

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

May 22, 2023

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a meeting on Monday, May 22, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following members present: Ken McWilliams, Owen McCall, Sandy Palmer, Carol Ann Rogers, and Mike Pittman. Also present was Nicole Schell, Director of Planning, Preservation, & Design, Mayor Bob Courtney, and Brooke Peach – Historic Preservationist.

J. Wilber 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 to the microphone to answer any questions. B. Peach will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. J. Wilber added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

Preservation Month Celebrations:

Mayor Bob Courtney read a proclamation honoring Madison’s citizens and the preservation non-profits, Historic Madison, Inc. and Cornerstone. The proclamation was given to John Stacier, President and Executive Director of HMI.

The HDBR presented preservation awards to seven citizens for preservation work done in 2022.

4/24/2023 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for April 24, 2023 and had any corrections or additions.

S. Palmer moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| J. Wilber | Approved |
| O. McCall | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. Devin Scudder – C. of A. to build a 24’x24’ garage with 2 overhead doors, standard door, and window(s); materials to be finalized but will include either wood/ cement siding.

Location: **835 W. Main St.**

Zoned: **Specialty District (SD)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Devin Scudder was present.

J. Wilber asked how wide the proposed door would be and D. Scudder stated approximately 60”. J. Wilber also asked if the glass would be tempered or frosted and D. Scudder stated it would be clear and tempered.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
May 22, 2023

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 9.0 Doors & Entrances | 59-61 | <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – The guidelines state a new opening may be permitted on a rear or side elevation if not readily visible from the public right-of-way and the new entrance should be compatible in scale, size, and proportion to the building. This entrance will be, so this project is in conformance with the guidelines.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p> |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Devin Scudder to replace the existing rear door on a non-historic edition with a glass and metal double door at 835 W. Main St.”

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

| | |
|------------|----------|
| J. Wilber | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| O. McCall | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Approved |
| J. Wilber | Approved |

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

- Ken & Linda Pettit – C. of A. to replace existing wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows of same size, shape, & design.

Location: **119 East St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Ken Pettit was present.

K. Pettit provided additional photographs of the existing windows. He stated several of the windows were non-operable and were either caulked or painted shut or had broken ropes. K. Pettit also stated they had problems keeping their windows clean. J. Wilber asked if K. Pettit the windows had ever been repaired in the time he owned the home and K. Pettit stated the windows had been reglazed twice. J. Wilber also asked if there were storm windows installed on the home and explained briefly about the benefits of exterior storm windows. C. Rogers asked if there were interior storm windows because she noted the historic hand-blown glass on many of the front window panes. K. Pettit stated there were exterior storm windows installed except for on the front windows where there were interior plexiglass pieces installed.

J. Wilber asked about the configuration of the muntins on the proposed replacement windows and B. Peach noted the estimate stated the muntins would be simulated divided lite.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
May 22, 2023

C. Rogers asked if the 13 windows in the application were all the windows in the home and K. Pettit stated the application was only for the windows on the original brick portion of the home. K. McWilliams urged K. Pettit to save the windows and investigate window repair craftsmen.

O. McCall asked about the removal of the shutters included on the estimate and asked if the shutters would be reinstalled. K. Pettit stated he certainly wanted the shutters reinstalled. J. Wilber noted the shutters would not function nor be hung like the historic shutters if the proposed new windows were installed.

J. Wilber noted K. Pettit seemed interested in saving the front windows and asked if he wished to amend his application. K. Pettit stated he did wish to amend his application to keep the front five windows but replace the remaining eight side windows and install storm windows on the front five.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted Suzanne Hollinger. S. Hollinger stated there were local contractors like Roger Welch who could repair windows and that a list of registered contractors who were experienced in working on historic properties could be obtained from the Office of Planning, Preservation, and Design.

J. Wilber also noted Link Ludington. L. Ludington stated he was a former resident of the home and that he'd done some restoration work previously on the windows. He also urged K. Pettit to retain and preserve the windows and consider replacing only the glass if there were safety concerns with the lower front windows. L. Ludington observed K. Pettit's house to be one of the best preserved examples of its style in town. C. Rogers noted the fact the applicant's property was included on the 1970s Historic American Building Survey.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 18.0 Windows | 82-86 | <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – The guidelines state historic windows should be retained and preserved including all significant related elements such as frames, sashes, shutters, hardware, sills, old glass and moldings. Existing windows should be maintained. Only those elements that cannot be repaired should be replaced. The project as amended does meet the guidelines.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I does not meet the findings of fact at all. These windows are some of the best I've ever seen while serving on this board and it would be a tragedy to get rid of any of these, so no it does not satisfy the guidelines.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree it does not meet the guidelines to retain and preserve. Assuming the side windows are in the same condition as the front, then their replacement does not meet the guidelines either.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with C. Rogers with the exception that I would suggest you have whomever looks at the front windows for repair to look at the side windows as well and, if possible, repair those as well. Therefore, in totality, it does not meet the findings of fact.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I, too, live in a historic home and understand safety concerns surrounding inoperable windows, but repair of these windows would allow for their functionality and retain the character of the home. I would urge storm windows to help protect them. I would agree this does not meet the findings of fact.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I do not believe it meets the guidelines.</p> |

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
May 22, 2023

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a COA to Ken and Linda Pettit for the proposed repair of the front façade windows and replacement of the side windows with aluminum clad wood windows at 119 East St.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| J. Wilber | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| M. Pittman | Deny |
| O. McCall | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Deny |

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was denied. A Denied Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

3. Cheryl Huy – C. of A. to increase the rear door opening from 34” to 36” to allow furniture to be moved in/out; this includes rebuilding the frame to fit & includes the storm door.

Location: **502 E. Second St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Cheryl Huy was present.

C. Huy stated they didn’t seek a COA prior to doing the work because the front door had been pushed in, the first-floor window frames were rotted and held together with L-brackets and plexiglass. C. Huy stated the building used to be a store, so they installed the glass brick in a manner similar to other rehabilitated storefronts in the surrounding area. C. Huy also stated the changes were for security reasons due to the history of trouble in the area. J. Wilber asked how many apartments were in the building and C. Huy stated three. She also stated they moved the door over more to the left because a wall prevented it from opening all the way in the previous positioning. J. Wilber asked if the replacement door was smaller than the previous door and C. Huy stated it was actually a bit larger. J. Wilber also asked about the transom and C. Huy stated it was pressboard infill that was rotted, so they also filled it with glass block.

M. Pittman asked if the windows that had been replaced were wood and C. Huy stated they were. C. Huy stated they replaced the windows with 1/1 like what had been there but vinyl because they were not aware of the historic photo showing 6/6 windows but they would be willing to add muntins to create a 6/6 look. C. Rogers asked about the window air-conditioning unit that had been placed on the front. C. Huy stated the previous unit had been pushed in and pried in attempts to break in or steal the unit, so the current unit was installed to provide air-conditioning and security. J. Wilber commented about wood windows being more architecturally and historically appropriate.

C. Rogers stated the front door was more in the Craftsman style than Federal and C. Huy stated she was willing to change the glass insert to be a 3/3 glass panel. O. McCall asked about the shutters and stated the spacing between the windows and the historic photo suggests the structure would not have had shutters originally. C. Huy stated they planned on removing the shutters.

Page 5
 Historic District Board of Review
 May 22, 2023

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 9.0 Doors & Entrances | 59-61 | <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – The guidelines say original doors and entrances should be preserved but this was a replacement door that you replaced. Entrance features including decorative and functional aspects should be preserved. You’ve added glass blocks and I don’t think the original picture had glass blocks. You are trying to maintain the original opening. Replacement doors should be compatible and with C. Rogers’s suggestion, it will be. In regards to the windows, you can’t repair what isn’t there, but replacement windows should resemble historic windows. The shutters are not original and are plastic. This project meets the guidelines as best it can given the replacement materials that were in place prior to this replacement.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree with O. McCall.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree with M. Pittman.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I disagree. Vinyl windows are not appropriate. We don’t have evidence of the deterioration of the previous wood windows, so we cannot tell if replacement was warranted. The glass block and the door do not reflect the federal style, so it’s not consistent with the guidelines. The removal of the shutters does meet the guidelines, however.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I wish we could have seen proof of the deteriorated windows, but we’ll take your word for their condition. I am appreciative you did not replace all the windows. Although I wish you would’ve come to us prior to the project, I appreciate you’re here now and agree with M. Pittman.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree with M. Pittman. This structure has been drastically changed over the years and it makes it more difficult to restore. I agree the vinyl windows would probably not be approved now, but at least you’re putting in windows that resemble the replacement windows that were in place previously.</p> |
| 18.0 Windows | 82-86 | |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. M. Pittman made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Cheryl Huy for replacing the first floor windows with vinyl windows, replace the front door with a 3/3 insert to make it look more federal, removal of the shutters, and installation of glass blocks at 502 E. Second St.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| J. Wilber | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Deny |
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| O. McCall | Deny |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Approved |

Page 6
 Historic District Board of Review
 May 22, 2023

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

4. Regina Erlewein – C. of A. to replace old deck with new two-level deck.
 Location: **835 W. Second St.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Regina Erlewein was present.

R. Erlewein stated the old deck was rotten and that when she hired a contractor to rebuild the deck, she entrusted the contractor to obtain all the necessary permits and COAs. R. Erlewein also stated she based the two-level design on similar decks she'd seen on First St. and that her adjoining neighbor was supportive of the project. J. Wilber asked if the deck could be seen from the front of the home and R. Erlewein stated no. C. Rogers asked if it was going to be painted and R. Erlewein stated she would paint/stain it to blend with the home.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 27.0 New Construction - Decks | 109 | <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – The guidelines provide for decks to be only on the ground level, so because of the height, it does not meet this guideline. Decks should not cause visual damage to significant architectural features and should be installed in a way so they can be removed without damage. Overall, however, the deck will not be visible from the front of the home, so it meets the guidelines.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I disagree. I think it's too tall and does not fit into the neighborhood.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – Decks should be located on the ground level, so it does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree with S. Palmer.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – Although the deck will violate the first guideline, the rest of the guidelines are in conformance. It will not be above the roofline, so it is definitely higher than our guidelines call for, which makes me conflicted, but overall, I agree with S. Palmer.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with S. Palmer.</p> |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. M. Pittman made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Regina Erlewein for the project as submitted at 929 W. Second St.”

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| J. Wilber | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Deny |
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| O. McCall | Deny |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Deny |

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 May 22, 2023

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

5. Arliss Helton – C. of A. to remodel to modify existing roofline to change to gable roof.
 Location: **1108 W. Main St.** Zoned: **Residential Medium Density (R-8)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Arliss Helton was present.

J. Wilber asked what materials were going to be used and A. Helton explained it would be exposed fastener metal roof, which was the same as what had been installed decades before. J. Wilber asked if the front façade wall would be changed, and A. Helton explained that it would be brought out to flush to be even all the way across in order to provide support for the trusses.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 15.0 Roofs | 71-73 | <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – The guidelines state original and significant later roof forms should be preserved and you’re preserving the west end. It’s not appropriate to make alterations to the roof that are visible from the street, but it must be done. The roofing materials are compatible with what you have on the west side now. It meets the guidelines.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Arliss Helton and Madison Iron Works for the project as proposed.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Approved
 S. Palmer Approved
 M. Pittman Approved
 O. McCall Approved
 K. McWilliams Approved
 C. Rogers Approved

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

6. Steve McCue – C. of A. to build new 16’x48’ residential structure.

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
May 22, 2023

Location: **910 (912+) W. First St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Steve McCue was present.

S. McCue stated they wanted to build a shotgun style home with a garage on the first level and residence on the second level using materials commonly found around the district like Lp Smartsiding, possibly concrete stamped brick pattern, snap-lock roof, and vinyl windows. O. McCall questioned the vinyl windows but S. McCue noted the guideline regarding vinyl windows in new construction. K. McWilliams clarified the garage would face W. First St. and the porch would be on the residential second level.

C. Rogers noted the lot width to be 24' and the proposed width of the house to be 16' and asked if the home would be closer to one neighbor or another. S. McCue stated his desire was to stay about 4' on each side of the neighboring properties. J. Wilber asked if the project had been reviewed by the BZA or Plan Commission but B. Peach noted the applicant had met set-backs for his zoning and did not need such review.

O. McCall stated the HDBR had enough information to make a decision because there were no architectural drawings of the proposed home and no measurements regarding the height. J. Wilber asked how tall the structure would be and S. McCue stated the interior ceilings would be 8' and the roof would have a 7/12 pitch and that it would be no higher than the two-story neighboring structure.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 23.0 New Construction - Dwellings | 94-98 | <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – After reading the guidelines, this project is in conformance.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I do not agree. We do not have enough detail to know what we're voting on.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree.</p> |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Steve McCue for the new construction to be 16'x48' residence at 910 W. First St to have brick or stone, composite siding, vinyl windows, and a metal snap-lock roof."

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Approved
S. Palmer Approved
M. Pittman Approved
O. McCall Deny
K. McWilliams Approved

C. Rogers Approved

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

7. Jack Oliver – C. of A. to build an accessibility ramp on the west side of the home’s deck to extend to the south to the road.

Location: **411 E. First St.**

Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Jack and Wanda Oliver were present.

J. Wilber asked about the post securement in the current location and J. Oliver stated the posts at the base of the steps were cemented in but the rest were not. J. Oliver also stated they wanted to amend the application to keep the portion of the ramp that was installed over the steps but the remainder of the ramp would be moved as proposed. S. Palmer asked if the railing to be installed on the wood platform covering the steps would match the porch railing and J. Oliver stated it would.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| 33.0 Resiliency Guidelines – Elevation & Floodproofing | 129 | <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – Accessibility ramps should be installed on the side or rear elevations, you have limited options, but you’re proposing to place it on the side towards the rear. It’s a creative idea and will minimize the visual impact of what you’re doing. You’re going to put a railing on the front platform and conceal it with plants, paint, and lattice, so that also is good. Although the porch guidelines say alteration of a historic porch is not appropriate, this is a non-contributing structure and you’re using wood to cover dangerous steps. Overall, the project is in conformance.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree, and I’ll add that I don’t see what you’re doing as altering the porch anyway. In fact, you’re preserving the steps if anything and the changes can easily be removed without damaging the home.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p> |
| 14.0 Porches | 68-70 | |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Mr. and Mrs. Jack Oliver for the proposed application to build an accessibility ramp on the west side of the home’s deck to extend to the south to the road and also to include keeping the platform over the steps and installing a railing around it.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Approved

S. Palmer Approved

**Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
May 22, 2023**

- M. Pittman Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

8. Dean Miller – C. of A. to build roof addition to rear deck, siding to match existing, shingles to match existing, trim to match existing.

Location: **721 W. First St.**

Zoned: **Heavy Manufacturing (M-2)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Dean Miller was present.

C. Rogers noted the proposed accessory building would not be highly visible due to the placement and the surrounding topography. M. Pittman asked about access and D. Miller stated they would be able to access the building from a roll-up door on the front of the building or from the primary structure through double doors that will lead to the accessory building.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and recognized Charles Ricketts who voiced his support for the application.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 24.0 New Construction - Outbuildings | 101-102 | <p><i>O. McCall</i> – New accessory buildings should be compatible with dwellings in the historic district and should respect and blend with the architectural style and scale. This proposed building is a much lower scale than the original structure and it blends with the whole area. With the exception of one residence next door, and we just heard from applicant in support of the application, the neighborhood is largely industrial in character, so this is in fitting with that. Accessory buildings should be set back from the front façade and this very much is. It also should be in proportion with the primary structure’s mass, size, and height and this is much shorter and narrower, so that’s also in conformance.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p> |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Dean Miller for the proposed construction of an outbuilding to go on the east side of the main structure at 721 W. First St.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Palmer Approved

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

10. Robert Helton – C. of A. to install wood steps on rear exterior of building to second floor apartment; install new door between the windows to enter second floor apartment.
 Location: **407 W. Second St.** Zoned: **Specialty District (SD)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Robert Helton was present.

R. Helton stated the building would be an optometry office on the first floor and an apartment on the second floor, so they needed to add an exterior entrance to the apartment. C. Rogers and J. Wilber voiced agreement.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|--|------------------|---|
| 9.0 Doors & Entrances 10.0 Fire Escapes & Exterior Stairs | 59-61 | <i>S. Palmer</i> – It is architecturally compatible, in the rear, and it is compatible. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree. |

J. Wilber asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Robert Kyle Helton for the construction of wooden steps and a new door on the rear of 713 W. Main St.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Approved
- S. Palmer Approved
- M. Pittman Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Zink Approved

The motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

Old/New Business:

J. Wilber discussed the updated approval guidelines. K. McWilliams proposed to allow staff to review applications for non-historic chimney demolition.

Page 13
 Historic District Board of Review
 May 22, 2023

Staff Report:

May 2023 Fast-Track Applications

| Applicant | Address | COA |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Kathy Chandler | 719 W. Main St. | Install 40"x50" sign at right angle on front of building |
| Cynthia Rusconi | 719 E. Second St. | Replace existing metal roof w/ asphalt shingle roof |
| Cornerstone/ Link Ludington | 707 Walnut St. | Replace existing siding w/ aluminum (same as existing), wood, or composite; replace existing doors w/ new historically appropriate doors of same material |
| Jeff Brautigam | 214 E. Second St. | Paint 6'x12' sign on building |

May 2022 COA Review

| Applicant | Address | COA | Completion Status |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Joe Breeck | 321 Jefferson St. | Install an accessory building behind the primary structure | Yes |
| RJL Properties | 613 Walnut St. | Rebuild the proposed porch | Yes |
| John & Melanie Harrell | 313 W. Third St. | Infill of the standard door on the east side of the garage with historic brick; install galvanized metal siding along roofline of garage; rebuild rear porch | Yes |
| Rebecca Combs | 313 E. Fourth St. | Install 10'x12' wood accessory building w/ metal roof | Yes |
| Fiction Wraps/ Andrew Hodges | 310 W. Main St. | Install 49"x24" alumacore sign | Yes |
| Kim Kidwell Lytle | 314 W. Main St. | Temporary install of a 4'x8' wooden sign (not attached to building) | Yes |
| Cathy Taylor | 1010 W. Main St. | Install porch posts & gingerbread to restore historic | Yes |

Page 14
 Historic District Board of Review
 May 22, 2023

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---|---------------|
| | | porch appearance (photo evidence) | |
| Fillin Station Liquors | 814 E. Second St. | DENIED COA to install chain link fence w/ barb wire topper | Not Installed |

C. Rogers made a motion

to adjourn the meeting – seconded by S. Palmer.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Josh Wilber, Chairman

Brooke Peach
 Historic Preservationist