

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

Mr. Strouse answered that he assumed so – they will all match – are pretty good size windows. J. DeLuca asked Mr. Strouse if the separations will have the same profile. Yes, per Mr. Strouse. P. Davis commented that he thought most of the windows had been replaced ten or eleven years ago. Mr. Strouse said he understood that they may have been but they did a pretty poor job of it – water has run back in – now rotted – nasty. J. DeLuca asked if they will have single or double pane glass. Mr. Strouse said to be honest he thinks they are double pane, thinks his son wants to make it as weather tight as he can. J. DeLuca then asked what about storm windows. Mr. Strouse stated at this point in time he did not think so – son hasn't said anything to him about that yet. J. DeLuca asked for confirmation the windows will be wood. This was confirmed by Mr. Strouse – wood construction, separated panes, everything will be proper, will look good. J. DeLuca asked if the divided panels will be located within the double pane windows. Per Mr. Strouse – will have divided panes – won't have grills that just snap in, that's not going to happen - exterior will be painted.

G. Jorgensen stated she did not think these windows were replaced – some of them are original – don't think they were replaced ten years ago. Mr. Strouse said some of them were. G. Jorgensen then asked Mr. Strouse if he knew which ones. Mr. Strouse noted that some of them on the west side he understood had been replaced, he had been told that, doesn't know, was told they were replaced when some work was done a few years ago. P. Davis said there has been no maintenance at all – like Mr. Strouse said, you can stick your finger right through them – there has been no maintenance, cheap wood, windows on the west side all were replaced, cheap windows were put in there, front windows don't match so knows they aren't original. G. Jorgensen asked about the windows that have been picked apart. Mr. Strouse explained they are in very bad shape, old, drafty, and wind just comes right through them. G. Jorgensen said somebody has picked some of them apart and she just wondered if those aren't original. P. Davis said _____ on the west side. (Unable to hear next comment on tape.) G. Jorgensen said she believed the front windows to look like they are from the 1870's – the board needs to know which ones ... P. Davis advised these are all on the west side which you cannot see from the street – they don't all match so know they are not all original. G. Jorgensen said she can't tell which ones are _____, which one's are original and he (Mr. Strouse) is asking for a blank slate as to which ones ... to replace all of them, if that right? Mr. Strouse answered “maybe” – a lot of them are in poor shape, very poor shape. G. Jorgensen disagreed – noted she had looked at them very close – someone has picked at them – didn't know what they had used, some kind of tool.

J. DeLuca asked who the manufacturer is. Mr. Strouse answered that he did not know. In response to J. DeLuca, Mr. Strouse advised he is the father of the applicant (Cary).

G. Jorgensen stated that the board really doesn't have an idea which windows he wants to replace, he is just asking for this board to give him a blank slate. Mr. Strouse said every one of them that needs to be replaced, they want to replace, they are in poor shape – if they can be repaired, his son wants to try to repair them – if they can't be repaired, will need to be replaced. J. DeLuca asked if the plan is for all of them to match. Yes, per Mr. Strouse. G. Jorgensen read from page 61, # 3 of the Madison Residential Design Review Guidelines – “Windows should be repaired rather than replaced. If severe deterioration necessitates replacement (80% of the original window is missing or deteriorated), new wood windows should be in-kind to match the original design and materials” so that is why the board is trying to establish how many they are going to replace and which ones. Mr. Strouse said he could not stand there and give that answer because he doesn't know. R. Hopper commented these are not the original windows – these have been replaced. G. Jorgensen stated “he” said just the left side, not on the east side or the front – front lower windows probably replaced early on in the last two centuries. G. Jorgensen commented that she felt like the board is just being asked to approve something that they are not

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

given all the information as to what they are approving. Mr. Strouse said the only thing he can tell them is if they can be saved, he wants to save them, if they cannot be saved, they need to replace them – not going to know that until you get into it. G. Jorgensen then asked Mr. Strouse who is going to make that decision as to whether they can be saved. Mr. Strouse answered it would be the contractor, he would assume. J. DeLuca asked if Jon Richards is the contractor – is he a Madison registered general contractor. Mr. Strouse answered that he thinks he (Mr. Richards) is, yes – as far as he knows – contractor is very conscientious. J. DeLuca mentioned that the board could make this conditional upon the preservation of the windows upon an inspection and a determination – this would allow the applicant to go forward with the project, but it sounds like a reasonable request – they will preserve what they can and where they can't they will replace and the replacement will be of identical composition and design. D. Cheatham said this is basically what the applicant is saying – he is saying repair or replacement of windows – windows will be wood. J. DeLuca told Mr. Strouse his son has already made a change as the original application was to put in vinyl windows. He did want vinyl windows, that is correct per Mr. Strouse but changed that – will try to salvage what he can and put in like window, new ones where he has to.

J. DeLuca questioned as to why Cary is not here. Mr. Strouse answered that his son lives in California.

G. Jorgensen said she did not want to prevent him (Cary) from being able to change out the windows if they are rotten and they need to be replaced it's just if he has original wood windows they are going to be made of old wood and it is going to be much better for him/for the building to be able to keep them, if he possibly can. Mr. Strouse said that is what his son is saying – if he can salvage, he will.

As far as the door goes, G. Jorgensen what ... Mr. Strouse explained you can see right through it – it is rotten – it has to be replaced. G. Jorgensen asked about the style of the wood door – it was going to be Prairie style, is that what he (Cary) is thinking about doing? Mr. Strouse answered that it will be a very nice wood door – doesn't know if it's picked out yet or not – the door had been replaced – this is not original. In showing application information, J. DeLuca showed a picture of the proposed door and he knows originally the proposal was fiberglass – will now do wood – but as far as the design of the door, thinks that is the only thing he would be concerned about. G. Jorgensen said this is Craftsman style. She further said if taking a look at the Guidelines, it's a Federal style house and he (Cary) is proposing to put on a Craftsman style door. Mr. Strouse said if the board wants a Federal style door, they will do a Federal style door – not a Federal style door on there now so doesn't know what the problem is – they will have a nice wood door. Again, Mr. Strouse said if the board wants a Federal style door, will put on a Federal style door – don't see the problem there at all – if that is what the board wants, will do it.

Audience member, Greg Sekula, Indiana Landmarks, said he would certainly encourage the board – wood windows ... obviously material is an issue which it seems to be compatible – obviously wood ... but there are a whole gamut of wood window products out there – are we talking the Vega or the Cadillac or the Mercedes of wood windows – thinks it would be appropriate for the commission to ask for more specific information on the window manufacturer and what ... there will be promotional material that would be available from the contractor that chooses the wooden window; thinks it would be perfectly appropriate to ask that a contractor provide a sample of the wood window that they are looking for – if it's an Andersen or if it's an Marvin they can get samples to bring to the meeting – if it's an individual fabricating them, the contractor should be able to have that kind of information; and, likewise with the door – it's the same type of thing, need a specific design before the board would be in a position to approve the door; and, Mr. Sekula said he did not think it would be out of line to request that a window survey be done and then the contractor provide the board with specific evaluation as to which

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

windows he is thinking will have to be replaced verses repaired – he’s going to obviously need to figure that out anyway and if he has provided a quote to the property owners, he’s got an idea of what he is looking at, so that information can’t be that elusive for him to be able to provide to the board with that as they are making their decision. J. DeLuca said to him this sounds like a reasonable approach and in the length of time it would take the applicant to get quotes and/or sample windows and doors that would be good if they were specific and identified the materials and dimensions and the design of the windows and the door – as far as the survey goes, thinks in the ideal world that is probably great but didn’t know how precise the board needs to be under the situation. D. Cheatham then asked Mr. Strouse if it would be possible to get the information. Mr. Strouse answered that he didn’t know – had no idea – will have to talk to his son and the contractor – they haven’t gotten anything yet because they are trying to find manufacturers for them – it is sort of tough to do. D. Cheatham told Mr. Strouse it might be better to do something like that for the benefit of the board to make a more concerned decision and know exactly what... Again, Mr. Strouse explained it won’t be cheap stuff – it’s going to be ... D. Cheatham told Mr. Strouse he was sure it would be done right but just for the board’s satisfaction that might be the way to go. D. Cheatham asked the board members if they feel the same way. Yes, per G. Jorgensen – the board is being asked to make a decision on something that is really not tangible at this point.

J. DeLuca asked Mr. Strouse if there is work going on at this time on the house. Yes, per Mr. Strouse – tuck pointing. J. DeLuca then said this is not something that affect the door or window installation. Mr. Strouse said they need to get some windows put in because some of the others are about ready to fall out. J. DeLuca said he understood – knows there is a sense of urgency and that is why he brought this up, so the board can make sure there is a sense of urgency on the contractors part or Cary’s part to get the information that the board requests – and, knows there is a long lead time for windows so every day that goes by is another day lost on the installation. P. Davis noted the applicant has also been delayed one month due to there not being a January HDBR meeting.

G. Jorgensen asked M. Hoffman if he has a list of contractors who might help with the building of the windows. Mr. Strouse noted that he felt that should be his son’s prerogative who he gets to do that. G. Jorgensen said, sure – she thought just suggestions – just thought they were looking for someone to build the windows at this point in time. M. Hoffman explained he cannot recommend a contractor but can provide a list of contractors.

L. Waller asked Mr. Sekula if historic commissions have a list of windows that they prefer or don’t prefer. Mr. Sekula explained they do not endorse a specific brand – he said the board needs to look at profile, muntin profile is a big issue, there is some guidance provided in the Guidelines as to what to look for in a replacement window – want the dimensions to be the same – again, what the commission is to look at is that the applicant provides the information – this is the window they want to use and the board reviews it based on that as opposed to saying well we prefer another window over this window – it’s does this window meet the guidelines, that’s what they are looking at and if they can say “yes, it’s going to be the same size as the other windows, it’s going to have a similar muntin profile, then they can evaluate objectively that replacement. But, it’s difficult without information to know if they are meeting the intent of the guidelines, so the commission can say, no, they don’t think this window meets it and then the applicant is then basically to go back and find something else as opposed to them saying they want a Marvin instead of an Anderson, that would not be appropriate because obviously that does _____ issues of cost and things of that nature which the applicant is only able to know whether or not they can meet that. Further, he said another issue here is there has to be some sort of clarity on what can or cannot be saved – keeping the original windows, as eluded to in the Guidelines, is what the board if trying to achieve – preservation of those original windows – have to ascertain, as Paul as mentioned, maybe some of these windows are not original windows that are in there and someone, Mr. Hoffman if he can act in that capacity, thinks Mike would be able to look at a

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

window and say “this looks like it is a ten year window verses a 60 or 100 year old window.” Mr. Sekula said he knows from his training he can usually tell if a window is a replacement or an older window, so some sort of assistance as a property owner may not know because they are not accustomed to it - that’s where staff could be helpful or might recommend that they talk with HMI or some other expert locally who might be able to give them some guidance as to what may or may not be able to be saved; but, would think the contractor, if he has bid this job ... as a property owner when coming before the Commission for a project I’m usually knowing how much I got _____ and if I have a contractor on line I have a clear sense of knowing what he is going to replace verses repair and I want to know because if he is to repair or replace and can’t give an answer and I’ve got a budget that says I can replace five windows and I have thirty windows, I’ll want to know – so, don’t think it is unreasonable for the Commission to ask that because as a property owner I would hope I would also have that information. Mr. Sekula stated he thought it was just a matter of really getting down and really looking at it and being as... providing as much information as you can to these folks to be able to make a decision – and we know of some companies that do fabricate wood windows so if the applicant is in need of companies that do that he can provide some recommendations of folks who do it.

Audience member, Graeme Fothergill, said he would like to point out there are at least two contractors in this town who are excellent at restoring windows and it seems this conversation has gone out of town so if possible would like to see any work done be kept here. J. DeLuca told Mr. Strouse to please, after the meeting, provide those resources – board cannot get involved in that.

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

D. Cheatham said if the board agrees he moved to table this application until the next meeting or until the applicant can gather some information. P. Davis asked for confirmation the request is for more information. D. Cheatham said that is correct – for the windows and the door and as far as which windows will be replaced and which ones possibly repaired. G. Jorgensen added the board will need to know the style. D. Cheatham said he knows this is putting it off at least a month. L. Waller confirmed the boards requested information. G. Jorgensen also said they need to know what the door will look like and the materials, the specifics of what they are going to do. J. DeLuca said that ideally the board is looking for specifics of materials the applicant is proposing to install – both doors and windows.

APPLICATION TABLED.

2. **City of Madison** – *C. of A.* for a new ribbed metal roof and new aluminum gutters.
 Location: **118 W. Second St.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Application presented by contractor, Graeme Fothergill who explained the reason for this is that the present shingles are leaking and it was decided the 9-in. metal rib would be most appropriate seeing that some time ago the City actually obtained that building and there is metal on the other side, so just finishing. J. DeLuca asked Mr. Fothergill if the shingles he wants to replace is on the west side of the building. Mr. Fothergill answered “east.” J. DeLuca further stated he was looking at it today and could see the east side and it looked like that was the metal and then the west he couldn’t see. Mr. Fothergill said all he is doing is finishing the job that somebody had done sometime before. M. Pittman commented that the condition of the green shingles is pretty bad. Additionally, Mr. Fothergill said there is only 44-ft. that needs to be replaced. M. Pittman confirmed that the existing metal part is okay, don’t need to replace it just replace the asphalt shingles. J. DeLuca asked if the color will be the same. Mr. Fothergill said, no, there was a mix

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

front unless the building is on a corner (605 W. Main is not on a corner). Mr. Moore said that is why he is here in front of the board – asking for a variance. G. Jorgensen told Mr. Moore the board can't approve this because it would go against the Ordinance – the Ordinance states you can only have one sign per ... Mr. Moore said he understood the board could approve a variance. G. Jorgensen then told Mr. Moore the board can't approve a variance. J. DeLuca said he would like to do a little more research on it because he thinks ... design of the building does not allow for one continuous sign within the limits and feels it otherwise _____ within the historic district the board might want to consider it. Mr. Moore asked if it is possible to have one sign across the front. R. Hopper explained to Mr. Moore that it could be one continuous sign but then the lettering would be ... Mr. Moore said he thought the sign could only be 2/3 of the front of the building so he can't actually have that sign, can't ... if he reads the Ordinance correctly. J. DeLuca told Mr. Moore thought he was limiting himself – remembers something about 80% of the short side of the building is the maximum length of signage he can have. This is correct per G. Jorgensen. J. DeLuca said if the pieces are not put in the openings perhaps the sign would fall within the guidelines, doesn't know, just ... G. Jorgensen told J. DeLuca he was correct – can't put that many signs on the front. G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Moore for confirmation that his application is for the flat sign and for the hanging sign. Mr. Moore said he thinks he fits the guidelines for the hanging sign. M. Pittman said he guessed if Mr. Moore was seeking an exception for what the law is, what board would he go to to get that if this board can't grant it, would that be the Zoning Board of Appeals? M. Pittman further stated this board can say if the sign is historic or not but can't override the ordinance. M. Pittman asked if this board can vote on the appropriateness of the signs, thought as far as being appropriate to the historic district and with the condition he has to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. D. Auxier stated he didn't think it was the BZA. L. Waller said it was her understanding this board would make a recommendation to the City Council to ask to amend the Ordinance. Mr. Moore stated he was willing to wait as long as the vertical sign ... Mr. Moore encouraged the board to do what they must to ask the City Council – if it is something this board agrees to – perhaps there is another alternative here besides the 80% rule that still retains the historical accuracy of the sign.

Audience member, Link Ludington, asked if they are talking about putting lettering on the existing glass windows – transom windows above? It was confirmed the glass in the transoms is still there. D. Auxier told Mr. Moore he can paint one message per glass, however, Mr. Moore noted this is a concern because the font would be too small – could only cover 20% of the window area. D. Auxier said he thought the board took the position that the transom is part of the whole door unit – knows Mr. Moore prefers a sign up above, just not sure the board is going to be able to jump through the hoops to get there. Mr. Moore said if it is possible for him to get help in making a recommendation to the City Council, he would appreciate it. He thought his guess is what they will do is to wait and see if that type of thing might happen – can put projecting sign up pretty quickly and can see if there is anything that might happen in the near future and if not will think about the lettering on the transoms.

In regards to the lights, Mr. Moore stated they want those to be appropriate as well. G. Jorgensen told Mr. Moore this board has approved this style of lamp before for a downtown business – was approved for the bookstore.

No further questions or comments from the audience or board.

G. Jorgensen moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project which is at 605 W. Main Street that this board approve the gooseneck lamps – motion seconded by J. DeLuca. J. DeLuca said for his own clarity and for Mr. Moore, what will be done with respects to the balance of his request – who is taking action to go to City Council or Board of Review? D. Auxier advised that this board will need to make a recommendation to the City Council. G. Jorgensen said this board just made an Ordinance amendment recommendation

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

(approved by City Council) but that went through a committee – there was in place an Ordinance review committee and thought that had been disbanded at this point so didn't know what would be done about that, if there is a request from the public to review that ... L. Waller commented that perhaps there needs to be a committee to look into the signage ordinance as it stands now, come up with a recommendation, bring it back before this board, and ultimately present to the City Council. G. Jorgensen asked if the Ordinance review committee ... is there somebody working on that at this point in time. Mr. Sekula advised that at this point the decision was made not to continue the committee in part with the preservation planner position coming forward, thought it was probably a good idea to wait until that staff person was on board.

Mr. Sekula added that he thought at this point that committee is not an active standing committee but thought would be appropriate, as the attorney has indicated, for the commission subcommittee to look at the signage ordinance, make recommended changes, or specific to this issue maybe write a letter to the City Council saying – based on evidence of historic photographs and recent requests this board thinks there should be some amendments to this specific section of the signage ordinance and would encourage the City Council to move forward with an amendment. He noted the Council might ask this board for specific help and suggestive language. Mr. Sekula thought forming a subcommittee to look at all the signage or specific to this recommendation – may be other problematic areas he is not aware of that might be looked at as well. P. Davis asked when the slice of pizza was put on the pizza restaurant, did the Council approve that – that's been some years ago but all these times, the City Council... D. Auxier said there are signs all over town that don't comply with the Ordinance.

D. Cheatham noted there has been a motion and a second – all ayes – none opposed – motion carries – based on the preceding findings of fact, **I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to 605 Grill for the proposed application with conditions subject however to the conditions specified in the findings of fact made previously or subject to the following conditions: the building signage will be deleted from the application.**

Application approved for the gooseneck lights.

Business – Old or New:

2011 Chairman and Vice-Chairman-

Chairman – J. DeLuca nominated R. Hopper
 R. Hopper nominated D. Cheatham – 2nd by P. Davis
 No further nominations
 Roll call – all ayes

Congratulations to D. Cheatham as the 2011 Historic District Board of Review Chairman.

Vice-Chairman -

M. Pittman nominated G. Jorgensen – 2nd by R. Hopper - G. Jorgensen accepted the nomination

D. Cheatham nominated P. Davis – P. Davis declined the nomination

G. Jorgensen nominated M. Pittman – M. Pittman declined the nomination

No further nominations.

Nomination declined by P. Davis and M. Pittman – accepted by G. Jorgensen – roll call for G. Jorgensen – all ayes.

Congratulations to G. Jorgensen as the 2011 Historic District Board of Review Vice-Chairman.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2011

Cornerstone representative, Rich Murray, provided new board members with color copies of the Commercial and Residential Guidelines.

No further business to be brought before the board.

J. DeLuca made the motion to adjourn – seconded by P. Davis.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Louann Waller, Secretary

Dirk Cheatham, Chairman