

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

November 28, 2016

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, November 28, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Ann Roller, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey, and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell; City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

R. Hopper gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting.

Minutes:

There were no additions or corrections to minutes of the previous meeting. P. Newhouse made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by P. Sanchez.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Abstained
P. Sanchez	Approved

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.

New Applications:

1. Brian Marshall – C. of A. to reconstruct the garage utilizing new lumber and original lumber. The garage will have LP Smart siding, a carriage style door, and shingle roof as previously approved by the board. Walls will extend 4-ft. in height as approved previously by the board.

Location: **201 Plum St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented that the house on this property is located directly east of the garage and is a circa 1840 Federal style contributing structure. The garage as shown in the PowerPoint was a historic structure. N. Schell stated that on November 23rd, 2016 the applicant came into the office and amended the application to “replace current new framing lumber with original lumber. Raise the garage walls by 4-ft. with new lumber as previously approved by the board. Build roof rafters with new lumber. The garage will have LP Smart siding, a carriage style door and shingles as stated”.

N. Schell presented photographs showing the condition of some of the original lumber in the garage. N. Schell displayed images showing what has currently been constructed and what is proposed in the application. N. Schell noted during conversation with the applicant and the contractor, the contractor stated “the height of the garage extension is actually between 3-ft. and 3 ¼ - ft.”

N. Schell also showed images of historic wood windows from the house which will be used on the east façade of the garage as well as a modern entry door which will also be located on the east façade. N. Schell showed images of the LP Smart siding located on the addition of the house which will match the garage as well as asphalt shingles which will be used on the garage.

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

B. Marshall was present and showed the board an additional photo of a porcelain lamp which he would like to place out front above the garage door. B. Lyman asked if the applicant had any brochures or photos of what the garage door would look like. B. Marshall stated he didn't but stated the door would have two clasps on each side and a hinge style handle. N. Schell asked if B. Marshall had the drawing which he had shown her before the meeting. B. Marshall stated the drawing, which he passed around to the board, showed what the door would look like. B. Lyman asked if the door would fold up like a modern garage door. B. Marshall answered yes. B. Lyman and B. Marshall agreed the door would look like a carriage door. B. Marshall stated the door would be metal.

A. Roller stated that the board was not approving to restore anything but that they were looking at new construction because just sistering the 2x4s with old lumber makes her feel like the original building had been lost. A. Roller added that the applicant should start over and present an application for new construction. A. Roller stated that the job as board members is to look at restoration projects or new construction. B. Marshall stated he salvaged all the old lumber from the original garage. A. Roller stated in her opinion this project has gone beyond that and is now new construction. A. Roller stated the applicant needed to begin with the zoning process and the other steps he needed to take before coming before the board with an application for new construction.

B. Marshall stated that the original foundation was still on the site and extended about 2 feet above the ground. A. Roller stated that just the original foundation existing is not a restoration. B. Marshall agreed and stated that it couldn't be considered a demolition. A. Roller disagreed and stated that there is nothing left but the foundation. B. Marshall stated that if he used all the old wood in the bottom of the structure he saw it as a restoration.

A. Roller stated that it was no longer a restoration project and that because of its condition it might have never been a restoration project. A. Roller stated that the applicant should have just asked for the garage to be demolished but he had withdrawn that request. B. Marshall stated they attempted to restore the building but the seal plates were all damaged from termites. A. Roller stated that it sounds like this project was a demolition project and new construction and doesn't feel like the board can see it as a restoration project. P. Newhouse and B. Lyman agreed with that statement.

R. Hopper advised the applicant that he could either ask the application to be extended and amend it for new construction or see whether the application is approved or denied. A. Roller asked if the project was new construction then wouldn't it have to go before the zoning board first. R. Hopper stated that the applicant can just take the drawing and add the dimensions on it.

A. Roller stated that the board had to choose between restoration and new construction and she didn't see how they could see this as restoration. B. Marshall asked if it mattered whether he used the original lumber. P. Sanchez stated there was not enough left for it to be considered a restoration. B. Marshall stated there was enough for the bottom portion of the structure but not enough for the top. B. Marshall stated that the top of the structure was approved previously for new lumber.

A member of the audience, Tony Hendren, stated he was going to help the applicant work on the garage. T. Hendren stated when the applicant came before the board previously he got approved to raise the roof line 4-ft. T. Hendren stated that is what currently has been built. T. Hendren stated what was pictured on the PowerPoint shows the 2x4 studs on each side of the new lumber and that was exactly what the board had approved. T. Hendren stated that by raising the roof line you cannot safely add 4-ft. to the top of the old studs. T. Hendren added that there would have been the same amount of studs coming up with those same boards there. T. Hendren stated that there would actually be less original studs used than what is proposed if the applicant had done it the way the board approved it.

B. Lyman stated the applicant should have requested a demolition. T. Hendren stated the only reason the structure came down was because while they were pulling the roof off of the original structure the structure fell. T. Hendren stated they had braced the structure but it still came down. A. Roller stated that it was at that point the applicant should have come before the board stating the structure had fallen down and now is a demolition and gone through the zoning process and brought the board plans for the new construction.

Page 3

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

A. Roller asked T. Hendren if he understood why the board didn't see this project as a restoration. T. Hendren stated both agreed but disagreed why the board didn't see this project as a restoration. T. Hendren added that the proposed structure would have more of the historic lumber because they will use original material from the home to finish the garage. A. Roller stated the applicant was building something new with old material. T. Hendren stated they were using the same amount of new and old material. A. Roller stated that the applicant was building something new with old material not restoring an existing structure.

T. Hendren stated that if a structure falls down and you put all the material back into it how this works. The only thing new is the seal plates because they were rotten and the reason why the structure fell down. The applicant plans to cap all the new seal plates with original lumber. T. Hendren stated he buys properties all the time but stays out of downtown because he doesn't understand how the process works. T. Hendren asked the board to clarify if this project is new construction, even though the applicant is using the same amount of new material as he was approved for, how the project was approved in the first place. A. Roller stated the board probably thought the garage was in better shape than it actually was. T. Hendren stated he asked the applicant if the board thought he was going to cap all the original studs and add the 4-ft. on top of them because that is impossible. B. Lyman and A. Roller stated that was what the applicant had requested. T. Hendren asked if the application wasn't to just raise the roof line 4-ft. A. Roller answered yes and stated the board had assumed it would be ok to add the 4-ft to the original studs otherwise he wouldn't have presented it if it wouldn't have worked. T. Hendren stated that with today's standards you cannot build something on 2-ft. centers and therefore the studs would have needed to be moved anyway to raise the roofline. T. Hendren stated that he didn't understand knowing this how this project couldn't be considered a rehab or remodel.

A. Roller stated that the board has a document called the Secretary of Interior Standards for Restoration and it lists what is considered restoration. T. Hendren stated he thought that document stated you only had to use somewhere around 70% of the original material. A. Roller stated she thought that was in regards to windows or something like that. T. Hendren stated he read that as any original material including wall studs. T. Hendren informed the board that he advised the applicant to go get a permit if he needed one and the applicant was told he didn't need a permit so they assumed the project was a restoration. T. Hendren stated he could see their point and that if the project has the same or more of the historic material then maybe you are building new but using the old material to do the same thing.

B. Marshall stated it would still look exactly like what he was approved for at the July meeting. B. Marshall clarified that it would actually look better because he wasn't going to use the barn metal siding but using the Hardie Board and the old windows from the house. P. Newhouse stated that if you had an old building, tore it down, and used the old material to build a dog house or something different then it's not restoration. Just because you use the old material to build something new does not make it restoration. B. Marshall stated that if you use the old materials to build on the same footprint and the same foundation and actually make it look older than it was...the first photo of the PowerPoint showed the garage which was built in the 1940s with the rig metal and it didn't have windows it just had openings with tarpaper draped over it. A. Roller stated the applicant should have just come and asked for the garage to be demolished and started over. R. Hopper pointed out there was another member of the audience who wished to talk on this application.

Rich Ries of 1020 East St. stated him and his wife have been residence of Madison for over 30 years with the last 11 years being located on East St. R. Ries stated that the East St. neighborhood has been plagued with absentee landlords who have questionable ethics and who are happy to draw revenue from our community but do little to support the integrity of our neighborhood. It has been a problem and some time ago Brian (Marshall) bought a couple of bungalows which were neglected for years by Fannie Mae Eversole and Brian (Marshall) did a fantastic job restoring them. R. Ries stated they have had zero problems with B. Marshall's tenants and the properties are professionally maintained. R. Ries stated if they see a problem such as a downspout that is clogged, Brian (Marshall) attends to it literally the next day. In a neighborhood where they are at least half rentals, having his two have set a standard for the other landlords to observe.

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

R. Ries stated he didn't know the particulars of this property but stated that what he has gathered is that we have a group of people who are tasked with defending a position but not committed to finding a mutually beneficial resolution and operating in good faith to come to resolution. R. Ries stated his suggestion would be to move to something where all parties can be satisfied with the outcome and believed that would be possible once the board stops defending a position. R. Ries added if the board can resolve this issue bringing Brian Marshall's influence to this neighborhood would be a benefit to the community as a whole and to this community in particular. R. Hopper thanked R. Ries for his comments and asked if there were any other questions from the audience.

Agust Eiriksson who resides at 803 W Second St. stated he wanted to speak against this application. A. Eiriksson stated he was quoted from the July 25th meeting minutes where the owners are instructed they need to work with Mark Johnson for the building permit and the applicant would get the COA once it, the building permit, was generated and signed. A. Eiriksson stated as far as he knew the building permit had not been generated or signed. R. Hopper stated what that section meant was the COA would be given once it was generated and signed. R. Hopper added the board does not have anything to do with the building permits. A. Eiriksson stated that was correct but the board told him he would get the COA once the building permit would be generated and signed.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

A. Roller made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as of fact that the application submitted on October 28th and discussed on November 28th is not within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines on garages on page 45. Many dwellings retain original or added outbuildings constructed before the mid-1950s. These buildings contribute to the character of the historic district and should be preserved and maintained. The garage in this application has been demolished and not preserved in any way. The adding of a few original boards in no way meets the criteria for restoration as described in the Secretary of Interior Standards for Restoration. For example, material from the restoration period will be maintained and preserved, deteriorating materials will be repaired rather than replaced, and designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed are only a few of the many restoration methods not done on this project. The guidelines are not being met and therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should not be granted."

Motion seconded by B. Lyman

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the COA was not approved and advised the applicant to go through the process for new construction such as the building permit and variance for the set-backs and then come back before the board with plans for new construction.

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

2. Luke Burress – C. of A. to replace vinyl siding and trim on garage with new LP Smart siding and trim; replace existing gutters and downspouts on the garage with new seamless aluminum gutters and downspouts; replace existing wood deck on garage with new Trex-decking and railing; replace existing 7-ft. x 16-ft. door with new steel insulated door of the same style; replace existing aluminum siding and trim on the house with new LP Smart siding and trim; raise height of walls of the addition 2-ft. to match height of original portion of house; extend gable roof over addition; replace existing deck on house with new Trex-decking and railing; replace existing gutters and downspouts with new seamless aluminum gutters and downspouts; replace front porch ceiling, trim, and posts with new wood and LP Smart siding and trim.

Location: **1213 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell presented photos of the project in a PowerPoint. N. Schell stated the house on the property is a circa 1880 contributing gable-ell style. N. Schell noted that the PowerPoint is broken up into several sections since there are a lot of different aspects to this project. The first section includes images of the garage. The second through fourth section includes images of the house.

P. Newhouse thanked the applicant for taking on the project because there is a lot of work that needs to be done. A. Roller asked about the condition of the interior of the house. Luke Burress was present and stated he has gutted the interior. A. Roller stated she drove through the alley and could tell the roof was in bad shape on the back addition. P. Newhouse stated she thought the applicant had thought everything through and picked good materials.

L. Burress explained that the gabled part of the house was the original section and the next slanted part of the roof covered an addition and the back part is an additional addition. L. Burress stated the house ceilings goes from 10-ft to 8-ft to 6.5-ft. L. Burress explained that what his application is proposing is to move the center of the gable over the center of the house and extend the gable over all the additions and over the deck. This would allow the ceiling height in the house to all be 10-ft and allow the deck to be covered with the same roof.

P. Newhouse asked if the deck on the garage and the deck on the house would be facing each other. L. Burress answered yes and stated the garage was not in good shape. P. Newhouse asked if the garage was a two story garage. L. Burress answered yes and stated the garage had a 24x24-ft loft above it and added he would like to also replace the entry door to the loft on the north façade. L. Burress also stated he wanted to change the vinyl siding to LP Smart siding to match the house. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was planning on using shingle because she didn't see that in the application. L. Burress answered yes. P. Newhouse stated the applicant wasn't required to include that in the application because he was replacing in kind.

L. Burress informed the board that there was 3-inch wood siding on the original part of the house under the aluminum siding however both additions only had wood boards under the aluminum siding. L. Burress stated that was why he was proposing to do the entire house in new LP Smart siding and added that he intends to use the original wood siding from the house on the garage if he can remove it without tearing it up. P. Newhouse stated that the Smart siding has a smooth finish and the board would recommend the applicant to use that over the siding which looks like lumber because it is more appropriate for historic homes. P. Newhouse asked about the width of the siding proposed. L. Burress answered he planned to use 6-inch.

Mike Pittman of 420 Elm St., from the audience, spoke regarding this application. M. Pittman stated he was glad to have Luke (Burress) back in Madison. M. Pittman stated he would like Luke (Burress) to ask for rehabilitation rather than a restoration because rehabilitation gives you a lot more flexibility on the materials you can take out. M. Pittman encouraged Luke (Burress) to ask for rehabilitation rather than restoration because there will be some demolition on this project and he didn't want to see Luke (Burress) caught in the same trap as the applicant before him. M. Pittman stated that when someone gets into a home like this they won't know what needs to be done until the start to remove material and he hates to see a project delayed months of construction because of a situation like this.

Page 6

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

L. Burress stated he has already removed most of the interior and all of the frame work is in good shape.
R. Hopper thanked M. Pittman for his comments.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

“I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as of fact that the proposed project at 1213 W. Main St. if constructed according to the plans submitted on October 28th, 2016 and discussed at the November 28th board meeting is compatible with character of the historic district. Specifically regarding the house; all aluminum siding and trim will be removed and replaced with LP Smart siding and trim, reference Madison Residential Design Guidelines pages 56 and 58. Composite roof shingles will be removed and replaced with similar shingles. The height of the single-story rear addition will be increased to match the height of the original structure and extending the newly shingled roof over the rear deck, reference (Madison Residential Design Guidelines) page 68. Existing aluminum gutters and downspouts will be replaced with seamless aluminum gutters and downspouts, reference (Madison Residential Design Guidelines) page 46. The wood on the rear wood deck will be replaced with Trex-decking and railing, reference (Madison Residential Design Guidelines) page 64. The wooden front porch ceiling, trim and posts are to be replaced with wood and LP Smart siding and trim. Wooden columns will be replaced with wooden columns, reference (Madison Residential Design Guidelines) page 5. Garage changes include: replacing vinyl siding with LP Smart siding and trim; replacing existing gutters and downspouts with new seamless gutters and downspouts; replacing existing wood deck with Trex-decking and railing; and removing the existing 7-ft x 16-ft door and replacing it with a similar but insulated door of the same style. A Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.”

Motion seconded by A. Roller.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

R. Hopper stated the application has been approved and the applicant would receive the COA once it was generated and signed. R. Hopper advised the applicant to work with Mark Johnson to see if a building permit was required. M. Dorsey, B. Lyman, and P. Newhouse thanked the applicant for taking on this project.

3. Vinod Gupta (Represented by Allan Singleton) – C. of A. for removal of existing door on the west facing façade; replacement of the existing door on the south facing façade with a 2 panel, 9 light aluminum door; replacement of existing vinyl window on first floor of west facing façade.

Location: **405 E. Third St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

N. Schell stated the building was a circa 1840 Federal style contributing building. N. Schell stated on November 18th the applicant's representative came into the office and amended the application to the following: replace one exterior door on south facing façade and one exterior door on west facing façade with a 2 panel, 9 light aluminum door; replace existing first floor vinyl window on west facing façade with a 1/1 aluminum clad wood window. N. Schell presented photos on the PowerPoint of the structure, historic images, and proposed door and window.

Allan Singleton was present and stated the proposed window would match the windows upstairs. B. Lyman expressed her appreciation for the applicant's willingness to change out the window to match the rest of the windows and stated that was the most appropriate for the structure. A. Singleton stated he originally wanted to just replace the vinyl window with the exact same window but N. Schell talked him into finding a more appropriate option. A. Singleton noted that the other window was \$1100.00 but agreed it would look better. A. Roller asked what the building was to be used for. A. Singleton answered that it would be used for apartments. P. Sanchez asked if A. Singleton managed the building. A. Singleton responded yes. P. Newhouse asked how many apartments were located in the building. A. Singleton stated there were 4 apartments, 2 upstairs and 2 downstairs. P. Newhouse asked about the access to the upstairs apartments. A. Singleton stated there was an entrance on the Third St. side of the structure.

A. Roller asked what material the doors would be made out of. A. Singleton stated they were wood construction with aluminum clad, just like the one N. Schell pictured in the PowerPoint.

A. Singleton stated he thought it was silly to have 2 entrances into one apartment and he originally wanted to wall up one of the entrances but N. Schell talked him into just replacing the 2 doors. A. Singleton stated it would be more energy efficient to wall up the one entrance and that was what he was looking for.

B. Lyman stated she has done some research on the building directly west of this structure and it has doors exactly like the ones on this building including the side lights. The door has a ¾ light and it is a wood door. The window in the door matches the length of the side lights and she believed that was the door which was originally located on this structure. A. Singleton stated the side lights are still on the building. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was going to keep the side lights. A. Singleton stated that hadn't been discussed and that he didn't really want to keep the side lights and he could frame it in with aluminum and make it look nice. He believed the doors would provide enough light into the apartment unless the board decides they would like him to keep the side lights. A. Roller asked if the applicant would leave the glass in. A. Singleton answered he would if he had to but that door would probably cost around \$2-3 thousand per door. A. Singleton added that he wanted to remove everything then just frame in around the replacement doors. B. Lyman asked to clarify if the application was to take the side lights out. A. Singleton stated yes. A. Roller asked if that door would be extra big. A. Singleton stated right now the opening is 32-inches and he wants to put in a 36-inch door and frame in the rest of the space with wood covered in aluminum. B. Lyman asked about the transoms and if the applicant intended to keep those since one of the original transoms is still intact while the other is boarded up. A. Singleton stated that if the board felt he should leave the top window in than he would do so but it is not very efficient. B. Lyman showed the photo which she believed was the original design of the doorways. A. Roller stated she has a transom at her house and there is some depth and she put a storm window over it. A. Singleton stated that would probably be what he would do if asked to keep the transoms in place. A. Roller stated that would help with energy efficiency.

B. Lyman stated she went online and looked up doors similar to one she has shown and based on the dimensions given by the applicant in his application but she didn't realize that meant he would be removing the side lights. A. Roller stated she believed the board would like the applicant to keep the side lights and transom. A. Singleton stated he would have to put in a really high dollar door in there because the side lights can currently be pushed open. A. Singleton added that he does not keep tools in the building because it is easily broken into. A. Roller asked if that was because people can break the glass in the side lights. A. Singleton answered that those have been broken a few times but really the door frame is bad because when you close the door the whole frame moves.

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

B. Lyman stated that the side lights were there currently. A. Singleton stated yes and that they were Plexiglas. P. Sanchez asked for clarification that the side lights were Plexiglas. A. Singleton stated that was true. B. Lyman stated she thought the applicant could just get plate glass cut to fit into the current side light framing. A. Singleton stated yes he could do that especially if the board asked him to do so but that he would defiantly have to replace the material. B. Lyman stated that she noticed that if you look through one door to the other the original framing was still located on the inside of the structure. A. Singleton stated yes and if he was asked to keep the transom he would keep that framing on the inside but he would get thick glass from Glass Unlimited. B. Lyman expressed her appreciation for A. Singleton's willingness to work with the board.

P. Sanchez asked to clarify that the side lights and transom would stay glass and the door would be aluminum clad. A. Singleton stated he thought the doors which are currently on the building were steel but the replacement door would either be steel or aluminum clad. B. Lyman stated wood exterior doors would also be okay with the board and she has found several wood exterior doors for reasonable prices. A. Singleton state he would be willing to look into that and he was just trying to put back in what was already there. A. Singleton added he thought that a wood door would probably look really nice on that building and he could probably get one for roughly the same price. B. Lyman stated she would pass her research onto N. Schell so that N. Schell could provide them to the applicant.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

P. Sanchez made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as of fact that the application submitted on November 1st, 2016 and discussed on November 28th, 2016 for the property located at 405 E Third St. is within the windows guidelines which is found on page 60-63. The current vinyl window on the first floor of the west facing façade will be replaced with an aluminum clad wood window in keeping with the guidelines for replacing windows. Likewise, replacing both the west and south facing doors with 2-panel, 9-light aluminum clad or wood doors, retaining the side lights and transoms as discussed is keeping in the guidelines for replacing doors on pages 39-42. As materials and designs are within guidelines the Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted for both window and door replacements."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

Extended Applications:

1. Equestrian Group – C. of A. for three (3) cloth awnings – placement of one awning over each of the three (3) second floor windows; concealed LED uplighting to front façade of structure.

Location: **113 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell stated this building is a circa 1800 Italianate style contributing commercial structure. N. Schell showed images on the PowerPoint of the building with the awnings and concealed uplighting. M. Johnson represented the applicants who could not attend the meeting due to a business trip. B. Lyman asked what material the awnings were made of. R. Hopper stated they were canvas. P. Newhouse stated the awnings imitate the shed awnings which were historic in this town and they look wonderful. P. Newhouse added that the awnings could be removed easily without hurting the windows and thought the building looked stunning. R. Hopper stated he thought they did a wonderful job.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

““I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 113 W. Main St. to install three second floor canvas awning and LED uplighting on the front façade of the structure supported by the Commercial Design Guidelines on pages 34 and 35 stating that the addition of awnings to commercial buildings is appropriate if they are of traditional design, materials, and placement. Storefronts and upper facade windows are both appropriate locations for awnings. The new light fixtures are supported by the guidelines on page 45 which states that if modern light fixtures are desired as replacements or where light fixtures previously did not exist, they should be unobtrusive, conceal the light source, and direct light toward the building. Therefore, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be approved.”

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.

Business - New or Old:

R. Hopper stated that N. Schell had some new business to discuss. R. Hopper stated he thought the board has had a chance to review the new signage for the applicants to put on their building visible from the street. N. Schell stated she thought the sign spoke pretty clearly so she would answer any questions. R. Hopper stated he thought it looked wonderful and was simple and to the point. R. Hopper added he thought it would be more appropriate than what the board has had in the past.

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

B. Lyman made the motion to approve the new signage. Motion seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse Approved

R. Hopper Approved

B. Lyman Approved

M. Dorsey Approved

A. Roller Approved

P. Sanchez Approved

The motion to approve the signage passed. The new signage will begin to be used for the December meeting.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other new business.

Melissa Prickett represented Glass Unlimited which is located at 807 Lanier Drive. M. Prickett presented on a storm window Glass Unlimited offers which they would like to be considered for a Fast-track application. The storm window brand is ProVia which is an aluminum storm window. This brand has all the same features as the Mon-Ray storm windows. ProVia offers a life time warranty instead of the 10 year which is offered by Mon-Ray. ProVia is available in 16 different colors and Glass Unlimited started carrying this brand about 5 years ago. M. Prickett provided the board with 2 informational packets and a copy of the warranty.

A. Roller asked if the brand carried the full glass storm doors. M. Prickett answered yes and they have several styles. The full glass storm door is called the deluxe. A. Roller asked if the windows/doors had the ability to add the screen to the bottom and if they made a steel door. M. Prickett answered that a screen could be added but these doors were only aluminum not steel. A. Roller asked if the life time warranty also extended to the storm doors. M. Prickett answered yes and that the doors were 1-1/4 inch thick. M. Prickett added that if the owner sold a home with this product the owner just had to fill out a form and the warranty would transfer ownership without a fee. M. Prickett stated Glass Unlimited installed every brand they carry and they provide free estimates.

M. Prickett told the board that Glass Unlimited started carrying the product about 5 years ago because customers wanted a choice in color and ProVia offered those options. M. Prickett added that ProVia has been in business about 32 years and that Glass Unlimited gets the product from a distributor in Louisville, KY.

R. Hopper asked if these products go on the outside of buildings and if ProVia made ones for the inside of the buildings. M. Prickett answered yes those products go on the outside of the buildings but she wasn't sure if ProVia offered storm windows for the interior. ProVia has several different styles such as double-hung, sliders, etc. A. Roller asked if they would make them in any size. M. Prickett answered yes they would and they also offered architectural styles to accommodate designs such as transoms and rounded windows.

B. Lyman stated that one of the things about the other brand which is Fast-tracked is that it is adjustable so that if you get odd shaped windows which are maybe 1-inch wider at the top than the bottom the storm window frame can be adjusted for that. B. Lyman asked if the ProVia had that ability. M. Prickett stated that they did not have that type of adjustment but they have a 1-inch expander on the sides.

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

November 28, 2016

M. Prickett added that the ProVia is made to fit in the opening and cover the wood to protect the window and framing. B. Lyman thanked M. Prickett for coming to present to the board. A. Roller added that the board could not keep up with all the new products and appreciated M. Prickett for presenting on their product.

B. Lyman mentioned that she hoped that a couple of the board members and staff could come to Glass Unlimited and discuss the ordinance and guidelines so that Glass Unlimited to come up with a list of vendors for the historic district. M. Prickett agreed to meet with the board members at a later time. M. Prickett stated that Glass Unlimited carried several brands of wood windows and also aluminum wood windows. B. Lyman asked if they had the ability to restore wood windows. M. Prickett stated they could do some restoration work such as sills or part of a wood window but the cost and time prohibit them to do a lot of the restoration work. M. Prickett added it would depend on the amount of deterioration and that people can bring their wood windows to their shop and Glass Unlimited could repair them. M. Prickett stated the in-shop repairs were limited to re-glazing and new glass.

The board agreed to take a vote on the Fast-track proposal at the next meeting.

Link Ludington, member of the audience, spoke on the topic of Fast-track applications. L. Ludington thought this presentation was a set in the right direction but wanted the board to consider approving based on a set of criteria rather than brands which are presented before the board. B. Lyman asked if there was a definition the board could use. L. Ludington stated he wasn't sure of a specific definition but he calls them personally low-profile storm windows. B. Lyman stated it would be nice to use a definition which is commonly used to be approvable. L. Ludington also stated that in addition to expanding the definition of approval fast-track storm windows he would like to see the board allow the fast-track of the removal of modern exterior storm windows and storm doors.

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Sanchez made the motion to adjourn - seconded by B. Lyman.

Meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator

Louann Waller, Secretary