

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

Minutes

April 24, 2017

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, April 24, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Valecia Crisafulli, Pam Newhouse, Sonny Ash, 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. Once the application is announced the applicant or representative will come up the microphone to answer any questions. N. Schell would present the particulars on the project. The board would then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. R. Hopper added that at the end of each application the board would vote.

**Minutes:**

P. Newhouse made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by M. Dorsey.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
S. Ash	Approved

***Minutes stand approved as published.***

**New Applications:**

1. Mark Adams – C. of A. to build 12-ft x 10-ft shed north of house. Shed will have LP smart siding, standing seam metal or shingle roof, wood carriage style doors, and aluminum clad wood window.

Location: **902 W First St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was built in 1837 and is a contributing Double Pen style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the location of the proposed shed and specifications on the proposed shed and window. M. Adams was present and stated they had owned the property since July 2016. M. Adams stated they needed storage outside and the only difference between the proposed shed and the specifications given is that the height of the walls needs to be 8 feet instead of 7 feet. This will account for the height of a golf cart which will be stored inside the shed.

R. Hopper asked if the applicant has decided on roofing material. M. Adams stated they would like to install black shingles. V. Crisafulli asked about the siding of the shed. M. Adams stated the siding would match the house and would match the paint color of the house. This was the reason behind choosing the black shingle roof because the metal roofs available at Lowe's do not match the house. V. Crisafulli complimented the applicant on the house located on the property.

R. Hopper thanked the applicant for coming before the board and for choosing appropriate materials. R. Hopper stated he would go through the application to determine if the materials meet the guidelines.

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

April 24, 2017

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Garages & Outbuildings	45	---	R. Hopper stated the structure would be wood with LP Smart siding. M. Dorsey – It follows the guidelines on page 45 for garages and outbuildings. It meets the location guidelines as well. S. Ash asked if the siding would be smooth or the distressed look. M. Adams stated it was the textured look. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons. P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree also.
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	P. Sanchez – It meets the guidelines on page 60 as the wood clad is acceptable. P. Newhouse – Yes, it is appropriate material. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree also.
Roofs	53, 54	47	V. Crisafulli – Yes it is an appropriate material because the board allows standing seam metal or shingle. The applicant has made a good case on why he chose the shingle roof. The guidelines are on page 53. P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse asked what color of the structure would be and M. Adams responded that it would be painted the same color as the house with white trim and black doors. P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree. M. Dorsey – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree also.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the application for the 12-ft x 10-ft shed at 902 West First Street as presented”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

Page 3

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

S. Ash            Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project. M. Johnson stated this project would need a building permit.

2. Robert Bayne – C. of A. to demolish existing garage. Build new garage to be the same size as existing. Remove bay window and replace with single wood window. Replace 3 wood windows with wood windows and add canvas awnings on house.

Location: **801 W Second St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1930 contributing Colonial Revival style structure. R. Bayne was not present at meeting. D. Sutter stated the board may go out of order of applications to allow the applicant time to arrive to the meeting.

Application revisited after application number 10.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move to deny application number 2 because neither the owner nor representative was present at the meeting to discuss the project at 801 W. Second St.”

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper        Approved

M. Dorsey        Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez        Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Approved

***The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will NOT be issued.***

3. Katie Woods – C. of A. to replace tin siding with Hardie Board siding.

Location: **213 E Fourth St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1870 contributing Federal style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the remaining tin siding, the wall which it was removed from to repair structural elements, and the front elevation of building. Andy Miller was present and represented K. Woods. P. Sanchez asked where the sided section was located on the building. A. Miller stated it was the back corner of the home inside the courtyard. A. Miller added it was not visible from the street but is visible from the American Legion parking lot. A. Miller stated the wall was so rotted it was starting to fall inward.

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

April 24, 2017

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>V. Crisafulli – Yes it is an appropriate material. The applicant has given good reasons for the removal the existing to repair the structural damage. On page 57 of the guidelines it states Hardie Board siding is acceptable material.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree and since it is hardly visible from the public right of way it is hardly an issue.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree with both of those reasons.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also.</p>

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the project at 213 E. Fourth St. to replace the tin siding with Hardie Board siding as submitted in the proposal”.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

4. Scott Lynch – C. of A. to replace 5 upper windows and 4 lower windows on the North and South side of home with aluminum clad wood windows.

Location: **311 Central Ave.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1890 contributing Italianate style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the front and north elevations, north elevation, south elevation, and brochure of the proposed replacement windows. S. Lynch was present. V. Crisafulli stated one of the things the board has struggled with in recent years is the matter of historic wood windows. One of the things the board has been wanting is to get expert opinions on historic wood windows.

Page 5

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

V. Crisafulli stated it was her understanding that the applicant met with someone who does window repair and that these windows can be repaired. S. Lynch stated he consulted with Roger Welch. S. Lynch stated he has no interest in repairing the windows.

S. Lynch continued that he wanted to replace the windows due to noise from the alley and for insulation. N. Schell noted this applicant was not present during the time of inspection with her and the board's volunteer window expert.

R. Welch stated that S. Lynch is taking the effort to keep the windows on the front façade and the alley side has a lot of traffic. The replacement windows, if done properly, is a unit that slides in behind the blind stop. If these are done properly the replacement windows do not take away from the visual historic view of that opening.

R. Welch continued by stating that if the replacement units are installed properly behind the blind stop, they can be beneficial to the home owner economically. P. Newhouse asked R. Welch if he was going to be doing the replacement. R. Welch stated he would be overseeing the work. M. Dorsey asked if the existing windows function. R. Welch stated there all different style of windows located in historic homes. Some have sash and weights, some have a pin, and some have a stationary top sash. S. Lynch stated many of the windows are nailed shut but the front windows work. R. Welch stated that even if you have a functional historic window they allow a lot of air in and that is why they are covered with storm windows. P. Newhouse asked if storm windows would be placed over top of replacement windows. R. Welch stated no the storm windows would be removed.

V. Crisafulli stated the dilemma the board faces is that the guidelines stated that windows must be 80% deteriorated in order to be replaced. V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell to give a staff recommendation on this application since she went to inspect the windows with the consultant. The note that N. Schell sent the board states the windows on the north side are restorable and just need storm windows replaced. The note continued by stating the windows on the south side need cleaned and the windows on the north side do not have a pulley system and therefore do not stay open. V. Crisafulli stated that would be a reason for replacing those on the north side. V. Crisafulli stated that it was her opinion if the board was to uphold their guidelines then the windows that can be repair need to be repaired. N. Schell agreed. S. Lynch stated he has no interest in repairing the windows. S. Lynch asked for clarification. V. Crisafulli stated the board has been having issues with wood window replacement in the past so N. Schell brought in a window repair expert to make an assessment of these windows. V. Crisafulli stated it was in the board's best interest to follow the direction of people who have the professional expertise in this area.

R. Welch stated he did not understand why this is an issue when the applicant will be keeping the original windows on the main façade. R. Welch stated that when people look at the windows along the alley and on the other side, they will see a six over six window and they will help in case of a fire in this structure. The new windows would help keep the heat and air inside the building. V. Crisafulli stated that is why the board allows storm windows to be fast tracked by staff.

P. Newhouse asked about the brand of the replacement windows. S. Lynch stated they would be the Quaker, Historic Series windows which the board has previously approved. R. Welch stated these would not take away from the appearance or function of the historic window. P. Newhouse stated it was her opinion that R. Welch was an expert of windows in Madison and she would listen to what he is saying about these windows.

R. Hopper stated in his opinion the board has previously approved the windows on the side to be aluminum clad wood windows and since the applicant is keeping the windows on the front façade. R. Hopper stated he would trust R. Welch's judgement as well.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

Page 6

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

L. Ludington, Cornerstone Society, ask for the name of the consultant. N. Schell stated it was Jack Patchin.

P. Sanchez asked for clarification about which windows the board was considering. R. Hopper clarified that the windows along the alley were proposed to be replaced and the windows along the street would remain.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>M. Dorsey – This application meets the guidelines and I agree with what R. Hopper stated earlier.</p> <p>S. Ash – I do not agree. The guidelines on page 60-63 that states that the window must be more than 80% deteriorated in order to replace it.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I do not agree for the same reasons and think it is important to uphold the language in the guidelines.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I accept R. Welch’s recommendation and am happy the applicant has chosen to keep the windows on the front of the house.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree with P. Newhouse and it is in keeping with the guidelines on page 60.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also and the board has heard differing opinions from two experts and the board has negotiated with other owners in the past that if they kept the façade windows they could replace the other ones.</p>

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the application to replace 5 upper windows and 4 lower windows on the north and south side of the home with aluminum clad wood windows at 311 Central Ave. as proposed”.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Disapproved

S. Ash            Disapproved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project. R. Hopper asked the applicant to consider donating the windows to Habitat ReStore.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

- 5. Richard and Sandy Fox – C. of A. to remove existing patio doors on front porch of house. Replace with two 36-in x 60-in wood windows with mini blinds in windows and trim with Hardie Board smooth vertical boards and brick mold trim.

Location: **103 Presbyterian Ave.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1960 non-contributing Modern Movement style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the facade with the sliding glass doors which are hidden behind a second floor porch railing and specifications for the proposed windows.

Sandy Fox and Bill Peckinpaugh with Kentuckiana Contractors were present. B. Peckinpaugh stated the windows S. Fox is proposing are the best windows that Pella makes which are the 750 designer series. These windows will have mini blinds and they will be one over one. B. Peckinpaugh stated that because of the age of the house he thinks those are the most appropriate.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

P. Sanchez asked if the vertical Hardie Board would help fill in the areas where the current doors are located. B. Peckinpaugh stated that was correct and that the difference in opening is about 18 inches on each side of the window. B. Peckinpaugh stated they would probably use LP Smart siding because the look from the outside is a little bit better than the Hardie Board.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	R. Hopper stated the windows proposed are wood with aluminum clad. B. Peckinpaugh clarified that the proposed windows are solid wood. S. Ash – The windows meet the guidelines which says you can go with a wood window or aluminum clad window. Since this is a modern structure, the applicant is staying with the modern look. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. The windows are approved on pages 60-63 and the siding on page 58. P. Newhouse – I agree that this is appropriate for a 1960s structure. P. Sanchez – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree also.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the project at 103 Presbyterian Ave. to remove existing patio doors and replace with wood windows and trim with LP Siding as written in the proposal. The windows are approved in the residential guidelines pages 60-63 and the siding on page 58”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved
- P. Newhouse    Approved
- P. Sanchez      Approved

Page 8

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

V. Crisafulli      Approved

S. Ash              Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

6. KQ LLC – C. of A. to build canopy on west side of building to cover baler.

Location: **120 E Second St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1950 non-contributing Commercial structure. N. Schell showed photos of the existing condition of the proposed canopy location, drawings of the proposed canopy and an example of the baler to be installed.

John Muessel was present and stated the roofing material for the canopy would be metal. N. Schell noted the fence shown in the proposal has been fast tracked and approved by staff.

P. Newhouse asked where this was located on the building. J. Muessel stated it was the west side along the alley between the grocery store and the Clearinghouse. M. Dorsey asked if there was a baler on the south side of this building. J. Muessel stated yes but it would be removed. The reason for this change is since Ruler food only operates on one level it is difficult for them to access the baler in its current location.

V. Crisafulli thanked the applicant for his efforts to improve the appearance of this property. J. Muessel stated he would work with N. Schell about appropriate colors for the materials proposed.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Rear & Lateral Additions	68	62	P. Sanchez – It meets the guidelines on page 62 in the commercial guidelines. P. Newhouse – I agree. V. Crisafulli – I agree. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree also.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA to build a metal canopy on the west side of the building at 120 E Second St. to cover the baler as presented”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse   Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved



Page 9

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

V. Crisafulli      Approved

S. Ash              Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

- 7. Carol Wiggam – C. of A. to replace existing vinyl siding with Hardie Board Siding. Replace existing metal and shingle roof with standing seam metal roof.

Location: **417 Baltimore St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1870 contributing Front Gable style structure. N. Schell stated the applicant had removed the vinyl siding before coming before the board. N. Schell showed a photo which showed the currently wrapped home and the three types of existing roofing material.

Carol Wiggam was present and stated she thought it would look a lot better if the roofing material was all the same material. V. Crisafulli agreed.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board.

S. Ash asked the applicant if she considered the newer roofing located on the structure as standing seam. C. Wiggam stated the newer roofing is a new type of material. C. Wiggam presented a sample image to the board and stated M. Johnson had previously looked at the material. C. Wiggam stated this material was a new material and this is the first building with it in this area. It does not have the shiny look of the barn metal roofing material. S. Ash stated the shed portion of the building has a true standing seam metal roof. C. Wiggam stated that roofing material is different and she was not sure of the age of that material. C. Wiggam stated she was on a time crunch because that part of the roof is leaking. C. Wiggam stated she wanted to match the rest of the roof to the front portion. S. Ash stated the shed portion is a true standing seam roof and the new roof looks nice but is more like a ribbed roof than a standing seam roof. C. Wiggam stated the back part of the roof is in really bad shape. S. Ash clarified and state he wasn't saying she shouldn't replace it.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	M. Dorsey – It meets the residential guidelines on pages 56-58. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. V. Crisafulli expressed her appreciation for the applicant's effort with this property and thinks this is upheld by the siding guidelines on page 56-58. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree also

Page 10

## Historic District Board of Review

April 24, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53, 54	47	<p>V. Crisafulli stated she agreed with the materials the applicant is using for the roof and the siding but this is an area the board could use some education on the different and new materials for metal roofing. V. Crisafulli expressed her appreciation for the applicant's effort with this property and thinks this is upheld by the guidelines on pages 53 and 54.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also.</p> <p>S. Ash – I disagree because the guidelines states that a standing seam which is each panel is folded over the next and is not a sheet of metal which is just laid and screwed/nailed down.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree with V. Crisafulli.</p>

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the public.

L. Ludington stated he thought the board was reading different guidelines. L. Ludington stated as S. Ash pointed out the guidelines specifically states, if replacement of an existing standing seam metal roof is necessary "the new roof should match the historic one as closely as possible in dimensions, seam crimping, and seam spacing". L. Ludington stated he is not here to speak in opposition of this application but historically if someone comes before the board for a COA, after starting the work, the board has not made them undo the work. L. Ludington stated in order to be consistent and to explain yourselves to the public you need to explain why you are doing the opposite of what your guidelines say. If the reason is that the work is already done and you don't want to make the owner undo the work than just state that. L. Ludington stated this is essentially a barn metal roof not a standing seam roof. C. Wiggam asked if L. Ludington has seen this particular roof in person. L. Ludington stated he has and he has seen people come before this board stating they were installing a standing seam metal roof and then they install a corrugated sheet metal roof.

V. Crisafulli stated she was reading on page 54 of the guidelines number 5 and she believes L. Ludington is correct. It says "the new roof should match the historic one as closely as possible in dimensions, seam crimping, and seam spacing" and L. Ludington is correct on this point.

P. Newhouse asked about the spacing between the seams. C. Wiggam asked M. Johnson for help to explain the roofing. M. Johnson stated it was about 8 to 10 inches. M. Johnson stated this is not the typical barn roofing. The bi-rib roofing has the spacing of 2 to 1 to 1 to 2 to 1 to 1 and this roofing has the spacing of 1 to 1 to 1. This is close to the original look but the seam is not as high and is not a true standing seam.

C. Wiggam stated the roof was about the fall in on the one side and she would not have purchased the house if she had known that she couldn't change the roofing materials. The front part of the roof was leaking pretty badly and that was why they went ahead and changed the roof but they waited on the back part. C. Wiggam stated she did not like the typical barn metal roofs on homes but this is not that material.

V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell to plan an educational meeting on metal roofing materials.

M. Johnson showed the board examples of something similar to a standing seam metal roof and a metal roof piece that is similar to what is proposed. The difference between the similar sample to proposed material is the profile of the seam. P. Sanchez asked if the roof would simulate what the existing. M. Johnson stated the proposed is more like the sample than a standing seam roof. P. Sanchez asked if all three rooflines would be made of the same material. N. Schell stated that was correct.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53, 54	47	<p>P. Sanchez – The guidelines states “the new roof should match the historic one as closely as possible in dimensions, seam crimping, and seam spacing”. M. Johnson stated that was pretty close and therefore yes it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I do not think this meets the intent of our guidelines but I am willing to make an exception here given the fact this is a hardship case with the leak.</p> <p>S. Ash – I disagree because this is a ribbed roof and it should copy the most historic roof on the structure which is the standing seam roof.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree with V. Crisafulli and the new material is far superior than the typical barn roofing even though it is not the typical standing seam.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also.</p>

D. Sutter stated the board should separate the motions and have one for roof material and one for siding.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that we approve a COA to replace the existing shingle and metal roofs with the metal roof as proposed at 417 Baltimore St.”

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved
- P. Newhouse    Approved
- P. Sanchez      Approved
- V. Crisafulli    Approved
- S. Ash            Disapproved

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

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that we approve we approve the Hardie Board siding for the property at 417 Baltimore St. as presented.”

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

Page 12

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

8. Sandy Dierdorf – C. of A. to replace 8 wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows on east, west, and south walls. Remove one wood window on the sided second floor addition and move centered the remaining window. Replace the existing wood siding with Hardie Board siding on the southern additions.

Location: **317 W Third St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1845 contributing Italianate style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the windows to be replaced, drawings which show which window will be removed and which will be relocated, and photos of the damaged wood siding.

Jim Dierdorf was present. V. Crisafulli stated she wanted to point out the difference between this application and the other application to replace wood windows because the consultant took a look at these windows and gave the recommendation that they need to be replaced. V. Crisafulli stated this was why the board looks toward outside counsel.

V. Crisafulli stated the removal and centering of the one window is necessary for the interior use of that bathroom. J. Dierdorf stated that was correct. V. Crisafulli stated that seems like a reasonable thing to do.

P. Newhouse asked the age of the addition. J. Dierdorf stated it appears to be the 1920s or 1930s. J. Dierdorf stated the windows do not match up the rest of the windows in the house and there is no insulation. J. Dierdorf stated when it rains the rain comes down the inside wall of the tool shed addition.

J. Dierdorf stated the windows on the second story sit right on the roof and there is no way to shed that water.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

Fred Burrell at 315 W. Third St. stated the Dierdorf family is their common wall neighbor and have been doing extensive work on the home. The home was abandoned for two years and they have come in and renovated this property. F. Burrell stated one of Madison's leading names, Lide White, was born and died in J. Dierdorf's home.

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

April 24, 2017

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>P. Newhouse – This is approved material and the reasons the applicant gave for it to be done, it should be allowed.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree and it meets the guidelines on pages 56-58.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also.</p>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>S. Ash asked for clarification on the actual conditions of the windows on the southern additions. J. Dierdorf stated he had to use about four tubes of caulk to hold the windows in. The frame work is rotten.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree based on the guidelines on page 56-59 which allows the applicant to replace the windows with aluminum clad wood windows.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also.</p>

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the COA to replace 8 wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows on the East, West, and South walls at 317 W. Third St.”

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

M. Dorsey amended motion:

“I move that we approve the COA to replace 8 wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows on the East, West, and South walls at 317 W. Third St. and install Hardie Board siding as presented.”

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Approved

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

Page 14

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

- 9. Lindsay Bloos – C. of A. to move downspout on southeast corner to allow for better water flow and change from a rectangular downspout to 4-inch round downspout.

Location: **415 Poplar St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1860 contributing Italianate style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the existing condition of the box gutters and downspout and drawings of the proposed downspout connection.

Lindsay Bloos was present. P. Newhouse expressed her appreciation for the use of the round downspout which is very historic and stated the reason for the change sounds like this is something that is needed. V. Crisafulli agreed.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board or from the public.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Gutters & Downspouts	46	44	P. Newhouse – This is approved material for historic homes here in Madison. P. Sanchez – I agree and it meets the guidelines on pages 46. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree also.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the round downspout for the property at 415 Poplar St. as presented in the proposed application”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved
- P. Newhouse    Approved
- P. Sanchez      Approved
- V. Crisafulli    Approved
- S. Ash            Approved

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

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

Page 15

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

10. Glenn Bailey – C. of A. to remove wood door/plywood on rear of building and replace with 9 light 2 panel metal door.

Location: **413 Poplar St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

P. Sanchez stated when she went to take a look at the project the sign on the door stated the front door instead of the rear door. N. Schell stated she would look into the wording on the signage. R. Hopper asked how to procedurally move forward with this application.

D. Sutter stated section 151.22 says that “the Board of Review, by approving, disapproving, or modifying an application, shall act upon the application at the next meeting at which such application could be considered. Otherwise, the application shall be deemed to be approved and a certificate of appropriateness shall be issued. Nothing herein shall prohibit an extension of time where mutual agreement has been made and the Board of Review may advise the applicant and make recommendations in regard to the appropriateness”.

D. Sutter stated since there is not a representative for the applicant and there having been no contact with someone in the office prior to the meeting, there cannot be a mutual agreement for the extension. D. Sutter stated the board must make a vote either up or down otherwise the application would be deemed approved.

V. Crisafulli asked if both applicants knew they needed to be present at the meeting. N. Schell stated they were informed.

L. Ludington stated that under the Rules of Procedure, page 3, “property owners or their representatives must attend the meeting to discuss their application with the HDBR”. L. Ludington stated it was his opinion that since the owner or representative was not present the application is not complete.

D. Sutter stated his recommendation was to deny the applications due to the representative not being present at the meeting.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to deny the application due to the fact that it is incomplete because of the applicant not being present at the meeting to discuss the application for Glenn Bailey at 413 Poplar St.”

Motion was seconded by V. Crisafulli.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
S. Ash	Approved

***The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will NOT be issued.***

**Extended Applications:**

1. Springdale Cemetery – C. of A. for demolition of single family dwelling structure.

Location: **600 W. Fifth St.**

Zoned: Open Space (OS)

Page 16

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 24, 2017**

R. Hopper stated the applicant came into the office and has asked for a one month extension.

V. Crisafulli made the motion to extend the application for another month.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli   Approved

S. Ash           Approved

***The motion to extend the application one month passed.***

**Business - Old:**

**Business – New:**

1. Gutters and Downspouts

N. Schell stated it was requested at the last meeting to discuss changing the gutters and downspouts staff approval process. The proposed amendment is to page 5 of the *Madison Approval Guidelines*, row C under roofs. The proposed amendment is to change the wording on Staff Review/Approval column to read "X (Does Meet Guidelines)" and the HDBR Review/Approval column to read "X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)".

N. Schell stated the amendment will allow staff to approve gutter and downspout projects that meet guidelines but if staff determines they do not meet the guidelines it would go before the Historic Review Board. P. Newhouse asked if the application tonight with downspouts could have been approved by staff. N. Schell stated that was correct.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move to approve this staff approval as presented".

M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved



Page 17

## Historic District Board of Review

April 24, 2017

V. Crisafulli      Approved

S. Ash              Approved

***The motion to approve the staff approval of gutters and downspouts passed.*****Business – Staff Report:**

## Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
John DeLuca	507 W Main St.	4/3/2017	6' Wood Fence: 1 gate
KQ LLC	120 E Second St	4/3/2017	6' Wood Fence: 2 gates
John Estep	716 West St	4/4/2017	Iron handrail
Sandy Dierdorf	317 W Third St.	4/4/2017	5 Black ProVia storm windows; 7 White ProVia storm windows
Scott Lynch	103 E Vaughn Dr.	4/12/2017	56" wood Fence: 3 gates
City of Madison	101 E Vaughn Dr.	4/13/2017	Brick/limestone; aluminum
Mary J. Brindley	808 Filmore St	4/18/2017	Siding: Cedar board and batten to cedar lap siding

## Historic District Board of Review: 2016 April COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Work Done According to COA?
Miller, Melissa Lee	114 E. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace 6 windows in front of building with aluminum clad wood.</li> </ul>	Yes

No further business to be brought before the board.

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 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