

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW****Minutes****June 26, 2017**

**The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, June 26, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Sonny Ash, Mike Dorsey, Betsy Lyman and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; Devon Sharpe, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.**

R. Hopper asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes from last meeting and had any corrections or additions.

**Minutes:**

B. Lyman made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

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

**Minutes stand approved as submitted.**

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.

**New Applications:**

1. Harold Dixon – C. of A. to remove existing chimney.

Location: **716 Saddle Tree Ln.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1945 and is a non-contributing vernacular structure. N. Schell showed a photo of the building with the existing chimney.

Harold Dixon was present and stated he needed to put a shingle roof on his house and he has a brick chimney. He wants to remove it because he is not using it. H. Dixon stated he has a gas furnace and he is losing heat out of the chimney. H. Dixon stated the distance between the chimney and the ground is about 20 feet and he needs to do some repairs around the chimney after it is removed.

P. Newhouse asked if the chimney is attached to a fireplace. H. Dixon answered no.

B. Lyman asked if the applicant knew the history of this house and if it was actually built around 1945. H. Dixon stated that was the date he was told when he purchased the house and he didn't know about its history.

M. Dorsey asked the applicant to explain how the chimney needed repaired. H. Dixon stated if he had to leave the chimney the contractor would need to repair around the chimney when the new shingle roof is installed.

P. Sanchez stated the applicant had mentioned he was going to install a new roof on the house and then remove the chimney. H. Dixon stated he originally thought about using a metal roof but then decided to replace the shingles.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

P. Sanchez stated she saw that as part of the application but then it was removed. N. Schell stated that since the applicant decided to replace the shingles he did not need approval from the board.

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

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

M. Dorsey asked the applicant to describe what he meant by repairs because that would make a difference on whether the chimney met the guidelines. H. Dixon stated he didn't want the roof to leak after they replaced it. M. Dorsey asked if the chimney itself needed repaired. H. Dixon stated you needed to be on the roof to see the chimney and where it needed repaired.

P. Sanchez asked if the chimney was leaking now. H. Dixon stated that over a long period of time he could see where the water and air has gotten into the house. It is not currently leaking because he has had it patched. P. Sanchez asked if the applicant's main concern is the loss of heat. H. Dixon stated he had it checked some time ago and his home was tighter than a new home.

S. Ash stated that if the applicant hires a good roofing company they would flash around the chimney and then counter flash it. It will not leak after that. H. Dixon stated he would tell his contractor that information. S. Ash stated the applicant should have a thimble which once attached a gas stove, an oil stove, or a wood burning stove to the chimney. S. Ash stated the applicant could get a thimble cover to place over the hole and one could be purchase for ten dollars.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Chimneys	38	--	<p>M. Dorsey – Based on the guidelines, it states chimneys should not be removed or altered if original or architecturally significant and this falls under that category. Therefore I would have to say since the applicant has alternatives it does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – The board is here because they were appointed to serve the city and to look at each structure. We are reading from the law and the guidelines were developed from those laws. We look to see what is architecturally significant about each house. Chimneys are one of the things in the guidelines that are architecturally significant. We took an oath to uphold these ordinances and so that is why I have to agree with M. Dorsey. It says in the guidelines that chimneys should not be removed or altered if original or architecturally significant.</p> <p>H. Dixon stated the bricks themselves are peeling off and falling on the roof. If the chimney is left on the house the bricks could cause the roof to continue to leak even after it is replaced. B. Lyman stated the board would need to have some photos of that because she couldn't tell when she drove past the property.</p>

Historic District Board of Review

June 26, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Chimneys	38	--	<p>H. Dixon stated you would have to be on the roof in order to see the deterioration. H. Dixon stated that the bricks are peeling off in smaller pieces and thankfully they haven't broken off in larger pieces. B. Lyman stated there would be some labor required to remove the chimney and that would cost the applicant something and maybe it would be the same amount to repair the chimney.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree with M. Dorsey and B. Lyman that the chimney is architecturally significant to your house. That is stated in the residential guideline book. There aren't many elements to a house that make it architecturally significant, sometimes it's a chimney and other times it is a window or door. If you take the chimney off of the house then you have lost one of the elements that make your house an older architecture styled home. S. Ash stated he saw that the chimney would need repaired because it is spalling. Spalling occurs when the face of the brick starts to come off but there are several masons in Madison who can repair the chimney. H. Dixon stated he didn't want to pay \$20,000-\$30,000 for this job.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – The applicant has a chimney which is obviously in need of repair and the house is noncontributing. On the other hand the only thing that makes it the least bit historic is the fact that it does have a chimney because not many houses have chimneys anymore. I agree that taking it down will cost and maybe to repair it wouldn't be as costly.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I am in agreement with the others. It is original and therefore is architecturally significant and should not be removed. Number three says that the chimney should be rebuilt to match the original design and those two go together. S. Ash had mentioned the applicant could install something to keep the heat from being lost. So I think I have to say that this does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>M. Dorsey and S. Ash stated the applicant could also cap the chimney.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree that it does not meet the guidelines for the same reasons that have been discussed.</p>

R. Hooper asked for a motion. Link Ludington interrupted and asked if the board had already asked for public comment. N. Schell and R. Hopper stated yes. R. Hopper stated the board could still take public comment.

Dennis Courtney who resides at 830 Green Road stated that he didn't see why the chimney couldn't come down because the applicant cannot afford to fix it and what the board has suggested with the thimble cover is not tight. Cold air will still come inside the house and therefore is not a solution but rather a fix. D. Courtney stated that the applicant needed to fix his roof and if the bricks from the chimney are still falling then the bricks will tear up the new shingles.

Page 4

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

H. Dixon stated he did not consider his house historic and he understood that there are historic homes in town but his house is not historic.

L. Ludington who resides on Mulberry Street stated he was not prepared to speak on this application because the structure was rated non-contributing and the removal of the entire structure would not be detrimental to the character of the historic district. L. Ludington stated he was somewhat encouraged that the board is so concerned with a chimney, a single element of a building that is not even rated as contributing, and he could only hope that the board is that diligent when it comes to the removal of entire structures that are rated contributing. The board is focused on the provisions of chimneys but what this application is really about is the demolition of a chimney. While looking at the residential guidelines on page 80, L. Ludington stated he didn't see anything there that says the demolition of the chimney on this roof is in any way detrimental to the overall character of the National Historic Landmark district. L. Ludington stated he was somewhat reluctant to speak because it did not even occur to him that this was going to be an issue. Normally L. Ludington is crusading for retaining historic structures and the significant features of historic structures but even if this was built in 1945 as apparently it is supposed to be, by the criteria the board is currently using which is the National Historic Landmark nomination survey, this building in 2006 was identified as non-contributing and because that survey has not been updated the way it is supposed to be, unless someone comes forward with solid evidence that suggests this structure is now contributing, L. Ludington stated he thought the board's concern about this one chimney was misplaced.

L. Ludington stated he admired the board for being diligent and detail oriented with the regard to significant elements of buildings but this is in fact setting the stage for future considerations than maybe that isn't a bad thing but personally, L. Ludington has not seen anything to suggest that the preservation or retention of this particular chimney on this particular house ought to be that great of issue for the Historic District Board of Review.

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

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

"I move to allow Mr. Dixon to remove the chimney on his non-contributing house".

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper        Approved – Based on the comments from the audience and the fact that the board does not have in the guidelines anything that distinguishes between contributing and non-contributing

B. Lyman        Disapproved

M. Dorsey        Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez        Approved

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.

Page 5

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

2. Robert Bayne – C. of A. to demolish and rebuild existing garage. New garage will match existing in size and materials. Replace 4 existing wood windows with new wood windows. Add awnings to 4 first story windows. Remove bay window and replace with single wood window.

Location: **801 W Second St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1930 and is a contributing colonial revival style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the garage and of home which showed the windows which will be replaced and receive the awnings. The photos included a closer view of the windows and the bay window.

Robert Bayne was present and stated that he would also like to replace the vinyl siding and door on the south wall of the addition since it is missing siding from the storms. R. Hopper asked if the applicant is amending his application. R. Bayne stated yes. N. Schell asked if the applicant is replacing the siding with vinyl. R. Bayne stated he would like some other alternative such as what is located on the back of Madison Apothecary. The Madison Apothecary has about four feet of siding which looks like rock and the rest is lap siding. R. Bayne informed the board that he could not purchase the vinyl siding to match his siding. R. Hopper asked about the material of the lap siding. R. Bayne stated he would go with a Hardie Board or clapboard siding. R. Bayne stated the vinyl siding is a Dutch cut and he didn't think that was available in wood. R. Bayne stated he would most likely go with the Hardie Board siding or Smart siding.

S. Ash asked if the applicant planned to just replace the missing siding or wanted to replace the siding on the entire house. R. Bayne stated he just wanted to replace the missing siding on the south wall. S. Ash stated he knew there were a couple of suppliers of the Dutch cut wood siding. The suppliers mentioned included Tiny Timbers and Phillips Lumber Company. R. Bayne stated he had talked with Tiny Timbers and their estimate for tongue and groove was expensive. S. Ash stated Phillips may have some stock on hand and that would be cheaper.

R. Bayne stated he would like to remove the bay window and make the wall flat. When he removes the bay window, that portion will also need new siding. B. Lyman asked how many windows the applicant planned to put back after he removed the bay. R. Bayne answered four then corrected himself and stated one window. B. Lyman asked about the material of the windows. R. Bayne stated he would like to replace them with wood however they have been beat to pieces from the weather. That is the reason why the applicant has requested awnings.

R. Hopper asked about the material of the awnings. R. Bayne stated he would like to find someone who is getting rid of their aluminum awnings because the home had those on it before. R. Bayne stated he also liked the idea of canvas awnings. R. Hopper stated that canvas was the preferred material according to the guidelines. R. Bayne stated he would prefer the canvas also.

P. Newhouse asked if that was the east side of the home. R. Bayne answered yes. P. Newhouse stated the applicant must get a lot of sun in the morning. R. Bayne stated that was correct and was why he wanted the awnings. P. Newhouse stated she would encourage the applicant to go with the canvas awnings. R. Bayne agreed. B. Lyman asked if the awnings would be the shed type awnings. R. Bayne answered yes.

R. Hopper asked if there were any additional amendments to the applicant's application. R. Bayne stated he would like to amend the garage portion. R. Bayne stated he would like to remove the retaining wall and re-pour it since the current one is leaning. R. Bayne stated in regards to the garage he would like to replace the current board and batten with T111. S. Ash stated he did not like T111 and that the board and batten is actually more historic. R. Bayne stated he agreed but the boards are rotten at the bottom. R. Bayne stated he was out at the Dutch Pantry and saw that they had created a board and batten by using a 4x8 sheet with batten over top of it.

R. Bayne stated he would check with Tiny Timbers about getting the lumber but he thought the last quote was about \$2.46 per foot. S. Ash stated to check with Phillips instead. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was saying he didn't want to demolish the garage but rather repair the garage. R. Bayne stated that was correct because he didn't want to have to remove the concrete to move the garage.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

R. Bayne asked if he could remove and rebuild the block retaining wall under the garage. B. Lyman asked M. Johnson if that would fall under repair. M. Johnson stated yes.

S. Ash asked if the applicant would keep the existing roof or replace it. R. Bayne stated he needed to replace the roof because it is completely rusted. R. Bayne stated he would like to replace the roof with standing tin metal roof but wasn't sure where to get it from. P. Newhouse and R. Hopper stated Exterior Pro on the hilltop could make the traditional standing seam metal roof. S. Ash stated that if the applicant did not have any holes in the roof he could sand the roof and prime the roof with a primer made to go over rust. The applicant could then prime over that primer and just paint the roof and get another 20 years out of the existing roof. R. Bayne stated he would like to do that.

R. Hopper asked if that was all the changes to this application. R. Bayne answered yes. L. Waller pointed out that the applicant had mentioned he wanted to change a door on the house. R. Hopper asked what type of door the applicant wanted to replace the existing door with. R. Bayne stated it was located on the addition and wasn't visible on the picture. The existing door is rusted and he wanted to just replace it with the same type of door. R. Hopper asked about the material of the replacement door. R. Bayne answered steel with a window. R. Hopper stated the guidelines recommend a wood door.

R. Bayne asked if the guidelines said a wood door for a newer addition. R. Hopper answered yes. P. Newhouse asked if the door was visible from the street. R. Bayne answered that you would have to stand in his yard to see the door. R. Hopper stated he thought the applicant was talking about the door on the side. R. Bayne answered no it would be on the south side. The door on the side is a cool Dutch style door where you can open half of it and leave the other half closed. The other door is an arched door with a port hole.

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	S. Ash – Yes the wood window would meet the guidelines and approved materials list. M. Dorsey – Yes I agree for the same reason. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reason. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reason. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the application for replacing wood windows with wood windows”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

P. Newhouse Approved

P. Sanchez Approved

S. Ash Approved

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

R. Hopper asked if the applicant was going with wood siding. R. Bayne stated he wanted to use the T111 but he would check with Phillips. R. Bayne asked if he could have either option. B. Lyman asked if all the siding needed replaced or just portions of the boards. R. Bayne stated he didn't want any splices in the wood but would rather have one continuous board from top to bottom. B. Lyman asked if the rot was just on north end of the structure. R. Bayne stated it was also on the south and some on where the garage door is.

S. Ash stated he agreed with the applicant that a spliced look isn't as nice as a continuous board and also agreed that putting on a rot resistant wood would be very expensive but if the applicant got a good contractor he could probably salvage a lot of the wood. The contractor could do a 45 degree angle on the new boards rather than a butt joint. This would allow for the water to flow over the joint. R. Bayne asked if he could try that first and if that doesn't work then go with maybe a trim board at the bottom. S. Ash stated the applicant needed to be careful with a trim board because that can become a water trap.

R. Hopper asked if the applicant now plans to repair the siding. R. Bayne stated yes but there is going to be a lot of replacement needed. R. Bayne stated that the board wants him to remove each plank and cut a 45 degree cut on each board then put the boards back up. R. Bayne asked how long the permit is good. R. Hopper stated the applicant needed to start within the year but there is no competition date requirement.

S. Ash suggested that the applicant purchase a pine board and treat it with a preservative and then paint over top of it. R. Bayne asked if he was permitted to replace the sill plate. S. Ash answered yes. R. Bayne stated he would like to go with the pine boards to replace the board and batten. R. Hopper stated that the applicant would like to repair the boards as much as possible and then replace what is needed with the pine board.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Garages & Outbuildings	45	---	P. Newhouse – Yes I think that if the applicant does what has been discussed it will meet the guidelines. P. Sanchez – I think it does. The guidelines read that the property should be preserved and maintained. That is what the applicant plans to do by using wooden materials as replacement. S. Ash – If the applicant uses a plank of wood and not T111 then I approve. B. Lyman – I agree if the applicant uses plank wood and battens. M. Dorsey – Provided that wood plank boards are used where necessary than it meets the guidelines. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

Page 8

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

“I move to approve repairing and where necessary replacing the boards around the garage and trying to salvage the roof as stated at 801 W. Second Street”.

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

**Roll Call:**

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

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

B. Lyman asked if the applicant was considering trying to find the Dutch lap siding in either wood or Smart siding. R. Bayne answered yes.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56-58	--	B. Lyman – Both proposed materials are approved materials and therefore meet the guidelines. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reason. S. Ash – I agree for the same reason. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move at the house at 801 W. Second Street where the bay window will be removed and new siding to be replaced, if either the siding is wood Dutch lap siding, Smart siding, or cement board, all of which are approved materials, then a COA should be approved”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

**Roll Call:**

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

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

June 26, 2017

S. Ash            Approved

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

R. Hopper confirmed with applicant that he was proposing to use canvas shed type awnings.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Awnings	35	34, 35	P. Newhouse – Yes, this will meet the guidelines. P. Sanchez – Yes, it does meet the guidelines. S. Ash – Yes, it does meet the guidelines. B. Lyman – Yes, the guidelines on page 35 state that canvas shed type awnings are approvable and so I agree. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reason. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

“I move that the canvas shed style awnings are appropriate for this project and should receive a COA”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

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

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

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

- 3. Susan Morrison – C. of A. to replace 4 windows on second floor and windows on first floor along Madison Street, the alley and back side.

Location: **308 Madison St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1890 and is a contributing upright and wing style structure. N. Schell showed photos of home which showed the five windows to be replaced, one on the second story of the west façade, one on the second and first story of the north façade, and two on the second story of the east façade. N. Schell also showed an image of the brochure of the proposed aluminum clad replacement windows.

Susan Morrison was present and stated the current windows are wood windows and are old and leaking.

Page 10

**Historic District Board of Review**

June 26, 2017

B. Lyman asked if the design on the brochure was what the applicant wanted to use. S. Morrison stated the windows would not have that exact design but will match what is there now. The current windows have a plain lower window and a four divided upper portion.

S. Ash asked if the current windows were original. S. Morrison stated she didn't know but knew they were wood windows with weights on the sides. S. Ash asked about the condition of the wood windows. S. Morrison stated they were not in good shape because they are drafty and do not open or close. N. Schell stated according to the NHL inventory it states that the home has aluminum siding, replacement doors, and replacement windows.

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	P. Sanchez – Yes, the aluminum clad is appropriate per the guidelines on pages 60-63. P. Newhouse – I agree. S. Ash – I agree. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was going to change the size of any of the openings. S. Morrison answered no. B. Lyman – I agree. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reason. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

"I move to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for replacing the wood windows with aluminum clad windows at 308 Madison as described".

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      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 11

## Historic District Board of Review

June 26, 2017

4. Robert Eversole – C. of A. to demolish existing single family structure.

Location: **704 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1870 and is a contributing shotgun structure. N. Schell showed photos of home which showed of the west, north, and east elevations.

Rod Kiefer of 302 W. LaGrange Rd in Hanover from Sedam Contracting was present to represent the applicant.

P. Newhouse asked why the owner wanted to demolish this structure. R. Kiefer stated the owner, who lives out of town, inherited the properties from his late mother and cannot keep up with the maintenance. P. Newhouse stated the properties were in a flood plain and therefore once they are removed they cannot be replaced. R. Kiefer stated he didn't think the owner had plans to replace the structures once they are removed.

S. Ash asked if the representative had been inside the buildings and knew about their condition. R. Kiefer stated he has not walked around inside but there are numerous doors and windows missing. S. Ash asked about the siding and what was underneath the current siding. R. Kiefer stated this property has vinyl and the next property has aluminum. He guessed that both have the insulbrick which is seen under the aluminum siding of the next application.

M. Dorsey asked M. Johnson if had been on the inside of the either property. M. Johnson stated he had been inside the southern building and it is missing the toilets and portions of the floor. M. Johnson also stated that since it is in the floodplain they would have to redo the electrical, plumbing, and HVAC and they could not do that because he cannot give a building permit for structures in the floodplain.

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

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

Donna Weaver, who resides at 404 East Third Street, stated that this came up at the last meeting and she assumed since it was unopposed they had a year before anything could be done about this. D. Weaver stated just because a building is not wanted doesn't mean that it should be torn down especially since it is a contributing shotgun.

P. Newhouse stated she agreed but it is a hard situation because there are many things that cannot be done with these structures. M. Johnson stated the one he was in would need new plumbing, electrical, and HVAC and his office cannot give a building permit for a structure in the floodplain.

L. Ludington, president of the Cornerstone Society, stated he was confused about the permit requirements for structures in the floodplain because his house and a lot of houses in Madison are within the floodplain. L. Ludington stated that under the new Zoning Ordinance which was enacted last year that there is specific language that states that any work that is required to maintain and repair and continue the use of a structure does not require a building permit.

L. Ludington stated that all his comments will also pertain to the next application. The COA application for demolition for these structures was denied at last month's meeting and with his understanding L. Ludington stated that would start the twelve month moratorium on demolition. The fact that these application have already been denied at last month's meeting starts the clock on the twelve month time period which the intent is to allow the applicant and interested parties to acquire or make arrangements for preservation of the structures that are rated contributing. L. Ludington stated he has not heard anything that should augment the decision from last month's meeting. L. Ludington stated during that time the applicant must come up with documentation with all the elements which must be met in order to demolish even though the board has denied a COA.

L. Ludington continued by talk about the City of Madison's effort to revitalize this area with the Madison Connector trail running through the neighborhood. L. Ludington mentioned that there have been several "ugly duckling" buildings recently saved and restored in Madison.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

L. Ludington mentioned for the record that Cornerstone Society is not against the demolition of these particular buildings but they opposed to the demolition of contributing historic structures in the National Historic Landmark district without exhausting the possibilities for pursuing other alternatives. L. Ludington stated as a resident of the neighborhood would like to request the board stick with the decision that was made at last month’s meeting.

L. Ludington pointed out that the Habitat House was in worse condition than either of these two properties and Habitat was able to go in and save the structure. L. Ludington gave examples of how to deal with the problems discussed by the applicant’s representative.

M. Johnson responded and stated that there is more to it than just boarding a house up to keep people out. It could become a public safety concern because they have to stay warm and could start a fire.

P. Sanchez asked why the applications were allowed to be placed back on the agenda.

N. Schell stated that according to section 151.32 of the Historic District Ordinance for Demolitions of Buildings it states in section B, “the Board of Review may at anytime during such stay approve a certificate of appropriateness” and therefore that is why they were allowed to be placed back on the agenda.

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	80, 81	71, 72	M. Dorsey – No I do not believe it meets the guidelines and I think that we would be remised to change from our decision last month. B. Lyman – I agree that it does not meet the guidelines for demolition since both are contributing structures and I think that a year period will allow us and the owner to look at other options. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree. P. Sanchez – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

S. Ash made the following motion:

“I move to disapprove the COA to demolish the building at 704 Mulberry St. based on the residential design guidelines on demolition on pages 80 and 81 which says applicants for demolition should explore possibilities for selling and reusing historic structures”.

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman      Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

Page 13

**Historic District Board of Review**

June 26, 2017

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez     Approved

S. Ash          Approved

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

5. Robert Eversole – C. of A. to demolish existing single family structure.

Location: **706 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1870 and is a contributing shotgun structure. N. Schell showed photos of home which showed of the west, south, and east elevations.

Rod Kiefer of 302 W. LaGrange Rd in Hanover from Sedam Contracting was present to represent the applicant.

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

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

L. Ludington stated all his comments from the last application should be repeated for the record for this application.

R. Kiefer asked about the procedure for these properties after the year is up so that he could advice his client. R. Hopper stated there are certain criteria that are required by the owner. L. Waller recommended that the owner speak with DNR and see what they would approve or not approve.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to disapprove the application for demolition at 706 Mulberry St. for the same reasons as the previous application”.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman        Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez     Approved

S. Ash          Approved

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

R. Hopper informed R. Kiefer that he could obtain the criteria for demolition from the office.

6. Cornerstone Society, Inc. – C. of A. to demolish the partially collapsed section of a masonry wall along back of a house facing East Third Street behind 420 West Street.

Location: **420 West St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Page 14

**Historic District Board of Review**

June 26, 2017

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1920 and is a contributing classical revival style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the partially collapsed wall which is located behind the main structure and is visible from the alley.

Link Ludington, president of Cornerstone Society, Inc. was present and stated the portion of wall this application is referring to is not part of the old Elks building but rather one of the last surviving portions of a much earlier structure. The structure which this fragment is a part of was actually built as an addition to the federal style house at 106 E Third Street. This structure was a kitchen addition which was built circa 1850 and was sold to the Elks Club after World War II.

L. Ludington stated that decades of neglect and disrepair caused this structure to collapse and the fire which damaged the Elks Building, the Old City Hall, and 106 E Third Street in 2006 caused the rest of the structure to fail. The Cornerstone Society recently reclaimed the property from an out of town owner. L. Ludington stated that this wall is basically a masonry pier that used to separate two windows or doors. The wall has buckled and is partially collapsed and leaning against an old smoke stack that is attached to the back wall of the Elks Building. L. Ludington informed the board that the Cornerstone Society has a signed purchase agreement for the Elks Building and this structure is holding up the sale of the building.

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

B. Lyman stated that since she is a board member of the Cornerstone Society she cannot comment or vote on this application.

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

Patrick Thevenow, who resides at 106 E. Third Street, stated he would like to see this wall torn down. P. Thevenow stated the south wall of his structure actually collapsed partially and he had to rebuild all of it.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	80, 81	71, 72	M. Dorsey – Yes I think it does and it looks hazardous like it could come down at any time. B. Lyman – I cannot comment. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree as this structure is just a fragment and is barely visible from the alley. P. Sanchez – I agree. I saw P. Thevenow working out in the yard and she thought the wall might fall on him. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the application for demolition of the partial brick wall at 420 West Street”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman      Abstained

**Page 15**

**Historic District Board of Review**

**June 26, 2017**

P. Newhouse      Approved

P. Sanchez      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. Vickie Burton – C. of A. to replace door on west side of house with steel door.  
Location: **212 E First St.**      Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1870 and is a non-contributing Hall and Parlor structure. N. Schell informed the board that this structure is considered non-contributing because of all the alterations that have been done to the structure. N. Schell showed photos of current door and storm door and photos of the proposed door and storm door. N. Schell informed the board that the applicant came into the office and amended her application to include the replacement of the current storm door.

Vickie Burton was present and stated the side door is rotten and needs replaced. V. Burton informed the board that they were going to have to fix the foundation under the door and the door currently has Plexiglas in the door. V. Burton stated this home has been in her family for about 60 years and she is working on it after her son moved out. V. Burton stated the door gets hit with the weather because it is on the west side of the house.

V. Burton stated the door they picked out was a steel door but then she talked to N. Schell who stated the board didn't typically approve steel doors. V. Burton stated they wanted to go with a wood clad door. Dennis Courtney who resides at 830 Green Road stated the door they wanted to go with has a wood core and an aluminum wrap. D. Courtney stated they wanted to add the same storm door to the side door that is currently located on the front door. D. Courtney stated a wood door would rot on that side because of the weather. S. Ash asked if that would occur even with a storm door. D. Courtney stated yes.

V. Burton stated they wanted a door with a window because it is dark in that room which is used as a bedroom. B. Lyman stated that at first N. Schell stated that this house was contributing but then stated it was non-contributing. N. Schell stated she had made a mistake on her staff notes and checked before the meeting and the survey form has it labeled as non-contributing due to the number of alterations.

B. Lyman asked if there was a reason the applicant picked the design on the door's window. V. Burton and D. Courtney stated they liked the door.

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	M. Dorsey – Even though wood doors are preferred, in this situation with the weather issues and the door being behind a storm door, it would meet the guidelines.

Historic District Board of Review

June 26, 2017

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	<p>B. Lyman – The guidelines do state that it should be wood but she understood the situation. I would like to see a design that matched the house’s architecture.</p> <p>V. Burton asked what B. Lyman would recommend. B. Lyman stated a clear glass would be better. V. Burton stated that this door went into a bedroom and she didn’t want to put clear glass into a bedroom. The glass is frosted glass.</p> <p>S. Ash – I am on the fence here because the approved material list has a wood door and they make wood doors that have windows in them.</p> <p>V. Burton stated they have a wood clad door that look just like the one in the photo.</p> <p>S. Ash – Since this is a non-contributing structure he was unsure how the board would be held accountable.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I think it is fine since it is a non-contributing house.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I would defer to those who have already spoken and agree.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason because it is going to be an aluminum clad wood door it would meet the guidelines since we approve aluminum clad wood windows.</p>

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

“I move that the door that is being proposed is suitable for downtown and for this structure and it deserves a certificate of appropriateness”.

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- B. Lyman       Approved
- M. Dorsey     Approved
- P. Newhouse   Approved
- P. Sanchez     Approved
- S. Ash          Approved because it is a non-contributing structure.

***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 17

**Historic District Board of Review**

June 26, 2017

**Extended Applications:**

1. Gerry and Leon Michl – C. of A. to build 22-ft x 14-ft picnic shelter on concrete pad.  
 Location: **203 Shamrock Ln.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1870 and is a contributing 19<sup>th</sup> Century Functional style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the barn, the location of the concrete pad and proposed structure, and drawings of the proposed structure. N. Schell stated the structure would have a standing seam metal roof.

Dr. Leon Michl was present and stated the structure would be 19-ft x 11-ft to meet the setback requirements. Originally the plan was to attach the structure to the barn but he was told that attaching it would affect the taxes on the barn.

P. Newhouse asked if they would have considered that an addition to the barn. L. Michl stated that was his guess.

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

B. Lyman thanked the applicant for his choice in materials. The materials include a standing seam metal roof, plank siding, and wood swinging doors.

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Rear & Lateral Additions	68	62	P. Sanchez – Yes, under new construction on page 68, all of the compatibility issues as well as the material issues are met by this application. P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. B. Lyman – I agree. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reason.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move to that the shelter project at 203 Shamrock Lane for an 11-ft x 19-ft shelter with a standing seam roof, barn wood siding, and wood doors be approved as described in the application”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

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

Page 18

**Historic District Board of Review**

June 26, 2017

***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. L. Waller reminded the applicant that he needed a building permit for this project.

**Business - Old:**

**Business – New:**

**Business – Staff Report:**

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Vickie Burton	212 E. First St.	6/8/2017	Fence: Wood, 3' x 22' Pickets and 6' x 40' Privacy
Michael Burrow	311 E. 2 <sup>nd</sup> St.	6/23/2017	Chimney: Brick Stabilization

Historic District Board of Review: 2016 June COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Work Done According to COA?
Lytle, Linda	414 St. Michaels Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing wood siding with LP engineered wood siding</li> </ul>	Yes
Butler, Daniel	502 Jefferson Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install an ADA accessible ramp to site</li> <li>Place Hardie Board siding at rear of structure, matching front dormer, to fill window openings</li> </ul>	Yes, ADA ramp placed on north side
Gray, Sharon and Paul Dicken	410 Broadway Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install 2 vinyl or aluminum clad windows on South elevation where vinyl and wood currently exist</li> </ul>	Yes
Garlinghouse, Jonathan	920 W. Main Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build an 8'x8'x8.5' wood-frame, mobile shed at rear of property</li> </ul>	Yes

No further business to be brought before the board.

M. Dorsey made the motion to adjourn - seconded by P. Newhouse

Meeting adjourned at 7:34 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