

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

May 26, 2016

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Thursday, May 26, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall, 101 W. Main St., Madison, IN 47250. Valecia Crisafulli, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Ann Roller, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey. Absent was Ron Hopper. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Jess Butler, Preservation Planner; Tamara Broadnax, Preservation Support Staff; David Sutter, Board Attorney; and Louann Waller, Planning Secretary.

V. Crisafulli asked to have one point of order. She apologized that she just drove in from the National Main Street Conference in Milwaukee where six of them from Madison were all week. And anything you are with a National audience like that there are so many people who immediately see our name tags and they say Madison, IN and they are so excited to meet people from Madison because this town is known all over the country for its historic preservation, for its beauty, for the vibrancy of its downtown particularly among a Main Street audience and for those of you who appreciate this historic district and know how important it is as an economic driver for this community. That was certainly reinforced with all the sessions we heard at the National meeting this week and with the kind of attention that the people that paid of Madison nationally is just a real honor to be representing this city at a meeting like that. It was great.

Minutes

V. Crisafulli called for approval of the April minutes and hoped that everyone has had time to look over those and asked if there were any suggestions or revisions to the minutes. P. Newhouse stated that she had one. It refers to aluminum frame windows and it really should be aluminum clad wood windows. V. Cristafulli agreed and stated that it was certainly more consistent with the guidelines. V. Cristafulli asked if P. Newhouse remembered where it was in the minutes. P. Newhouse responded in was in several places. V. Cristafulli asked if L. Waller could make a note of it to replace aluminum frame every time that appears with aluminum clad. Louann responded yes. V. Cristafulli thanked Louann. V. Cristafulli asked if there were anything else. V. Cristafulli asked do I here were a motion to approve the minutes as amended. P. Newhouse made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

Roll Call

B. Lyman	Approved
V. Cristafulli	Abstained (Not present at last meeting)
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

The minutes were amended, approved and published.

New Applications:

1. Don Weidman – C. of A. to brick in a window opening, facing Poplar Street

Location: 229 W. Main Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

J. Butler presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She said that it is a contributing, commercial structure within the District and was built in 1880. She stated that the applicant is seeing to brick in the original window facing Poplar Street and the sill of the window is the same as others at the building indicating that it is an original opening. J. Butler pointed out the design sketch/elevation submitted on the PowerPoint presentation and a local picture of a faux window. J. Butler stated that it has been painted and designed to look like a window and maintains the opening without there being an actual window installed. That would be a preferred option per the guidelines where we are encouraged to maintain original openings of structures. V. Cristafulli asked if the applicant would like to comment on the project. Applicant stated that it is not considered a window and is an opening in the wall. It is actually 9 feet off the street so you can't actually look through it as far as using it as a window. The applicant stated that it is an opening that lets sunlight in at the time it was a store. Applicant said when he had the store inside, it actually came about half way above his drop ceiling, and he wanted to drop the ceiling down. He said that there was a moisture problem inside where the window leaks and he insulated the wall and put plywood on the inside.

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

Applicant said he also eliminated that problem with the paint peeling and unsightliness on the inside of the building. His original intent was to duplicate the window and then put some type of screening on it so that you couldn't see through it. Applicant stated that when he priced the window that it was more economical to just brick it up and eliminate the potential water problem in the future. Applicant stated that even through there is a storm window that he has a potential leaky area into his building and making the wall wet on the inside. Applicant stated that he is trying to eliminate a moisture problem and an unused opening. P. Newhouse asked what did the space look like before and if he put the storms configurations in. Applicant said it had window air conditioning, eliminated that and went to central air. Applicant stated that he made that improvement to the building and since eliminating that air conditioning he wanted to eliminate the small window, and duplicate the other window but stated that it just solves the problem to just brick it up and eliminated the possible moisture and also the window is an unused opening in the building that didn't serve any purpose. From the pictures in the presentation, P. Newhouse asked if this was how it looked when the applicant purchased it. Applicant responded that when he purchased it that the air conditioner was there. And there were no storm windows and that he was getting water on the wall. He stated that when he put the storm windows on that it helped some but didn't eliminate the problem. Applicant stated that cocking something only last for a while but it doesn't keep it 100%. Applicant stated that it would be a better improvement to just eliminate the opening. B. Lyman asked if it were an original window, and if it had been determined by historic pictures or has that window been modified. J. Butler stated that we looked in the archives with Jefferson County Historical Society and didn't find an old photograph but she would think that from the sill being the same as the other windows of the property that it would be original. P. Newhouse said that she thinks that window is not an original window and that there is not a lintel and that she thinks at some time it had been punched in at some time after the building was built and doesn't believe that it is an original space at all. She stated that she doesn't think it is any lost to have it spaced on either. V. Cristafulli asked the applicant if he and J. Butler had discussed the faux window option. Applicant responded no. V. Cristafulli asked the applicant if that would be something he would consider and take a look at. The applicant responded that he would like not to do that because it is still it still has the potential for leaks. P. Newhouse asked what kind of a faux window it would be. She stated that a style would have to be decided upon and that she didn't think it was a good solution either. J. Butler stated since she has been on board that we haven't had one of these particular cases and looking into current practices elsewhere that she has found that even paint if it's bricked in, it's an artsy take on identifying what was an opening. She stated that she isn't suggesting that it is the best option, but it is an option to still identify what could have been an opening. M. Dorsey asked if J. Butler meant a complimentary color. J. Butler stated that we don't determine colors for anybody. Applicant said that he wasn't following what J. Butler was suggesting. J. Butler explained that there are a lot of ways to fill a window but still identify that it was a window. J. Butler said that even with this option, that it not a window and that it's just painted plywood. J. Butler said that she hasn't been on board to be a part of what we recommend be done with these. She said that she thinks there are different options without it being an actual window and even brick can be designed to stand out and it might seem odd to prefer something to stand out, but that's what she found looking into things that even painted brick to identify where a window was.

P. Newhouse stated that she still doesn't think it is an original structure so to identify it as such, is not necessary here. J. Butler stated that certainly matters if it's not original and what she considered evidence is the sill being the same as every other at the location. V. Cristafulli said that obviously we don't know. J. Butler said that we could not find photos.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other comments from the Board are from the audience about this project. L. Ludington was invited to the podium. L. Ludington apologized that he had to stand up at the podium and speak because he didn't examine the project close to speak authoritatively but that he could tell us that he did look at this window from the outside he didn't see a reason to ask about it any further because it seems to be so obvious that it was a recent addition and he thought that the only thing the Board would be looking at was the plan. He asked if J. Butler could go back to the slide in the presentation. L. Ludington said that the way it was installed looked as if it were made later and the fact that is a concrete sill/masonry sill instead of

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

something else doesn't really mean anything and that it is not characteristic of the way you would expect a window of that height to be made for a building that period and he doesn't see anything about it to suggest that the alterations was made long enough in the pass to have any historical significance. P. Newhouse stated that she agreed. L. Ludington stated that he thought the only thing the Board would be concerned about the plan would be to remove all traces of the window and key in the masonry instead of just butting masonry up and leaving the outline of what's there. He stated that it doesn't add anything to the character of the building and that it is on the secondary elevation. He stated that you don't have to have pictures necessary in order to look at a feature like the window to determine whether it was original to the building or not. If you really want to know for sure, he would run down there and look since it is only a block away. He said he thinks that the concern in maintaining original or otherwise historic features is important, but in this case that it is misplaced. He stated that this is not an example of that.

V. Cristafulli thanked L. Ludington for his comments and asked if there were any other comments from the audience. J. Butler added that she should always consult with Link. B. Lyman asked if what the applicant plans are, and if he planned to tooth it in. Applicant responded that he doesn't have any objection to do that and that he had a contractor lined up to do it. Applicant asked if he would be required to take the sill out also. The members of the Board responded yes. V. Cristafulli stated that the thing that looks bad is when brick windows have obviously been bricked in and it shows. It is a detraction from the appearance of the building. If this doesn't show, V. Cristafulli stated that that would be preferable in her viewpoint. P. Newhouse said that it can't be any worse than what it looks like now. B. Lyman asked if the applicant would be agreeable to that and taking the sill out and tothing it in. Applicant responded yes.

V. Cristafulli asked if there was a motion on the table. P. Newhouse stated that she move that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact the proposed project at 229 W. Main Street, to fill with brick a window space on the west façade, could be allowed according to the Madison Historic District Commercial Guidelines. In part, the guidelines state that "original windows should not be concealed, enclosed, or covered." However, it doesn't appear that the window space in question is original to the building. It has no lintel and the sill and frame are different from other original windows near it. The current ill-fitting aluminum storm windows that are in place are non-historic in character, and, actually, a brick infill would be an improvement. The present sill and frame should be removed and then smooth-faced bricked put in place before being painted the color of the building. If the owner agrees to this, a C of A should be granted. M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

2. Joseph and Cathy Jackson – C. of A. to demolish one of two garages on site; rehabilitate the remaining garage with transferring garage door to West façade, changing vinyl siding to wood; removing two window openings on rear façade of home and changing vinyl siding to wood; remove and replace a metal storm door at West façade of home with full-screen, wood storm door; replacing shingle roof with metal, and reinstall chimney where one had been removed.

Location: 701 E. Main Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

J. Butler said that applicant has done a lot of work with this house and are beginning the outdoor exterior projects. It is a contributing, residential structure and was built in the 1840. She stated that the applicants have done some really great work already at this property. J. Butler presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. V. Cristafulli asked if the applicants had any other comments to add about the project. Applicant stated that after further investigation behind the vinyl siding is wood. And that previous siding had been added over the wood, but wasn't sure if it could be saved. V. Cristafulli said that if the original wood could be preserved that that would be certainly be preferred and it would be great. Applicant said

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

that the side yard asphalt would be taken up, and converted back to a yard. Applicant stated that he would like to add a metal roof instead of a shingle roof. P. Newhouse asked what kind of metal roof. Applicant stated probably like the one looked like shingles. A. Roller asked if the applicant meant a standing stem or a barn roof. Applicant responded that it would be and that he would have to submit samples for approval.

V. Cristafulli asked the Board if they would be approving the roof tonight. J. Butler responded that it is within the application. A. Roller suggested that maybe the Board shouldn't do the roof tonight until the applicant knows what he wants. Applicant responded that when the house was built that it didn't have shingle roofing and that it was either metal or wood shingles or if it were slat it would probably still be on it. V. Cristafulli asked if J. Butler could work with the applicants and show them what kind of metal roof that the Board would approve versus the ones that we would not. J. Butler responded certainly. A. Roller asked if the Board would be messing with the roof tonight. V. Cristafulli stated that the applicant would have to come back before the Board if they took the roof out of the project tonight and stated that it would be nice if the applicants didn't have to come back. A. Roller said, but the applicants don't know what they want. M. Dorsey suggested that perhaps the Board could approve on the basis that they chose standing seam style and let J. Butler show them. V. Cristafulli said that she would have no problem with that. D. Sutter stated that if the applicant decided done the road that they wanted to do something different, that the applicant could come back at that point and that at least this would give the applicant the option if they didn't to go forth with the project and would have to come back. Applicant stated that he wanted to put the same roof on the garage too. Applicant said that they are from Bloomington and that they fell in love with this town.

A. Roller stated that she would like to do the demolition motion separate. V. Cristafulli said that would be fine. V. Cristafulli asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience on this project. A. Roller made a motion to move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application for demolition of a garage submitted on April 25, 2016 and discussed on May 26, 2016 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for demolition p. 80-81. Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district. The removal of the garage would improve the site design; therefore a C of A should be granted. B. Lyman seconded the motion. V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other comments, questions, or discussion.

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

A. Roller made another motion to move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application (excluding demolition) submitted on April 25, 2016 as discussed on May 26, 2016 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for the following:

1. Siding p.56-58 Original wood weatherboard, clapboard, shingles, and board and batten should be maintained. Replacement of vinyl siding on both the garage and house with wood siding would be appropriate.
2. Windows p. 60-63 Original windows should be retained, maintained, and if needed, repaired. Since these are not original to the house, removal would be appropriate.
3. Doors p.39-42 New screen doors should be complementary to the style of the house, have a wood frame, and be full-view of have structural members that align with those of the door. Therefore the change from aluminum to wood would be appropriate.
4. Chimneys p. 38 Chimneys should be maintained and preserved and not removed. Therefore replacement of a chimney that has been removed is appropriate.
5. Roofs p.53-54 Metal roofs in Madison typically date to the late 19th and early 20th century and were standing seam. Replacement of shingles with standing seam would be appropriate.

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

Therefore a C of A should be granted. P. Newhouse seconded the motion. V. Cristafulli asked if there were any comments, questions from the audience.

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

3. Tom and Karen Bump – C. of A. to repurpose one of two front door, and recreate an original window in that opening; replace existing storm window, using Mon-Ray if affordable or getting quotes from other manufactures.

Location: 605 Jefferson Street

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

T. Broadnax presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She said that the applicants have already begun to paint the exterior of the property. She stated that there are two front doors and they are going to keep the existing front door and repurpose the other door and recreate an original window in that opening using possibly Mon-Ray but they have been shopping for other materials. V. Cristafulli stated the Mon-Ray for the storm windows. T. Broadnax responded yes. B. Lyman asked if it were for the large picture window. Applicant responded that the Mon-Ray was for a different window. Applicant stated that they wanted to keep the door within the same frame work to make it mirror the other window. Applicant stated that the two doors are not original and that she can't find anything that states that the two doors are original to the house. It had been divided into three apartments in 1930 and it was originally a single family house. V. Cristafulli stated that it was nice that the applicants were taking it back to a single family house. B. Lyman stated that she also read on the application that the applicant had saved some of the original siding and asked when they put the new window in if they would be putting in some of the wood siding below it. Applicant responded absolutely. B. Lyman asked if the applicant would also be repurposing the glass. Applicant responded yes. B. Lyman said that it's great how they are recycling all of this material. Applicant stated that she would be using Mon-Ray for the storm window. B. Lyman stated that it looks like the applicants have done a lot of beautiful work on the property.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board or the audience about this project. B. Lyman made a motion to move that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 605 W. Jefferson be constructed according to the plan submitted on May 4, 2016 and discussed at the May 26, 2016 Board meeting is compatible with that character of the Historic District. The project includes repurposing one of the two front doors on the West façade of the structure to recreate a window of the same size, style, and trim as other windows of the house and filling in below the new window with popular siding or some other type that matches is the same type of siding as the house. The project also includes replacing the storm window on the large picture window also on the West façade of the house with one that has no dividers so that the design of the original window is visible. The residential guidelines support this project on page 60 the guidelines state that windows are prominent building components, and that original windows should be preserved in their original size, location, and design with the original material in number of panes. In this case removing a door that was added in the 1930's and replacing it with a window that has the same design and materials as other windows in the house is appropriate. Also replacing a storm window that had a divider that didn't match the original window's design with one without dividers so that the original window can be viewed is also desirable. Therefore the project should receive a C of A. Applicant stated that she would like to correct that it is all on the East side of the house. B. Lyman stated so amended the "East side." M. Dorsey seconded the motion. V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other comments.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli Approved
 B. Lyman Approved
 A. Roller Approved
 M. Dorsey Approved
 P. Newhouse Approved

4. John and Lori Heitz – C. of A. to expand outdoor seating, to 20’x30’, and to include wood deck and railing of either wood or wrought iron.

Location: 842 W. Main Street

Zoned: Local Business (LB)

T. Broadnax presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She said that the property at 842 W. Main Street is purposing to expand the outdoor area; the existing outdoor seating is underutilized so the applicant wants to expand that. She said that it would be a wood deck style and presented images of the purposed railing. V. Cristafulli asked if the applicant had anything to say about the project. Applicant responded that it was underutilized and that it really didn’t look that good. He stated that he had plenty of room in the front of the building and that it was cost effective to add a little bit more seating and that coming into town it might make it pop a little bit more. V. Cristafulli stated that it would be nice for the neighbors. Ann Roller asked if you would still be able to park in front of it. Applicant responded that there is still plenty of parking. M. Dorsey asked if it would adversely affect the number of cars you could get in there. Applicant responded no and that you could pull in so much further anyway that you wouldn’t lose it at all. B. Lyman asked how much further away from the building is this going to be than the current. Applicant responded that he thinks about 7 feet but he is not 100% certain on that. V. Cristafulli responded that we need more outdoor dining downtown and that she thinks this will be a good addition. Applicant responded that he thinks it should. M. Dorsey asked if the applicant would do with wood railing. Applicant responded yes. He stated that he probably can’t afford the wrought iron so he would probably just do the wood. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was thinking treated lumber for both desking. Applicant responded yes.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other questions from the Board or any questions or comments from the audience. M. Dorsey made a motion that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a C of A per the application for the property of 842 W. Main Street to expand their outdoor seating using wood desking and wood railing as an improvement with minimal impact to the streetscape. A. Roller seconded the motion.

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli Approved
 B. Lyman Approved
 A. Roller Approved
 M. Dorsey Approved
 P. Newhouse Approved

5. Jeff and Peggy Phagan – C. of A. to replace stairs in alley at East side of building.

Location: 115 E. Main Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

J. Butler said this is Gallery 115 and it is an contributing commercial structure within the District built in 1870 and the application is for the stairs at the East elevation; the fire escape stairwell. Currently it is all metal and will be removed and replaced with a wood frame stairwell and design change will be that it has this mid-way landing and upper landing with a shed awning to be installed. The applicant is currently applying for permits with the State that is required. V. Cristafulli asked if the applicant had anything to tell about the project. The

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

applicant said that he went through this 2 or 3 years ago, and stated that he couldn't get it done then because his central air unit went out for the whole building so that money was spend buying a central air unit for the upstairs and downstairs. A. Roller asked if the design was pretty much the same. Applicant responded yes, and the only thing he did, was add the awning on top. V.Cristafulli said that one of the key things about the commercial properties downtown is that they want to see use of the second and third floors. B. Lyman asked if where the current one sets will it be about the same profile. Applicant responded yes will be about the same length is 38 inches and will protrude further out toward the side road. He stated 12 foot between the front of the building and front of the steps. B. Lyman said so it will be 12 feet from the sidewalk and she believed that's what was indicated on the plan.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board. B. Lyman what the applicant was going to use for the stairs. Applicant stated that it will have metal supports and the steps itself will be of metal inlay with a wood structure, and the railing would be wrought iron. B. Lyman asked if it will be treated wood. Applicant responded yes, it would be pressure treated wood.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any comments or questions from the audience on this project. M. Johnson asked if there will be a hand rail. Applicant responded yes, hand rail would be wrought iron. M. Johnson asked if there will be tenures. Applicant responded yes.

M. Dorsey made a motion that per the proposed design and application asked that we approve the application or a C of A as proposed. A. Roller seconded the motion.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Roll Call

V. Cristafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved

V. Crisafulli asked if there was any old business to come before the Board. She invited L. Ludington to the podium. L. Ludington said that he is still inclined to say something about Mulberry Street but that he is also the President of the Cornerstone Society, Inc. and he wanted to reiterate the fact that this is Historic Preservation Month nationwide and also say thanks to Jess and several members of this committee and other members of the city administration who were partners with Cornerstone Society and Historic Madison, Inc. and the Madison Main Street Program and Jefferson County Historical Society in presenting the workshop we did at River Terrace a little over a week ago was very well attended and very well received. He thanked everyone for their assistance. V. Crisafulli thanked the Cornerstone Society for being so instrumental in the workshop and moving forward. She thanked B. Lyman particularly for her work on that.

V. Cristafulli asked if there were any new business to come before the Board. B. Lyman stated that she had some new business. She wanted to review the goals that were looked at during the workshop. J. Butler went to the goals in the PowerPoint presentation. B. Lyman wanted to go through the goals and decide how we were doing with those. B. Lyman asked how the goals were listed. J. Butler said the goals were ordered by their scores. B. Lyman discussed the first goal under Guideline Review and Update. She wanted to make a comment about that. She said in talking with Ben Ross about what his understanding was in helping us review the guidelines. B. Lyman said her understanding from his comments were that he was going to give us some pictorial definitions of current guidelines to help us see better examples of that. But as far as rewriting or adding or amending the guidelines she stated is not part of the Comprehensive Plan. She said if anyone has any other information that is different than that, that it would be good to know. She said that she thinks that we have all been going under the idea that Ratio was going to up us update our guidelines. V. Cristafulli stated that wasn't her understanding. Her understanding was that they would be making some recommendations for where we might want to be improving our guidelines. But they wouldn't be rewriting them; they would be

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

noting places where our guidelines were not sufficient. B. Lyman said that she wasn't sure that they were even going to do that. B. Lyman said that we need some clarification. V. Cristafulli agreed. She said she would be happy to reach out and get that clarified and would make a note to do that and communicate with everybody. B. Lyman asked if J. Butler had been able to find the contact with Ratio. J. Butler responded that she had not.

B. Lyman discussed the second goal under Establish Legal Procedures for Noncompliance/Nonconformance. She said that she guessed we were going to wait until the guidelines were finished before we moved ahead on that. J. Butler responded yes.

B. Lyman discussed the third goal under Continue Push for Full-Time Preservation Planner. She asked if there were any update. J. Butler responded that as the Board knows that she is leaving the position. She said her last day in the office is June 16, 2016 and that we are going to be posting for a full time Planner. She said that it would not be strictly Preservation. She said that T. Broadnax role at this point is also with the Planning Commission and the position will be for a full time Urban Planner/City Planner and that it is a shared position. She said that T. Broadnax will be invited to apply for that position, but it's going to be a full time position so a different posting than what we had a couple of months ago. J. Butler said that it is new and exciting that there is going to be a full time position. V. Cristafulli asked with Preservation responsibilities. J. Butler responded absolutely and that they would do everything Preservation and would like to think that they would do land use planning for the Hilltop when needed. J. Butler said that it will be more broad than just Preservation work but they will do all of the Preservation reviews and work with you guys. B. Lyman said that she sees that as a real positive step. She said she really thinks that having a Planner that is looking at the entire city, with all of the Comprehensive Plans, 421, and envision Jefferson County and can put all of that together and just look at the whole development of the town is important. J. Butler agreed. V. Cristafulli said lets continue down the list.

B. Lyman said that we have revised the C of A application. V. Cristafulli said that the fourth goal was skipped over. B. Lyman apologized. B. Lyman discussed the fifth goal under Face to Face Outreach to Target Groups. J. Butler said that she would say that we have done a nice job since coming up with these goals. She said that we have reached out to the community widely and these targeted groups such as Relators and Contractors. She said that is ongoing and high priority but she thinks that if we get staff or the Board that it should almost be an epic of Preservation in Madison that we are always reaching out and brings us down to the educational components and that we are doing a better job at outreach currently than we had been. V. Cristafulli asked B. Lyman if it's her feeling that it needs to be a plan in place reaching out to these groups. J. Butler said that in the minutes of these meetings, that is what was discussed. Who can take it to which specific groups and that we never really assigned those but that we did talk about clubs and different organizations that we should at least have an email blast capability to reach out to those groups but that has not been done. B. Lyman said that she thinks that there was some discussion of developing a program that maybe groups would be interested in having.

B. Lyman said that we have completed in revising the C of A application. She wanted to reiterate to staff that one of the things that we hoped to accomplish by making a new application was pointing out to applicants the appropriate Guidelines that would go with whatever they were applying for. She said that she thinks we are relying on you guys to talk with them and point out that if they are looking for windows that it would be a good idea to read the guidelines on such and such page because that would probably give them the best idea of what kind of questions we were going to ask and would help them feel a little more prepared and a little more transparent about what we are trying to do here. B. Lyman said that anyway that could be supported by staff that would be helpful. J. Butler said that is important to state, because this application is so much more helpful itself so staff can better communicate when they are sending an individual home with an application. V. Cristafulli said that it seemed apparent to her tonight that there had been good communication with all five of the applicants that had come before us tonight. J. Butler said except for Mr. Weidman because she had never met him before. P. Newhouse asked if the applicants get a copy of our motions and see what's in the motion. J. Butler said yes and that the C of A is worded straight from the approved motion. V. Cristafulli said that is good because that would be a reference for them. J. Butler agreed.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

J. Butler said it takes us down to point #8 but we are not there yet but that the detail in the motion is important because the one thing that they receive and hold on to. B. Lyman said that she really appreciate when we get lots of pictures and drawings and things like that. She said support materials provided are really helpful to us. J. Butler asked if the Boards feels like they see enough on the presentations because she felt that when Mr. Jackson was looking for an image or something and that he put a lot of material into his application and that it didn't make the presentation. She asked if the Board thought that more of the applicant's material should be in the presentation. V. Cristafulli said that she thinks so.

B. Lyman discussed the goal under Establish Rules for Orderly Board Procedures. V. Cristafulli said she and D. Sutter would meet and make some recommendations on that and that they haven't had a chance yet but that they do plan to do that.

B. Lyman discussed the goal under Review of Previous Applications for Compliance. J. Butler said that we discussed that on a one year or maybe nine month turnaround so that we could contact the applicants and review with them that their C of A will expire in a year if they have not begun the work and then otherwise the last meeting was a good example of G. Thieman coming to the podium and discussing his project once it was complete. She said that of course Graham was a part of this team in the recent past and he knew that was a goal and wanted to share his completed project. She said she thinks that a picture of this window once it is bricked in a 229 W. Main is a great thing to always maybe say to the applicant that we would like to see the finished project. She said that she still thinks it a great idea whether it's part of a monthly meeting with staff that one or two people go over what is at it 9 or 10 month date post C of A to go and take a look at projects either by that should be completed or begun as a courtesy. V. Cristafulli suggested that it be at 9 months. B. Lyman said that she thinks it's great when applicants can come back and demonstrate that great work that they have done. M. Dorsey said that that is something staff can enter into the calendar. J. Butler said that she would make a calendar for the next.

B. Lyman discussed the goal under More Detail in the Motion and Vote. V. Cristafulli said she doesn't know how we have more detail in the vote and that it just needs to read more detail in the motion. Board agreed.

B. Lyman discussed the goal under Add Brief Educational Components to each Board Meeting. She said the think we discussed doing something in the beginning. J. Butler said it also was mentioned that it might be best that either two or three minutes in the beginning as the amount of time we want to keep it at. A. Roller said that she thinks V.Cristafulli telling about her trip in the beginning was a nice thing. J. Butler said that's good information to share at these meetings and that she appreciates it. B. Lyman said that maybe we could look for something each time. J. Butler said that she is glad that Link came forward to talk about the Preservation on a Shoestring event because that did go really well. V.Cristafulli asked if the video was available. J. Butler said that there are two videos available and that there is one in the works that is going to be a trill. B. Lyman said that one is online if you go to channel 15 under other topics. J. Butler said that we will also have an edited and more exciting version hopefully to get on to YouTube.

J. Butler said that finally the Monthly Meeting with the Planner would be the opportunity to review past cases or look at site analysis issues like the window to help staff understand or help the Board understand whether we are even working with an original window opening. J. Butler said those are the ten goals that you guys have set for 2016. B. Lyman said thanks and that was a good summary and that maybe it is a good idea every few months to touch base and see where we are. V. Cristafulli suggested that maybe we do this quarterly. J. Butler asked if we could pick on that can also be marked as completed if we tackle it in the near future. She said that a lot of the goals are ongoing and she still thinks that guideline review and update is highest priority in her mind.

V. Crisafulli asked if there was any other old business or new business. J. Butler said that it is simply interpretation and that she has not spoken with D. Sutter regarding the height of a rear yard fence and how the Board will like to interpret from here forward, the allowable height for rear yards. She said that she should have made a diagram showing the exact difference of front, street side, side yard, or rear yard. J. Butler stated that these fences are clearly rear yard fences. Meaning that they don't project forward of the house. J. Butler

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
May 26, 2016

said that it has been recent practice, but maybe not long term practice, that based on #4 in the Guidelines, traditionally a fence could be as tall as 8 feet, so building permits would have to be issued for any structure taller than 6. J. Butler said that the guidelines also says could only be 6, so when people come and ask, she says 6 but there are occasions when fences are built to 8 feet and we then issue a building permit, but allow it. She said that the question is whether the Board sees the text as allowing 8 feet with a building permit or not. J. Butler said that something that is not currently done, but that she thinks is best practice, is to wish away the text of #4, but allow 8 foot fence if they receive a variance. Variance for fence height could be allowable on certain conditions. J. Butler said that in principle it is a zoning issue, but there is conflict in the way our design guidelines are written. D. Sutter agreed that multiple different heights in the text reads bad. He said that it is a zoning issue than a Historic Board issue.

L. Ludington said that fence height is an issue that affects historic character cause so many of the fences in the town to compliment the buildings were way over 3 feet high. He said for downtown Madison and the Historic District typically fences during the 19th century were taller than that, and that maybe it is not appropriate for the Historic District Board to set fence height. He said that it unreasonable to have that limitation for safety reasons. He said the zoning ordinance needs to be changed to allow fences that are appropriate in the Historic District for the buildings that they are intended to serve. He said that he would think that the Historic District Board would at least want to consult with the Zoning Board of Appeals to iron this issue out.

V. Cristafulli said that she understands why traditionally it could be as tall as 8 feet is in there, but it needs to be in a different section, maybe in a section that is talking about the character or history because it appear to be contradictory and it should be only one number when it get to the Guidelines. J. Butler said so it's a Guidelines issue and asked L. Waller if she thought that in the future that those would have to receive a variance to be approved to 8 feet. L. Waller said that she most definitely agrees with D. Sutter and that in the future if someone wants to exceed 6 feet in height that they would apply for a variance.

D. Sutter said that the cleaner the Guidelines could be made for people, the easier it could be made to interpret and certainly the better.

V. Crisafulli asked if there were any other new business to come before the Board. A. Newhouse made a motion to adjourn the meeting. A. Roller seconded the motion. V. Cristafulli said all approved. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Valecia Crisafulli, Vice Chair

Jess Butler, Preservation Planner

Louann Waller, Secretary