

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

B. Lyman stated that she understood that the materials they planned to use were wood and the same as the other side. Mr. Goodman stated yes the materials were treated wood and would match the existing porch. They plan to paint the porch this coming spring to match the existing.

M. Dorsey asked if the proposed porch would look exactly like the south side. Mr. Goodman stated yes.

B. Lyman welcomed the applicants to Madison and stated she was glad they chose to live in the historic district and that she understood that they had some experience with historic buildings. Mr. Goodman stated they have worked in New Albany. Mr. Holliday stated they thought Madison had a lot more charm than New Albany. Mr. Holliday stated that New Albany is a great town but there is something about Madison and it's probably the best small town in the world. Members agreed.

B. Lyman asked if they owned the property just west of the Culbertson Mansion. Applicants stated yes that was correct and that they currently reside in the Culbertson widow's home.

R. Hopper stated he thought they had toured the applicants' residence with HMI at one time. Applicants responded yes. R. Hopper mentioned he was a docent with HMI so he remembered that.

V. Crisafulli thanked applicants for moving to Madison and tackling this project.

R. Hopper mentioned that the board reviews applications in the order they are received except for the extended applications which always go at the bottom.

V. Crisafulli pointed out that the board has talked about in the last year or two wanting to showcase before and after projects and she thought that this one would be a good example. She requested the applicants to make sure they supplied the board with those pictures. Applicants agreed they would send photos in phases as the work is completed. V. Crisafulli stated it would be really nice to show the public people who are doing the right thing by these properties, who are really excited and who understand the value is in this district.

B. Lyman requested if the applicants came across any information they could pass along, as they go through this process, to pass it along so that the board could gather them as a resource to share with other people who come before the board. Mr. Holliday stated he thought the board had it down. B. Lyman stated the board was always willing to learn.

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 properties 304-306 Broadway Street to rebuild a second story porch originally on the north façade matching the porch on the south façade using similar materials as on the south porch supported by the residential design guidelines on pages 49 & 50 which states that if a historic porch is missing, it is appropriate to replace it using materials and styles that are compatible with the building to which they are attached."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

2. Grover Copeland, Jr. – C. of A. for a new single family 26-ft. x 42-ft. single family prefabricated residential structure. New structure to replace existing single-wide residential structure.

Location: **541 Spring St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell presented information about the application. She stated that the building located at 541 Spring Street is a circa 1990 prefabricated house. In the PowerPoint presentation she stated the photos are of the proposed building and a drawing of the location of the proposed house on the property.

V. Crisafulli asked if setbacks are appropriate for the larger structure. N. Schell stated that the setbacks were appropriate for the larger structure.

Mr. Copeland was present and explained that the current structure he is living in was his parents trailer and that before his mother passed away there was a leak under the floors and all the floors are buckled and in bad shape. The bathrooms are in bad shape. He stated he has four granddaughters and he wouldn't let them into the house and he wants a nice safe place where they can come and stay. He plans to put cement block all the way around the base of the structure at about five blocks high. He wants to make everything safe and look nice. He is considering after the first of the year to put a front porch with a gable roof connecting to the house.

V. Crisafulli noted that in the notes the board was given about this project that the applicant had a discussion about the materials with the past preservation planner. Mr. Copeland stated he had met with her about the materials. V. Crisafulli noted that the project was a proposed vinyl structure and asked why the applicant decided to go with that over the recommended or approved materials. Mr. Copeland stated that vinyl was the only materials he could get on this model and the manufacturer did not offer any other materials. It was a special the manufacturer had on this model and he couldn't change anything but did try to change the siding but they would not let him.

Scott Baldwin of 1450 Clifty Drive noted he was a member of the Board of Zoning Appeals but he was addressing the board as a private citizen. Scott Baldwin was an audience member. S. Baldwin stated the Board of Zoning Appeals gave a conditional use permit for this applicant pending the board's action and as the Board of Zoning Appeals went through their checklist one of the questions they had to answer is whether the structure is appropriate to the neighborhood and did it blend in and was it appropriate to the goals of Madison's overall purposes. He noted the Board of Zoning Appeals voted unanimously to approve the conditional use permit because the entire neighborhood there is mobile homes and they are all attractive. As a private citizen he acknowledges that the proposed project has vinyl siding but he thinks that given the neighborhood and what is already there that this structure would be appropriate.

V. Crisafulli agrees with S. Baldwin's statements.

Mr. Copeland's son stated that he thought given this condition also that regardless of this situation something has to be done because like he said it's becoming no longer livable or a suitable home. He stated he had two daughters himself and that the applicant is really wanting to be able to have them there for a slumber party or an overnight but given the conditions of the flooring and everything the new home would generate happiness for the family overall. It would be better conditions for everybody because right now you cannot walk across the floor and wonder when you are going to go through. M. Johnson asked if the current structure had gone through the flood a couple years ago. Mr. Copeland answered that it had. M. Johnson noted that mobile homes are made of particle board generally and when it gets wet it just destroys.

B. Lyman noted that the property is located by what she thinks is Crooked Creek. Mr. Copeland stated that he wasn't sure if it was Crooked Creek but he knew it at least ran into Crooked Creek if it wasn't. Mr. Copeland's son noted that the city has taken actions to prevent that area from flooding. R. Hopper noted that the city has changed some of the drains in that area.

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

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

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of a single family prefab dwelling/structure at 541 Spring Street with a dwelling of similar material and larger size commonly referred to as double wide according to the application submitted on September 28th 2016 and discussed on October 24th 2016 for the reasons cited below:

The current residential design guidelines do not address prefabricated homes in the historic district. The proposed project is consistent in scale, height, orientation, shape, placement, and rhythm with other dwellings in the context of the immediate surrounding neighborhood. While the new project is not necessarily consistent in materials used that are recommended in the guidelines the proposed materials would not significantly alter the character of the historic district. The applicant should be aware that the materials proposed to not have the durability, appearance, or longevity of other more appropriate materials. Therefore and especially given the lack of any specific guidelines to address the deterioration and replacement of prefabricated housing the COA should be approved."

Motion seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

3. Pamela Sue Brown – C. of A. for wood/aluminum clad replacement windows on the south (one upper window; two lower windows), north (one lower window), and east (two upper windows; 1 lower window) facades of residential structure; and for low profile storm windows.

Location: **620 West St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell presented information about the application. She stated that the building located at 620 West Street is a circa 1870 front gable home. It is contributing to the District. In the PowerPoint presentation she stated the photos showed the front façade where the windows are currently being restored and the other photos showed the facades where the windows to be replaced.

Ms. Brown was present and explained that she has owned the home for about three years. She has restored the windows in the front for the most part and is working on the lower two currently.

P. Newhouse stated it looked like she had done a really nice job on the windows on the front. Ms. Brown stated they were working on putting the weights back in. The lower windows they used all original materials. They sourced old glass to put back into where they lost old glass. They did lose a few of the tenions and they were made exactly the same. It was a lot of effort.

B. Lyman thanked the Ms. Brown for supplying such a complete application and that it was really nice for the board to get not only the pictures but the description the applicant added because it really helps the board understand the project completely. B. Lyman also expressed how much she appreciated how much effort Ms. Brown put in the front façade because that is the most important part of any building in the historic district. That's the part that public sees when they come in and out and Ms. Brown did an exceptional job at that. M. Dorsey agreed.

P. Newhouse stated that the vertical muntins that the width being wider than the horizontal ones was really quite unusual. Ms. Brown agreed and stated they were 7/8. Ms. Brown stated all the replacements that she was proposing to put in the back all have those exact specifications for all the

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

muntings. P. Newhouse asked who would be working on those windows. Ms. Brown stated Martin Stockdale would be installing them and she was going to order them through Quaker Windows.

P. Newhouse asked if they were aluminum clad. Ms. Brown stated that they would be aluminum on the outside and wood on the inside. B. Lyman noted that these windows are exactly what the guidelines called for.

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 a fact that the proposed project at 620 West St. if constructed according to the plans submitted on October 4, 2016 is compatible with the character of the historic district. Specifically the five newly restored windows on the façade of the home which faces West Street will be fitted with low profile custom made storm windows made LI Windows. Three windows on the south side of the house, one on the north side, and three on the east side of the house are to be replaced with aluminum clad wood windows, an approved product for windows that are deteriorated beyond repair. All are 4/4 with 7/8 wood vertical mutins which are slightly wider than the horizontal ones. These measurements will be replicated in the replacement windows Quaker brand classic series. Therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted."

Motion seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

4. Mike Estes – C. of A. for a 10-ft. x 20-ft. accessory building (wood siding; standing seam metal roof).

Location: **825 W. Third St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell presented information about the application. She stated that the home located at 825 W. Third Street is a circa 1880 contributing structure to the district. It was noted that a previous wood frame garage sat on the property that was similar to what is proposed. In the PowerPoint presentation a photo of the proposed garage was included.

Mr. Estes was present and explained that he desperately needs this project approved. He came a few years ago before the board. This is a house he purchased when his mother had passed away and he wanted to build a really nice carriage house behind it but his aspirations and budget dwindled quickly. I need something to store furniture and such.

B. Lyman asked if this was going to be a permanent structure with a footer and concrete base. Mr. Estes stated no that it would be right on 4x4 runners. B. Lyman asked therefore it could be moved later if you wanted. Mr. Estes stated that it absolutely could be moved later and that it was going to sit on the southeast corner basically where the garage used to sit which was torn down back in 2012 or 2013.

P. Sanchez asked if there was going to be access from the alley. Mr. Estes stated that there would only be the doors on the front and the picture on the PowerPoint is exactly like the unit they would like to purchase. P. Sanchez asked if that faced the home. Mr. Estes stated yes it faced the home and you would be able to see it from Third Street. There would be access from the alleyway of Wall Street but very minimum.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

There are no windows and no other door or entryways as well, just the front doors facing the house.

N. Schell stated that the office had a call come in from Julia Adams at 823 W. Third Street. She had to work and was not able to attend the meeting. J. Adams wanted to express her concerns about not the building of the garage but the placement of the garage. M. Johnson stated he would make sure he does a site inspection that it has to be 3-feet off the property line so that should eliminate any concerns. M. Johnson asked if the building would be built on site or brought in. Mr. Estes stated it would be brought in. V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant had talked with his neighbor about this project. Mr. Estes stated he hadn't. V. Crisafulli stated that it would probably be a good idea to find out exactly what her objections are and make sure she knows you are going to have proper setbacks. Mr. Estes stated it would absolutely be in the same spot and Mark would come down and survey the area but it won't be an issue at all. Mr. Estes asked if it was common to have a person call in and the historic board speak for a complaint via telephone and not come in person. M. Johnson stated people come in or talk to him or N. Schell. R. Hopper stated that he remembered one time there was someone who was agreeable with a project and they sent a letter to the board and he had read it at the meeting.

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 approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for property at 825 W Third Street to replace a one car wood-framed garage removed three years ago following Historic Board of Review approval with a storage building of the same size mainly 10x20. Proposed materials include wood siding, carriage style door and standing seam metal roof all consistent with guidelines on pages 45 & 53. There will be no windows in this structure. P. Sanchez noted that she had drove by the property and she couldn't see where it was going to be. So, I felt it was not visible from the street or the alley. The application was submitted October 4th and October 24th 2016."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

- Larry Crisafulli – C. of A. for a 6-ft. x 10-ft. greenhouse/potting shed to be attached to south wall of existing garage.

Location: **832 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

N. Schell presented information about the application. She stated that the home located at 832 W. Main Street is a circa 1840 contributing Italianate structure. In the PowerPoint presentation includes a photo of the proposed structure with the door being on the opposite end. The PowerPoint presentation also included views from the alley and the location of the proposed structure on the garage.

L. Crisafulli was present. B. Lyman asked if one of the photos showed where a fence would be. L. Crisafulli stated he was not applying for a fence but would like to come before board for a fence at a later date. L. Crisafulli stated that the north side of the garage is on the alley and the board was currently looking at the west side of the garage in the photo.

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

October 24, 2016

L. Crisafulli stated that the proposed greenhouse would be on the south side of the garage. B. Lyman acknowledged that the structure would be wood and glass. L. Crisafulli confirmed that was correct and stated that he planned to paint it the same color as the garage.

P. Sanchez asked if the applicant was building it or if it was a kit. L. Crisafulli stated he was building it and it would look like the first photo in the PowerPoint except the door would be located on the other side, the east side rather than the west side.

L. Crisafulli stated it was not visible from the alley or the street. There is a large Pine tree which obstructs the view of it from the street but someday that will be gone so he thought he better get approval.

B. Lyman thanked the applicant for coming before the board for that reason.

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 property at 832 W Main Street to construct a greenhouse/potting shed attached to the south wall of the existing garage using wood framing and glass as this will have minimal visibility from the street or alley and using approved materials that is consistent with the residential design guidelines page 68 for additions.”

Motion seconded by P. Sanchez.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Abstained
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

Extended Applications:

- James and Allison Hall – C. of A. for vinyl replacement windows: East façade – one (1) lower level and two (2) second level; South façade – nine (9) that will include five (5) on the lower level and four (4) on the second level; west façade – two (2) second level.

Location: **309 Elm St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented information about the application. She stated that the home located at 309 Elm Street is a circa 1860 contributing Italianate Duplex. In the PowerPoint presentation includes photos of the proposed windows which are located on the property located at 311 Elm Street and photos some of the current windows.

Mr. and Mrs. Hall were present and Mr. Hall stated he had photos of the inside of the windows for the board to view. Mrs. Hall apologized for not supplying those photos earlier.

B. Lyman asked which wall the windows pictures were located. Mrs. Hall stated they were a combination of the front and south walls. Mrs. Hall stated there is only two west facing windows and they bad shape. Mrs. Hall didn't think of those were pictured. Mr. Hall stated he had a brochure and that when he first submitted the application in August he had supplied this to Ms. Broadnax. The brochure is just information on the windows.

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

B. Lyman asked if these were the replacement windows in the brochure. Mr. Hall stated that those pictured were the replacement windows and stated they purchased the house in June.

B. Lyman stated that she noticed that it was mentioned in the application that the applicant wanted windows just like those of the neighbor's property at 311 Elm Street. She thought it might be good for the board to share the complete story about those windows. Some notes were shared with the board and thought it was appropriate to share those with the applicant. B. Lyman asked N. Schell if she had those notes at the meeting. N. Schell stated she did not have those with her at the meeting.

Mr. Hall stated that he thought that the house behind their property or the large brick house on Vine Street that has vinyl windows. B. Lyman stated she wasn't sure about that. M. Johnson asked which property Mr. Hall was referring to. Mr. Hall stated it was the large brick house just west of the applicants' property.

B. Lyman asked if the applicants had a chance to read the guidelines. Mr. Hall stated he had now after someone had mentioned it but they didn't get the guidelines at first. Mr. Hall stated there was an email which he accidentally passed around was from Ms. Broadnax where he had asked if they needed to come before the board to do this project and she stated no that they could fast-track windows. So, that's what we thought we were able to do. Mrs. Hall stated that is why they went ahead with the process. Mr. Hall stated he found out later that we had to go through this process.

Mrs. Hall stated they had submitted approval for a fence and they got that. They are getting an iron fence from Madison Iron Works and they are trying to do the best that they can with the means that they have to try to upgrade this house. It has been a dream of the applicants to live downtown for her whole life. Mrs. Hall stated that the windows they currently have are not functional and are rotting and that they did not have an option on replacing them.

Mr. Hall stated he contacted Mr. Welch and he was the only contractor who he could get to return his call. Mr. Hall stated he had called two others and emailed two others and they never responded back to him. Mr. Welch came down to their house and their windows like Ms. Brown was speaking of do not have any weights in any of them. The little pin holes that hold the windows up are now so stretched out that they no longer work. So, some of the windows were actually screwed shut so they didn't function at all. Mr. Welch stated they would have to put new weights in them and he quoted them \$1100.00 per window just to put the weights in and reseal the glass. Mr. Welch's quote would not replace any of the glass and then Mr. Hall got a quote for the lead abatement of those windows and that was \$4500.00 just to take the paint off those windows just so Mr. Welch could work on them.

Mr. Hall stated that if an organization is going to abate the lead, not just remove the windows but scrape the lead off there, there are certain OSHA standards and that lead becomes hazardous waste so there's a big process if you are going to do it correctly that has to happen. They took that into factor and got quotes on aluminum clad windows and it was over \$25,000.00 compared to these windows.

V. Crisafulli asked to see those quotes. Mr. Hall stated the first two quotes are for vinyl with grids in them from Lowe's and Glass Unlimited. The second one is one from Glass Unlimited for wood windows. And \$25,000.00 is between 20-25% of the value of the home that we purchased it for. So we took all of that into consideration.

B. Lyman asked if these quotes were for the fourteen windows. Mr. Hall stated that was correct. Mrs. Hall stated they had asked about just doing some wood and some vinyl and America's Windows stated they would not do that and Glass Unlimited stated they typically only do one kind. Mr. Hall clarified that they would not get the same price per window or it would be exponentially more to order three windows compared to all fourteen.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicants had priced the aluminum clad windows at Lowe's. Mr. Hall stated they had not. Mrs. Hall stated they had at Home Depot but they did not deliver. Those would have been around \$850 per window at Home Depot.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

B. Lyman stated she wasn't sure if the applicants had read the guidelines. Mr. Hall stated he had since everything with the Fast-Track application issue and that he saw the recommendations but that was after they had already saw the email saying they could do the fast-track and they wanted to know exactly what the applicants were going to get on the fast-track and how much it was going to cost.

Mr. Hall stated they had an issue with the installation because they were originally on the August meeting but the company wanted to install before that. Mr. Hall stated he had asked them to wait until they could go to the meeting and I asked them what was the next available date after the meeting and it was September 3rd. At that same time we had a miscommunication with Ms. Broadnax again about the posting of the green sign. After than the applicant forgot about it because they were leaving on vacation and the father-in-law was watching the house and the company showed up to install the windows and that's when they started.

Mr. Hall stated he would like to keep the current windows they have in the basement so that if someone does have the resources to install them they could go back and install them. They are not totally original. Mr. Welch believes they used to be a 6/6 and he could see where the wood was taken out of those at some point. Mr. Hall stated they would be willing to keep the windows in the basement if someone later would or if they would have the resources to refinish the windows and put them back in.

B. Lyman stated she regretted how much poor information the applicants received and that it has been a very confusing process for the applicants and very frustrating. B. Lyman apologized for that and stated that is not how it is supposed to go. B. Lyman stated that she thought the applicants were good caretakers of this property and that they wanted to do the right thing and this is their dream home. Mr. Hall/Mrs. Hall stated yes and that the inside is in bad shape and that they had spent months re-plastering the inside and the applicants had the curb fixed. Mrs. Hall states that the curb outside of their house was probably the worst curb in the city. Mr. Hall added that you could see the brick where they the asphalt was getting washed away and you could see the exposed brick underneath. Mrs. Hall stated they had done a lot of landscaping and putting paver stones in the back. Mrs. Hall stated they wanted to take good care of this home but they did not have the financial or time resources to do the restoration on the windows.

V. Crisafulli stated that given the applicants have gone to such care and the applicants obviously care about this house that's one of the reasons she hate to see the applicant put vinyl windows in the house. V. Crisafulli added that knowing what happens to vinyl windows over time and with weather and what it does to the appearance of the home she just hates that even though the applicant is doing the right thing by this property she would hate to see the applicant put vinyl windows in it. V. Crisafulli stated she hates to see the applicant waste good money. Mrs. Hall stated that she saw it as a value because while she understands that the best solution would be to restore them, in this case she didn't think that restoring the windows is an option for them right now and the second best option for her would be able to utilize the windows and have storm windows and be able to open them. Mrs. Hall added that currently she could not open any of the windows and that all the windows downstairs are painted shut and the ones upstairs are rotting to where they are crumbling and they are busted and the glass is cracked.

B. Lyman stated that speaking for herself as a board member that their problem is that the board is given a set of guidelines and they are charged with following them. B. Lyman added that it was just like with the applicants' neighbors who were allowed to put vinyl windows in, once the owners put them in, a previous board required them to take them all out and put the wood ones back in which apparently that was a part of the notes the board was given. B. Lyman wished the board and the applicants could find a level of compromise in this situation because the ordinance says it is the front face that so important just like in the Browns case, she took care to put those three windows back into shape and make them look as original as possible. B. Lyman asked if the applicants would consider just doing as much as they could to put the wood windows, either new or restored, on the front of the house and then go ahead with rest of the house with the kind of windows the applicants had prices for.

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

Mr. Hall stated they wouldn't mind doing that but they had already paid for the windows when they did the fast-track. The email he passed around was dated the 5th and on the 7th the applicants contacted the company and the company's quote was lower than the other quotes so the applicants paid for the windows up front. Therefore that would require the applicants to lose money to repurchase wood windows. Mr. Hall stated it was not economically feasible for them to do that and the other issue would be if they purchased new windows or tried to restore the current windows he wasn't sure the timeline to get a contractor in to do the work. Mr. Hall added that he had talked to Mr. Welch who is currently on a house on Saint Michaels next to the old Catholic church and Mr. Welch informed the applicants he was not sure when he would be able to do the work. Mr. Hall stated he could not get any other contractor whom he had gotten cards from to Jessica Butler for historic preservation people that do work and he could not get any of them to contact him back other than Mr. Welch.

B. Lyman stated she understood.

V. Crisafulli stated she was not in favor of allowing vinyl windows in the historic structures in the district at all. She thought the board had a situation here that makes it difficult for the board because they obviously had a temporary staff convey the wrong information to the applicants. She wasn't sure if that made this case mitigating circumstance or not.

B. Lyman asked D. Sutter for his opinion. D. Sutter stated that his opinion on what the board should or should not do based on the board's decision he would say that if the vote was no and the applicants were to challenge it and the email would create some problems. D. Sutter stated that even though the staff person was not here anymore that she was in that position of historic preservationist giving information that was apparently relied upon by the applicants to their detriment it would be a difficult challenge to overcome.

V. Crisafulli told N. Schell that this is why her position was so important. V. Crisafulli thanked D. Sutter for his advice and given the information the applicants had been given the board did not have any choice on this case. V. Crisafulli added that she believed the motion needed to reflect that and it be stated in the motion that the board is not setting a precedent for vinyl windows in the historic district and the only reason is because of the incorrect information had been given.

R. Hopper asked the applicants where they had purchased the windows. Mr. Hall stated they had purchased the windows from America's Windows.

R. Hopper asked for clarification on that America's Windows had stated they were not willing to change the windows at the front. Mr. Hall stated the windows they had purchased are already at the house. Mrs. Hall stated they had asked them previously when the applicants and the company were discussing the windows if they could do some in aluminum clad or wood or some vinyl and they would not do that. The company told the applicants it would be a lot more expensive to do a mixture of window materials. R. Hopper stated he thought the company was giving the applicants wrong information and was trying to make a sale.

B. Lyman stated that recognizing all the crazy circumstances the applicants had found themselves in but the fact the applicants were willing to save these windows could the board get the applicants to consider in the long run as the applicants lived in the property that it would be a goal to eventually put the original windows back in the front façade of the house. Mr. Hall stated they would keep them in the basement and consider that in the future when they become financial able to do that they would take that into consideration. B. Lyman stated that a lot of people come to this town because of the architectural charm and its beauty and when you walk down sidewalks and see front facades of houses so closely people know if they are vinyl or wood and that is why the guidelines are so stringent along this line. B. Lyman apologized that the applicants were so misinformed and the board appreciated that the applicants were willing to save the old windows so that the applicant or someone else could put them back in. B. Lyman stated that if they had lead in them to be sure to wrap them up and that she noticed all the windows had wavy glass which is the original glass and that stuff is very hard to come by and expensive to get so if the applicants could get the installers to take the windows out carefully so that they do not break that glass it would be toward the applicants advantage.

Page 11
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

V. Crisafulli stated the applicants might want to let Historic Madison or the people at the Re-Store know of these windows exist because sometimes there are requests for windows. Mr. and Mrs. Hall stated they were on the Habitat board.

P. Newhouse asked if the new windows had a grid system. Mr. Hall stated that yes the front east facing on Elm Street would have grids at 6/6 sandwiched in-between the glass and would look exactly like the windows next door.

M. Johnson stated it was his vacation day when he put the stop work order on the property and Window World was doing the construction. M. Johnson asked how many of the new windows are installed. Mrs. Hall stated it was six. M. Johnson stated he knew that the company had all of the windows out. Mr. Hall stated that all the windows were in the house. Mr. Hall stated there were six original windows in the house sitting downstairs and that there were eight original windows replaced so far. M. Johnson stated when the company was packing up and he had asked what they were going to do with the old windows and the company stated they were going to take the old windows back with them and that they had taken the windows that were sitting by the trailer. M. Johnson asked the company why they were going to take all the windows and the company stated because of the lead based paint. M. Johnson recommended that the applicants wrap the windows individually in plastic bags because the paint would chip off. Mr. Hall stated he was a hazardous waste manager for the military department so he understood and that in that situation that was a miscommunication with his father-in-law and assured the board that the applicants still had windows upstairs and there were enough of the side windows which are the exact same size to save. Mr. Hall stated there was only one window in the front had taken out.

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

B. Lyman made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for project at 309 Elm Street to which was submitted on July 22nd 2016 and amended in the discussion at the October 24th 2016 meeting in the following manner:

The applicants agree to store the existing windows in their basement and consider replacing them in east or front façade if possible and will let Habitat Re-Store know about their existence. We approve allowing 14 windows that have currently been purchased and are stored at the facility to be installed this includes three on the east façade, five on the lower level and four on the second level of the south façade and two on the second level of the west façade. Those will be vinyl replacements. The guidelines state on page 61 that windows should be repaired rather than replaced. If severe deterioration necessitates replacement which is defined by 80% of the original window is missing or deteriorated, new wood windows should be in-kind to match the original design and materials. Baked enamel or aluminum windows may be appropriate. Vinyl or vinyl clad wood windows should not be installed on the any façade visible from street views. In approving this certificate the board is not setting a precedent to approve vinyl windows in residential structures. The only reason we are doing this is because of misinformation provided by temporary preservation staff. If these guidelines are followed a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Abstained
P. Sanchez	Approved

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

Page 12
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

R. Hopper apologized to applicants for the misinformation that they were given. D. Sutter agreed and stated it was especially unfortunate given the fact the applicants initiated the email exchange and the applicants were trying to do the right thing.

Mr. Hall asked if they needed to apply for an application for a little iron hand rails. The board and M. Johnson agreed that iron hand rails would fall under fence which could be fast-tracked.

7. 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)

R. Hopper noted that applicant has requested for their applicant to be extended. V. Crisafulli stated that last month the application was an extension last month and they had given a reason and asked what the reason was for the extension this time. N. Schell informed the board that the reason for the extension was that the property owners removed the required sign during the required consecutive 15 day posting and that they already have a new sign which the board was assured that the sign would be posted for the required 15 consecutive days.

B. Lyman made the motion to extend application.

Motion seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Abstained
P. Sanchez	Approved

Application extended.

Business - New or Old:

V. Crisafulli stated that last month she had brought up the item of the board's membership in the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions which had lapsed and stated that she thought this was an important national organization for the board to along to. V. Crisafulli stated that there are resources which would be available to the board such as sample guidelines, procedures, looking at how other boards operate it would be so valuable. That information would be online and through inquiries and there is also a list-serve. Also there is a conference every two years that is also very valuable. V. Crisafulli stated she had attended that twice in the past. P. Newhouse asked if this board had never been a member of this organization. R. Hopper and V. Crisafulli stated that the board had been previously but it had lapsed. V. Crisafulli stated at the board's request she had looked up the cost and membership information and it is \$100.00 for towns of our population which is very reasonable. That cost includes membership for each member of the board and staff.

V. Crisafulli made the motion that the board becomes members of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions.

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse.

B. Lyman and M. Dorsey asked if the board had funding for the membership or where those funds would come from. D. Sutter stated the board did not have funding for the membership. R. Hopper stated the funds would have to come from the planning office.

Page 13

**Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016**

M. Johnson stated yes they would come from the planning office. N. Schell mentioned that Mayor Welch had expressed his support for the board's membership to this national organization.

B. Lyman stated the board should discuss the goals they had set out for themselves for the year. The goals are listed in the order of priority.

1. Guideline Review and Update

V. Crisafulli asked where that stood. B. Lyman asked M. Dorsey if he was involved with that. M. Dorsey stated it was going to be him and R. Hopper on a special committee but the mayor has postponed that because of other priorities. R. Hopper believed they were waiting on the five year plan to be completed. B. Lyman stated that since a Full-Time staff person has been hired she asked that if any if the board members have information from previous discussions and work sessions on this topic to pass them along to N. Schell. N. Schell stated she had what notes Jessica Butler and other people in the position had left on the computer. B. Lyman stated that Marcia was on staff while the board had the workshop and that she had found some notes that date back to Link when he was reviewing them and Rhonda reviewed them too and will pass them on to N. Schell to see if they are still valid or add additions.

2. Establish Legal Procedures for Noncompliance/Nonconformance

B. Lyman asked if anyone had taken that on. D. Sutter stated that it was going to go with number one. This would be looked at when the board would look at the guidelines and board procedures. It is still postponed with number one. D. Sutter stated that there are still the procedures that currently exist but there is nothing beyond what currently exists that has been looked at. V. Crisafulli stated in that regard one thing she would to put on the table because there have been so many items that have come before the board is projects that have already been start which puts the board in a bad position. V. Crisafulli stated that one of the really reasonable things to do as the board looks at number two is establish a reasonable fine for applicants whose projects have already begun. The guidelines state right up front that they have to come before the board before a project is started and she thinks a fine is a reasonable thing to have in place for all projects that are started or completed before that happens or helps address that stop work order issue that the board has had on a few projects. N. Schell informed the board that in order to do that they would have to amend their ordinance. B. Lyman asked M. Johnson if he could guide the board through the process of what that would require, could the board then make a recommendation to committee or City Council or what is the steps. D. Sutter stated that the historic ordinance was approved by the City Council so any amendments to the ordinance would have to pass and be approved by the City Council. V. Crisafulli asked if the committee R. Hopper and M. Dorsey are sitting on would be discussing all of this before it goes to council. D. Sutter stated that any changes at all reviewed by the committee would certainly be sent to the council. V. Crisafulli stated this would help people understand that this really puts the board in a bind not to have something like that in place. R. Hopper agreed.

P. Sanchez asked V. Crisafulli if this is the resources that the board just approved and stated couldn't the board get from other parts of the country some guidelines and that kind of thing. V. Crisafulli stated she was sure they could about how they deal with compliance issues. B Lyman stated that if it sounded like the board was in agreement with that something needs to be put into place then the board passes that recommendation on to R. Hopper and M. Dorsey to be their representatives. R. Hopper stated he would check the mayor when they would restart that process of meeting.

B. Lyman asked if M. Johnson had any staff recommendations since he is the one who has to issue the stop work orders. M. Johnson stated consistency because there have been a couple situations in the last couple months and the board does not have any guidelines and he thinks that this is a start. M. Johnson stated that he thought that if there is a fine there needs to be clarification on payable to whom, for what, etc. B. Lyman clarified that what M. Johnson said was that it has to have a specific process of step 1, step 2, and step 3. B. Lyman stated that at one time she thought V. Crisafulli mentioned that she thought there should be a step process of an official letter is sent out first, then something else such as talking to them face to face, then maybe the fine goes next in order to make sure there isn't misunderstandings on anybody's part. D. Sutter stated that he thought that the process regardless of what it is should still attempt to encourage compliance even if there was an initial non-compliance. V. Crisafulli and B. Lyman agreed.

Page 14

**Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016**

Link Ludington, a member of the audience, stated it was in the board's ordinance Section 151.99 about the penalty. B. Lyman stated that she thought that section was about how non-compliance would be taken to circuit court. V. Crisafulli stated she thought that section was the egregious one where it was up to \$10,000.00 per incident. L. Ludington stated that yes maybe in fact the maximum. D. Sutter stated that the process by doing that would be to have to initiate an action in the circuit court in order to effectuate that is the process of the current one and the fine does say up to \$10,000.00 but it could be an amount less than that.

B. Lyman asked if the council could approve something less than going to circuit court where it's like a traffic ticket or something on that level. D. Sutter stated that he believed they could but ultimately anything of that level could be challenged at a circuit court. D. Sutter stated that looking at all of these options is what this committee should be doing and if there are some intermediate options that could be recommended potentially could be less harsh that could also be helpful then those should be explored.

3. Continue Push for Full-Time Preservation Planner - Completed

B. Lyman stated that she thought that the board could happily agree that number three had been completed and wanted to extend her thanks to the mayor and the city council because they are the ones who allowed a full-time position and wanted everyone to understand that N. Schell was being employed as the city planner not just the preservation planner so N. Schell really is serving the entire city now not just the historic district. B. Lyman stated she thought that was to the board's advantage at such a critical time in the city's development where so much is going on that we look at the town holistically and not just as a small component of the city. V. Crisafulli stated that B. Lyman made a good point. R. Hopper agreed.

4. Face to Face Outreach to Target Groups

B. Lyman stated she has had a few discussions with a couple of city council people and what she is beginning to recognize is they really are very busy people and don't have the time to track everything that goes along in each of the boards; zoning, planning, and historic review board. B. Lyman has talked to N. Schell about this topic and she had some suggestions B. Lyman thought N. Schell should share. N. Schell stated that she would have to talk to Mayor Welch about her idea but she would like to be able to go before City Council and give them a report after the board meetings to give them an update on what the board is doing and what projects are being approved. R. Hopper stated he thought that had been done in the past. B. Lyman stated she thought that this idea was a really important thing in terms of the board's getting the information out about what the board is doing because some of the city council people she has talked to were surprised when she told them that as a board it's probably 90-95% of the time they approve applications. The City Council tends to hear about the ones the board does not approve so if N. Schell could make that report to them on a regular basis that idea could be underscored and show that the board is really trying to work as a resource for the community and that they are not trying to be impediment to all people trying to improve their properties.

5. Revise CoA Application - Completed

B. Lyman asked N. Schell that as she goes through this with new applicants if she sees something that isn't working to let the board know. B. Lyman stated she was surprised that the last applicant had not read the guidelines because the new CoA application form is supposed to be doing is to show people exactly what the guidelines are for each element of their project and it is so critical that the applicants read that and understand it so it doesn't seem like the board is making things up.

N. Schell stated she wanted to return that request to the board and if there was something they see that isn't working or have suggestions she would be open to working with the board to make those changes.

6. Establish Rules for Orderly Board Procedures

V. Crisafulli stated that one was on her plate and she hasn't done anything about that yet and asked the board has any points they would like to be considered to email them to her and she would try to get to it.

Page 15

Historic District Board of Review

October 24, 2016

7. Review of Previous Applications for Compliance

R. Hopper stated he thought there was a schedule made out but wasn't sure what happened to it. B. Lyman stated she thought the idea was when the two board members go with M. Johnson and N. Schell that at that time it would be the time to pull up what was approved a year ago because the CoA works for a year and at that time they could review what approved a year ago and see what stage it is in and that could be part of what N. Schell reports to the board. B. Lyman stated that could be a way the board monitors the projects. M. Johnson asked what would happen if they don't meet compliance. V. Crisafulli stated that it would jump to number two. B. Lyman stated that the board could engage a conversation with the applicants and see if there are mitigating reasons and what has happened with the project and see if the applicant still wants to go forward with the project. N. Schell stated it would be her staff recommendation to wait till the board looks at number one and number two but they could go by and look at those properties but until the board has that procedure established she thought the board should wait to make that an official part of the board's procedures.

8. More Detail in the Motion & Vote

V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell to mark complete on that number. R. Hopper agreed.

9. Add Brief Educational Component to each Board Meeting

B. Lyman asked N. Schell if she had some thoughts about this number and thought she had mentioned some before and after photos. N. Schell stated yes that in addition to possibly showing that to the City Council that it would be good to not only educate the board about the before and after photos but also public who attends the board's meetings. R. Hopper stated that was a good idea and that has been done in the past and even had a little certificate which was presented by the mayor for the Preservation Heroes for someone who had completed the process and the board recognized their good work. V. Crisafulli stated going back to number four and maybe this could be part of nine too but the board has to do something about two groups; one is the realtors and the other one is the contractors. Those seem to be the ones the board runs into so many problems with targeting and education. P. Newhouse asked if those groups had fairly regular meetings. V. Crisafulli stated the realtors do. P. Newhouse stated she thought the contractors used to. D. Sutter stated the Board of Realtors meets regularly and at their meetings they typically will have guest speakers. B. Lyman stated it would be good if N. Schell could go to these groups as a guest speaker but also good if a board member went with her.

10. Monthly Meeting with Planner

B. Lyman stated she thought the board was accomplishing number ten as well. P. Newhouse asked if there was something set up for November and she had a date but didn't know she B. Lyman was talking about site visits. B. Lyman stated yes that was correct. N. Schell stated she had a sheet in the office that had something along those lines. V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell if she could send that out to everybody. N. Schell confirmed she would do that. M. Dorsey stated he was sure that he was supposed to go and that he had it scheduled on Election Day so that would have to be changed but was not sure who was supposed to go with him.

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

N. Schell stated that the board/staff has had a few issues or concerns about the current signs and she is proposing to change the wordage. The new proposed sign is based off what Savannah, Georgia does for their CoA signs. The major change will be removing the public notice words and replacing them with Madison Historic Board of Review Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to make it clearer that the property or property owner is not in danger or of being sold so the public knows when they see the sign that it is regarding proposed changes.

N. Schell stated that there have been a few issues of adjacent property owners have come up recently and her staff recommendation would be to go back to sending certified letters as well as posting one sign per property. V. Crisafulli asked to clarify if the property owners would have to send the certify letters. N. Schell stated yes and therefore the board would have to change the procedures in order to go back to the letters. V. Crisafulli stated she thought the board should be careful about that topic because one of the things is from her understanding that has happened in the past is that if the applicant misses a neighbor or somebody it could be really onerous to put that on the applicant.

Page 16
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

N. Schell stated how other boards do it from her understanding is that the planning commission for example gives the applicant when they come in with the application a list of property owners they had to send out those letters to. So the applicant does not need to go out and get those addresses we would supply them. B. Lyman asked how far around the structure do these letters go out to. N. Schell stated all adjacent properties, any across the street and across corners. B. Lyman stated for example is City Hall wanted to do it then it would be every single building, next door, Red Roaster, then the corner one; how far does it extend. N. Schell stated just the adjacent properties then directly across the corner. V. Crisafulli stated there was a reason why the board moved to do the notice in the windows rather than the certified letters and that was to make a more user friendly process. P. Newhouse stated it was expensive and time consuming and difficult and sometimes you miss some people. P. Newhouse stated she didn't see a reason for going back to the letters. L. Ludington stated it was also because there was nothing in the ordinance that empowers the board to make that requirement. N. Schell pointed out that it was not in the ordinance but in the board's procedures. P. Newhouse stated she would be totally against going back to the letters. R. Hopper stated that changing the signage would be better. R. Hopper stated his nephew wanted to put up a sign before it could be fast-tracked and he had to send out seven letters. R. Hopper stated he thought it cost \$12. M. Johnson stated that the cost was \$6. R. Hopper stated that applicants complained about the cost and that is why it was changed. D. Sutter stated that a notice is still published in the newspaper. V. Crisafulli stated that the board should table the topic and let N. Schell see how many problems she thinks the board has. M. Dorsey stated he would recommend going ahead with the changes to the signage. P. Sanchez stated that Savannah's sign is much clearer than the proposed in terms of the bottom half. N. Schell stated she had originally matched Savannah's layout but Savannah's still stated public hearing at the bottom. R. Hopper asked if since the notice is published in the paper the board even needed to have a signage. D. Sutter stated he would take a look at those requirements. M. Dorsey stated he liked having the signage because people are going to miss it in the paper. R. Hopper stated he liked the changes because that was the issue with the one that was taken down because there was so many people who thought there was some issue with the city and taxes when it said notice of public hearing because that was all people saw and they didn't read the rest of it. V. Crisafulli stated she agreed with P. Sanchez that the Savannah sign is easier to read. R. Hopper stated the board would table the discussion for now and allow D. Sutter to look at the requirements and the board can look at it next month. B. Lyman asked if the proposed sign was different from the Savannah one. N. Schell stated yes but she could change the sign at the bottom from paragraphs to individual lines for each the date, time, and location. V. Crisafulli stated that would make it easier to read from the street. N. Schell stated the only reason she did not do that on the proposed sign was because she would have to make the font smaller to fit on the signs. B. Lyman stated that as long as N. Schell could keep the top part the same size then it wouldn't matter about the details. R. Hopper asked if the board needed to vote on the new sign. D. Sutter stated yes he recommended making a vote but he recommended N. Schell come up with another draft for the board to take a look at before the board votes on the sign. V. Crisafulli stated she had an example from when she was last in Charleston, SC that their board had their signs posted on the fence rather than on the front window of the building which made them very noticeable. R. Hopper stated it would be an issue if the property didn't have a fence. P. Newhouse asked how it would weather. N. Schell stated they probably put the sign in a projector sleeve. B. Lyman stated she thought windows were better.

R. Hopper asked for other old business then for any new business.

B. Lyman stated the only thing she wanted to add was since this was N. Schell's first meeting is that one of the things she thought would help the board would be in the application process. She thought there was a list on the website of what supplemental information is required and there has been some confusion in the past about what is accepted and what is not. B. Lyman added that N. Schell should help guide the applicants and knows that some of the other past preservationists would actually go out and help applicants take pictures and draw plans and would like to see the board and the office viewed as a resource and a help through this process because she knows it's confusing to a lot of people.

N. Schell stated she had no problem doing that and she came into this position with the intentions of being a resource for the public. N. Schell added that she wanted to make sure that those watching the broadcast or in the audience know that they can come to her with questions, concerns and anything regarding preservation.

Page 17
Historic District Board of Review
October 24, 2016

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Newhouse made the motion to adjourn - seconded by P. Sanchez.

Meeting adjourned at 7:07 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