it. R. Hopper said that he believed the Board had agreed to the changes to make it more user-friendly and more thorough and I think we just needed an official vote tonight to approve it. V. Crisafulli said if she could say one thing since we didn't have it to project it on screen, I think that one of the major changes that is so good on this is that one each point on the application the corresponding pages in the guidelines are noted so that an applicant knows exactly where to go to read about what is recommended and isn't left in the dark on that and I think your work in pulling together those pages for each step in the application really will make it easier and again all this is to make it clearer for the applicant so that they won't be confused and thank you Betsy and Jess for what you did on this and Ann.

Ron Hopper asked if we could have a roll call on that and said this is to approve the new application form. D. Sutter noted that he hadn't heard a motion or a second yet. R. Hopper thanked D. Sutter for clarifying that and then asked for a motion.

V. Crisafulli moved that we approve the new application. P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

**Page 15**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

The motion carried and the new COA application was approved.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other new business. J. Butler said there was. In a discussion on signs versus public art. We have supported public art and murals throughout town and that is great and I think we want to see more of that. Recently it has come to me not in application form but just in discussion that the Farmers Market would like to be a part of installing painting a mural on the Galena Garlic building that states much the same as the familiar right across the street here sign that states Madison's Chautauqua is the last full weekend of every September. The one on Galena Garlic would state in summer months on Saturday at this location. But there would be conflict in other codes that I've worked with in the difference between the art and the sign because we cannot allow advertisements to be larger than and more in number than what's allowed by sign code. And seriously I cannot find where that was discussed at the time of this mural, but it is an advertisement for Chautauqua so it is something that we need to discuss. I can't review it as staff as one or the other because it is really somewhere in between and I have thought of how, even though it is not in text, we can support this. Of course we can support the entire façade being covered in what is art, if it is a mural. But the portion of it that advertises the event would technically be under review as a sign and the problem with that is that it is an off premise sign which is not allowed anywhere in the city. So the only thing that I have found that I would like to support and whether we can do this without being in the text, but again this is somewhere in between and we deal with a lot of in between type reviews is when it is an organization that does not have a location where they can place a sign allowing them to be at some specification as part of public art advertised. And this could be a Ribberfest or a River Roots Festival. I mean those festivals, Regatta here is the art, but they do have a property where they technically could put a sign but I see the Farmers Market and Chautauqua as being different businesses for organizations. We couldn't open ourselves up for instance having Shooters put a mural that says Shooters four blocks east. I mean we can't open ourselves up to any other advertising in the form of a mural so it's a dilemma that I'm having that I think we should consider in changes to sign guidelines but. A. Roller asked if they were talking about a mural or just a sign. J. Butler said it will be a mural. V. Crisafulli said she had a question for J. Butler. Given the fact that the location of the Farmers Market is right there next is that technically an off premise sign. J. Butler said it was. It has to be on the property of the business. V. Crisafulli said what about wording on the sign that does not advertise the Farmers Market. For example it doesn't say every Saturday morning, it doesn't even necessarily need to say Farmers Market but it could say something like locally grown or locally grown in Madison or something like that. J. Butler said yes I think that is fully allowed, the key is text and even that can be up for debate if that is an advertisement. I have said to others who are interested in this opportunity for a mural that I would fully support in being a harvest mural. I mean that advertises. A. Roller asked what if they had a mural of a Farmers Market and just put Farmers Market on it. If you are not putting the time and date would that be alright. J. Butler said I think that would be fine also. Just the same as the river and boat races. However we can understand it to be art versus advertisement so we aren't opening ourselves up to off premise signs. I can't approve an off premise sign and so I would want your understanding of maybe how we are going to approach this in the future and I've never heard of a complaint of this sign. R. Hopper said he was trying to remember, that he thought they had come before the Board for that mural. J. Butler asked if they called it a sign. R. Hopper said no it was mural and I think that was the poster of Chautauqua for that year so it was more of an historic thing and it would have the old bridge in it. I think that was the thought. V. Crisafulli said that she thought the Board should work with the Farmers Market in any way we could to get something like this that is artistic. J. Butler said so that will be something. R. Hopper said it could be something that we could clarify when we are working on the new guidelines. J. Butler said so you will still see the proposed mural when they conceptualize one, but I wanted to bring up the discussion on this. V. Crisafulli asked if the property owner is in favor of this. J. Butler replied yes, very much so. J. Butler asked if any of the interested parties in the audience wanted to speak.

Jesse Earnst of 503 Broadway came forward. J. Earnst said that he worked with the new board for the Farmers Market and they were trying to think of, they were thinking more of a sign, but if it needs to be a mural, it can be a mural. They would like it to state Madison's Farmers Market and state Saturday mornings from 8 to noon, May, no from the beginning of April, April through October. I know like this is one example of something that is similar; it says when the festival is, it says what the festival is and then I noticed another example, is down, just at the end of West Street here on the river and Vaughn Drive, there is a metal frame it says Rock n Thunder and it has all the different festivals there signs and they

**Page 16**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

are there all year. So I don't know how that compares or how we can make that work, but I know that Bob was gracious enough to offer the side of the building there. It's something permanent in the area to bring more customers. V. Crisafulli said I think that's great.

Bob Waller came forward and said good evening. I guess for the purpose of this forum 402 Broadway, home is at Cherry Trace. Our involvement is that we were approached by Farmers Market over the owner our business, Galena Garlic, graciously agreed to allow for it to be allowed for it to be put on the building. His preference for it is that it is a physical object that has been painted and then mounted not actually painted on the building itself, and that's the difference between sign and a mural. I mean that could have been on a piece of metal or wood which is pretty good size and then mounted against the building, still not. And I guess that I'm the one that kind of came back after we talked about this and said if it can't be done to our building, how did it that get done. I think that's pretty much when the train went off the track. So to say, but that's our only involved is giving permission to use the side of the building as we have for the electrical and it helps the events and wifi and all that. We want to be good partners to the city.

P. Newhouse asked what would be the size of it. B. Waller said well that I think that could be the guidelines it couldn't exceed a certain amount of square footage as I recall. J. Butler said if Galena Garlic wanted to give up one of their signs we could have that discussion on that façade because the guidelines actually limit you to one attached sign per façade. You will be rather limited if we are going by sign guidelines, and to consider the mural which has been the decision made in the past and what I am able to site multiple murals is that it is considered paint. V. Crisafulli said public art. J. Butler said yes, it is public art. R. Hopper said rather than a sign. J. Butler said and because it is painted on the buildings and because we do not review paint, ever, it is paint, so attaching it I think it puts us in a different little dilemma. I think it needs to be painted. That's been decided in the past. B. Waller said and that maybe where this needs to go. J. Butler said but again, we have to do something whether it's in the review in just in writing that makes sure that it is understood that it's not an off premise sign based on something so that we are not advertising a for profit organization. We can't open the can to allow one business to advertise on another building in the form of a mural.

Terry Waller came forward, of 402 Broadway. If they are putting it on our building where we are actually anticipating it, it is actually 404 which is not, it is still our building but it's not a part of Galena Garlic so would we still have to give up a sign is my question. J. Butler said actually no. I'm glad you stated that because it is a different property, it is an attached structure and a different address and such, but we should still call it paint in support of the mural so it doesn't actually conform to other sign guidelines. You'd be rather restricted on the size to attach anything because has been, the discussions been had that we consider murals paint and therefore they don't have to comply with the sign guidelines at all.

T. Waller said personally I'd rather see it be a mural myself, I think it looks nicer and fits in with the historic look. But that's just my opinion. The Farmers Market grant and whatever their grant is going to pay for is going to be where we have to go next. J. Butler said that we would review that. Something that could part of the discussion is the size of the text meeting sign guidelines which up at this location it does. So that could be a portion of the mural and can be seen as an advertisement and the advertisement only be for an organization that does not have a location for site on which to advertise. So that is in my head and it is not in the text but I think this is a fair way of looking at this.

V. Crisafulli said that she would not be in favor of asking a retail business to take down one of their retail signs to replace it with this, I just don't think that is fair to the business especially, I just don't think that is fair but I think we ought to work with the Arts Alliance and as many people and the Farmers Market very closely to make sure we can make this happen. J. Butler said yes, that's the only reason I said that is by calling it a sign, we'd have to follow sign guidelines. We'd prefer to call it paint and not as a sign.

R. Hopper said thank you. B. Waller said thank you.



**Page 17**  
**Historic District Board of Review**  
**March 28, 2016**

R. Hopper said hearing no more business I'll take a motion to close the meeting. V. Crisafulli said I so move. Seconded by P. Newhouse. All those in favor. Voice vote indicated all were in favor. R. Hopper said approved and that we ended the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

---

Ron Hopper, Chairman

---

Jess Butler, Preservation Planner

---

Louann Waller, Secretary