

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

January 23, 2017

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, January 23, 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, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey, and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell; City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

R. Hopper stated that since this is the beginning of a new year, the board needs to elect a chair and vice chair for this committee. He entertained nominations.

P. Sanchez nominated R. Hopper for the position of Chair. P. Newhouse seconded the nomination. Roll Call- All ayes

Nomination approved in accordance with vote. R. Hopper is the 2017 Chairman.

B. Lyman nominated V. Crisafulli for the position of Vice Chair. R. Hopper seconded the nomination. Roll Call- all ayes

Nomination approved in accordance with vote. V. Crisafulli is the 2017 Vice Chairman.

R. Hopper gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. R. Hopper noted there were two screens at this meeting, one for the board and one for the public. The meeting process would begin with R. Hopper presenting the application and N. Schell would present the particulars on the project. Each applicant will come up to the microphone in case there are questions from the board. R. Hopper added that at the end of each application the board would vote.

Minutes:

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

Roll Call:

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

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.

New Applications:

1. Greg and Shirley Howard – C. of A. to build a 13-ft. x 9-ft. shed in backyard.
Location: **508 W. Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1885 contributing stick or otherwise known as Eastlake style duplex. The shed is located in the backyard which is slightly visible from the street. N. Schell showed photos of the view of the shed from the alley, street, and backyard and photos of the design of the shed. N. Schell added that the proposed materials included asphalt shingles and Hardie Board siding.

Greg and Shirley Howard were present and stated those materials were correct. R. Hopper asked if the shed would have windows. G. Howard answered yes and stated they would be wood windows. P. Newhouse stated the shed was nice in design. B. Lyman stated she wanted to complement the applicants on what a beautiful home they have. B. Lyman added it was in a premier location across from the Lanier Mansion. B. Lyman asked who did the coloration of the details on the home. S. Howard stated they did the colorations of the details on the home and added the neighbors who are attached to their duplex also did the colorations of the details on their home. B. Lyman stated the applicants' home has one of the best coloration combinations in town.

B. Lyman asked if the applicants have considered replicating the details from their house onto the shed. S. Howard stated there was going to be a decorative gingerbread detail on the dormer to coincide with the house. S. Howard stated the design would be simple and similar to the house but asked if the board had any other ideas. B. Lyman stated to mirror what the applicants already have, especially on the west end of the house where they have a simple stick design. B. Lyman added that when a shed mirrors the house in design people think they were all built at the same time.

S. Ash added he agreed with B. Lyman and stated the applicants could copy the decorative feature in the gabled-end of the house. The applicants may not need to extend that decorative feature as far down on the eave of the shed but they could allow it to be seen as the shed appears above the fence to match the house. That would make the shed unique to their place and it would tie the buildings together. S. Howard stated she agreed.

V. Crisafulli stated that she wanted to commend the applicants on their choice of materials but something she noticed as she walked through the alley is that this shed is taller than other sheds on the alley. She added this was probably the only reason the applicants have to come before the board because that is what makes it visible from the street. V. Crisafulli asked what the reason was for the height of the shed as compared to other sheds nearby. S. Howard stated the height of their shed was close to the height of their neighbors but is it a little bit taller than the neighbors. The reason for the added height is because the applicants has found some antique doors and they are a little bit taller and Bill (Peckinpaugh) is helping design the shed wanted them to be able to keep as much of the doors as possible.

V. Crisafulli stated the board is working to make sure people who own property downtown are familiar with the guidelines and people know why they need to come before the board. V. Crisafulli added she knew the applicants had come before the board previously and asked why they felt they didn't need to come before the board before starting construction. G. Howard stated it was because of visibility and had they known it was going to be visible before they started construction they would have been before the board ahead of time. V. Crisafulli asked for clarification if the applicants didn't realize ahead of time it would be visible. G. Howard stated that was true and the board would see the shingles and a foot to foot and a half of wall because they have a 6-ft privacy fence all the way around the shed. Bill Peckinpaugh from Kentuckiana Contractors added that the roof level was raised because of the doors and because the leaves had fallen off the trees and before that the applicants didn't realize it would be visible from the street.

B. Lyman asked if the dimension of the windows were going to be like those pictured or longer. S. Howard stated they would be similar to the drawing. B. Peckinpaugh stated the windows were wood windows the applicants purchased from Habitat for Humanity.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Garages & Outbuildings	45	---	<p>P. Sanchez – The project does meet the guidelines on page 45. The materials they have chosen are very exciting.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons and think it is very nice that they are going to integrate the design from their house and the materials used are appropriate.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree and am very glad the applicants are going to use historic recycled material.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I do feel that this meets the guidelines specifically on 45 it says “new garages and outbuildings should follow new construction guidelines” and then it talks about infill buildings on pages 69-71 it talks about new garages being built at rear of the building and this one clearly is. It should be compatible with adjacent buildings in scale, height, materials, orientation, shape, placement and proportion. This project clearly meets those guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree with those and in addition on page 69-71 it says designs are encouraged to be replicas of historic designs and I think the applicants are attempting that.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree because it follows all the material guidelines as well as the guidelines for garages and outbuildings on page 45 and the infill buildings on pages 69-71.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree because of everything the other board members have said.</p>

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the application for a COA at 508 W. Second Street to build a 13x9-ft shed in the backyard does meet the Historic District Guidelines and should be approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness.”

Motion was seconded by V. Crisafulli.

Roll Call:

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

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 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 COA once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project once they get their building permit.

2. Kindel “Kendra” T. Webster – C. of A. to remove vinyl siding on north, south, east and west façades. Renovate picture window and front door on north façade. Renovate both windows, downspouts, gutters, soffit and fascia on east façade. Renovate soffit, fascia, both doors, and window on south façade. Add railing to steps on south façade. Renovate windows, soffit, fascia, and gutters on west façade. Replace existing asphalt shingle roof with new asphalt shingles. Add Hardie Board siding if restoring existing wood siding is not feasible.

Location: **1013 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1890 contributing shotgun house. N. Schell showed photos of the front, west façade, condition of the siding and roof, the south façade where the applicant wants to add railing to the stairs, and east façade.

Kindel “Kendra” T. Webster was present. B. Peckinpaugh stated this project was unusual compared to most projects the board hears because the applicant is asking to remove the vinyl siding and restore the house back to its original state. B. Peckinpaugh added the applicant wants to renovate the windows and doors but the back door maybe beyond repair but the applicant would replace it with another wood door. B. Peckinpaugh informed the board the applicant was going to taking on extensive repair on the interior but she would be applying for a federal grant to cover some of those costs.

N. Schell informed the board that this application is also going to be heard before the PACE Committee at their next meeting. B. Lyman asked if N. Schell had gotten the photo she sent her. N. Schell stated she was not able to include it on the PowerPoint. B. Lyman stated she wanted to commend the applicant for bringing this building back to original state. B. Lyman asked the applicant if she knew John Shuring and his shotgun which was on the Shotgun House Tour. B. Lyman stated he also used PACE grant and it was about in the same shape as this house and he corrected all the windows and doors and details. It would be a good model on what to shoot for and he would be one person to talk to. N. Schell stated she had his PACE application and has the before and after photos in her office. B. Peckinpaugh stated there are structural issues on this house where the sides have been pulled in so the roof would have to be taken off and replaced.

B. Lyman stated if the applicant looked at the other shotgun, one of the defining features is the window because they always have one window and one door. B. Lyman stated it looks like someone has put in a larger window on the front than the original 1890 window. S. Ash added that typically the front window which faces Main St. it could be as long as the front door and sometimes they start up at the transom and don’t quite down to the length of the door but a lot of them are quite tall. With most shotgun structures the windows are typically bigger than you would think. B. Peckinpaugh stated that he had talked with Link Ludington before the meeting and the applicant would like to option to either repair the existing or replacing it to return it back to the original state depending on the economics of the project. S. Ash stated once the applicant begins the work in the building they would probably find the original structure material and that may point out how tall or how wide the original window was. S. Ash asked the applicant if the windows would be wood or aluminum clad. B. Peckinpaugh stated the windows would be wood. S. Ash asked what the mutin configuration would be in the new windows.

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

B. Peckinpaugh stated some of the windows are currently covered up and some are some are single pane over single pane but they would try to match them as they work on the building.

V. Crisafulli asked about the roof because the roof was checked on the application but there was nothing about materials. B. Peckinpaugh stated the roof would be shingles. N. Schell pointed out that the roofing material was included in the legal notice. S. Ash asked if the applicant was going to leave the window jams, have exterior trim, or a window sill. B. Peckinpaugh stated they would probably go back to a wood exterior trim on the windows or they might restore or replace the wood sills if they exist currently. B. Peckinpaugh informed the board that there is currently vinyl siding but the house may have had an insulated brick siding at one time but when he pulled some of the vinyl siding loose there was 4 inch Poplar underneath. The applicant would like to restore the Poplar siding but if it cannot be done then they would replace it with Hardie or LP Smart siding. B. Lyman stated that if the applicant needed to go to LP Smart siding to use the smooth side.

Link Ludington, president of the Cornerstone Society and chairman of the PACE preservation grant review committee, stated this was going to be a great project but would like the board to make sure the application is worded so the owner has some degree of latitude in terms about making the decision about specific window arrangement. L. Ludington continued stating if this building was in fact built around the 1890s then it is very unlikely that the existing triple picture window arrangement is original. It seems like this house has been remodeled at least two different times because there is insulated brick which is a fake siding material became popular in the mid-20th century. The picture window might date to the 1950s or 1960s remodel or might have been done even as late as when the vinyl siding was put on this house. The property is going to go through several layers of review because the owner has applied for the PACE grant and the federal tax credit. The PACE review committee maybe taking a closer look at the specific details of this project but the federal tax credit will be an even higher level of review. L. Ludington stated he would like to see the board word their application to make it possible for the applicant to either retain the window the way it is or allow the owner to take it back to what might have been there originally. L. Ludington suggested leaving it to the discretion of the board’s professional preservation staff to make that call based on what the physical evidence indicates is appropriate.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant and the contractor were okay with that flexibility in the language. K. Webster stated she would prefer that flexibility because it is hard to tell in the photos the condition of the house. She added she would like to preserve what is historic but there are a lot of unknowns until construction starts. She stated she preferred to not have to come back as things come up during construction.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	R. Hopper – The applicant is asking for wood doors. P. Sanchez – Yes I think this project meets the guidelines because in the guidelines it states clearly that the preference is that the wooden doors be used. P. Newhouse – Yes the wood should be retained if possible but she should have the flexibility to do what needs to be done in regards to it comes about once they start taking things apart. S. Ash – Yes, page 39-42 talks about retaining wood doors if they are original to try to repair them but if they are replacing them with wood doors I agree it meets the guidelines.

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	<p>V. Crisafulli – Yes, if the applicant does find the doors are compromised the Historic Madison Inc. salvage area up at the Restore does have some historic doors and V. Crisafulli urged the applicant to consider looking at those.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I support this for the same reason because the guidelines on pages 39-42 encourages repair damaged but if possible replace it with wood.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – Yes it meets the materials and design guidelines for doors.</p>
Gutters & Downspouts	46	44	<p>S. Ash asked if the gutters were going to be half-round or ogee. K. Webster stated they were going to be 5 inch residential gutters. S. Ash stated that was ogee gutters.</p> <p>D. Sutter informed the board that even though it is time consuming it is preferable that the board continue to answer individually to each section. N. Schell added that if a board member before them stated the design guidelines page number and you agree with what they stated the member can just state that they agree with whomever said what they agree with.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree because in the guidelines it says so on page 46.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reason but it would be nice if they were half-round but I support the ogee style if that is not possible.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree but also would love to see those half-round gutters because there are so few design details on a shotgun that things like that really pop.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree also because the guidelines on page number is 46 state that using well maintained gutters and downspouts helps to protect the building so even though the half-round are most appropriate, the other ones are allowed.</p>
Porch Columns & Railings	51, 52	---	<p>R. Hopper stated there are currently no railings but the applicant wants to use wood.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I think it is appropriate because the materials are acceptable.</p> <p>B. Lyman – The guidelines state on page 51 and 52 that porch railings can be made out of wood so it meets the guideline requirements.</p>

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Porch Columns & Railings	51, 52	---	<p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – 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 for the same reasons.</p>
Roofs	53, 54	47	<p>R. Hopper stated the roof would be replaced in-kind.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree because if the original roof cannot be repaired or maintained then materials in-kind are described on pages 53 and 54. P. Newhouse – I agree. S. Ash – I agree. V. Crisafulli – I agree with replacing the roof if necessary with in-kind. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reason. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reason. R. Hopper – I agree also for the same reason.</p>
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>R. Hopper – The applicant wants to remove the vinyl siding and repair the wood siding but if that is not feasible then they want to go with the LP Smart siding.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree that removing the vinyl and hopefully restoring the original wood is acceptable. If this is not possible going with Hardie Board siding is supported by page 56-58 of the guidelines. B. Lyman – We are giving the flexibility of restoring the wood or going with smooth LP Smart siding or Hardie Board siding which are all approvable. V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reasons for the pages that were named earlier.</p>
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>R. Hopper stated they were currently wood windows and the applicant wants to replace them with wood windows. We also talked about the flexibility of changing the front window back to a more historically correct window if possible. M. Dorsey – I think it is very appropriate to repair and restore the windows with the caveat of keeping them wood or replacing them with wood including the front window if they find out that window is not original. B. Lyman – I agree because of the guidelines on pages 60-63 which support what Mike has said.</p>

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree.

B. Peckinpaugh informed the board that the insurance company is requiring they put a railing on the back steps in order to get liability insurance. B. Peckinpaugh stated there will be a temporary railing placed on the steps which will be replaced with a more permanent railing.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that the board approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for extensive rehabilitation of the property at 1013 W. Main St. as noted in the application with appropriate materials that are sanctioned by our guidelines with the caveat that since this structure is considerably deteriorated once the work gets underway, particularly with respect to the front window but also with other areas as well, the applicant has the discretion to move to another acceptable material or configuration upon recommendation of our preservation planner or building inspector.”

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

- R. Hopper Approved
- B. Lyman 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 applicant would get a written copy as soon as it is generated and signed but the applicant would need to get a building permit. V. Crisafulli stated the board is trying to accumulate a collection of before and after projects that are admirable and adhere to the guidelines. V. Crisafulli stated she believed this project could be quite a showcase project once it’s finished so she wanted to ask the applicant to bring those after photos so the board could see them. N. Schell stated after photos would be supplied for the PACE grant so she could supply those to the historic board once the work is done.

- 3. Laszlo Martone and McKenzie Holder-Abbott – C. of A. to replace one (1) existing second story vinyl window on south facing façade and four (4) existing second story vinyl windows on west facing façade with Brighton Aluminum Clad windows.

Location: **402 Broadway St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

N. Schell presented the building is dated at 1966 rather than what the survey says. We have records which show the original building was torn down. The building is a commercial structure. N. Schell showed photos of the front/side elevation from 2013, the second story south facing façade window which faces Main St., the second story west facing façade windows which face Broadway St., and a brochure from the window manufacturer, Bridgeton.

McKenzie Holder-Abbott was present and added that the current windows are in terrible shape and are currently vinyl windows. R. Hopper stated the board appreciated the applicants’ willingness to replace the vinyl windows with aluminum wood clad.

B. Lyman asked about the proposed configuration of the front window since it is currently such an odd shape. M. Holder-Abbott stated the people doing the work told her that they could not do one window but it would be two windows. She added it would look similar to the current window. B. Lyman stated it’s probably similar to the west facing windows. M. Holder-Abbott stated that was the way the contractor explained how the front windows would look and operate.

S. Ash stated that the way the glass is oriented in the frame; it looks like the window is sideways. S. Ash asked the applicant if she would consider changing the glass to a more square configuration or even where it would be slightly taller than wide. M. Holder-Abbott stated the glass wasn’t actually separated but rather they are just made to look like it is separated. S. Ash asked if the new windows would be true divided glass. M. Holder-Abbott stated she wasn’t sure but she thought the contractor would try to make them look as similar as possible.

M. Holder-Abbott asked if there was something she needed to bring before the board in regards to the look of the windows. V. Crisafulli stated she didn’t think the applicant should have to come back before the board and asked N. Schell if she would consult with the applicant on the windows. N. Schell stated as long as that is included in the motion she would be happy to work with the applicant.

B. Lyman asked if the applicant planned to retain the shutters. M. Holder-Abbott stated this project was going to be the start of many projects to make the building look better which might include roof work, guttering, and brick repair. As of right now M. Holder-Abbott believed L. Martone did want to keep the shutters. P. Newhouse stated she would like to see the slat shutters removed because they are not appropriate for the historic district. Louvered shutters would be more appropriate but this building may not even need shutters. M. Holder-Abbott stated she would talk to L. Martone about removing the shutters.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	<p>M. Dorsey – I think they are appropriate because they meet the guidelines for windows on pages 60-63. I commend you for taking out the vinyl and putting in aluminum clad which is an acceptable material.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – The correct pages for the commercial guidelines are pages 56-59.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I would like to see the applicant work with the staff to create a design which is more proportional for the window.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I think this meets the guidelines for the reasons cited.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree it meets the guidelines.</p>

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Guideline Supported?
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	P. Newhouse – I agree and hope the applicant will consider my comments on the shutters. P. Sanchez – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reasons. Aluminum clad wood windows are an appropriate material for this project.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move for approval of the application for the property at 402 Broadway to replace the vinyl windows with aluminum clad wood as stated in the application and to work with the preservation planner on the configuration of the windows and shutters on the south façade.”

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved
 B. Lyman 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 applicant would get a written copy as soon as it is generated and signed. Please meet with N. Schell at your convenience.

Business - New or Old:

B. Lyman stated she emailed the goals she had suggested for 2017 and had copies to hand out. The idea is give the board an opportunity to review these with some timeframes on them. B. Lyman asked that the board take time between this meeting and next meeting to look over those timeframes. B. Lyman stated she was going to take the lead on these items as to not add to N. Schell’s workload. B. Lyman asked if the board members had interest in certain items to let her know.

B. Lyman stated at the last meeting the board had discussed the timeframe between when the application is due and when N. Schell has to publish the applications is too short and she needs more time so that she has the opportunity to set up one on one meeting with each person before this is published in the paper. B. Lyman had asked N. Schell to think about what time she might need because the board can take a vote on their own procedures. D. Sutter stated that was correct. N. Schell stated the best process for the department to review applications is an additional two weeks so that the department will have one week to review it internally and then give the applicant another week if we propose changes before the actual filing deadline which is when legal notice has to be to the paper.

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

January 23, 2017

B. Lyman asked if she were to make a motion N. Schell is saying to leave the application deadline as it is and extend the publishing notice two weeks. N. Schell stated the best process is to have a separate deadline; a lot of communities call it a preliminary deadline or internal review deadline and keep the filing deadline as it is. M. Dorsey asked for clarification that the application deadline would be two weeks before having to put it into the paper. V. Crisafulli clarified stating the preliminary application deadline. V. Crisafulli stated this is a good procedural change and will alleviate a lot of the problems that the board has had in the past. R. Hopper agreed because it gives N. Schell more time to review the applications. V. Crisafulli stated she was willing to make the motion on this but wanted to know if the board could go ahead with this for February or needed to wait till March. N. Schell stated this should wait till March to start this change. D. Sutter proposed waiting till staff could come up with a draft of the policy for the next meeting so that everyone can take a look at it then vote on it. M. Dorsey asked how that would affect the applications for the March meeting. N. Schell proposed the board delay the changes one month after the board votes.

L. Ludington stated the board should make sure whatever changes the board is going propose is in conformance with the ordinance and state legislation. L. Ludington stated the board was empowered to govern its own internal operations but the standards and requirements for an application and the application procedure is spelt out in detail in the ordinance.

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Newhouse made the motion to adjourn - seconded by V. Crisafulli.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 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