

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

August 26, 2024

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, August 26, 2024 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Mike Pittman presided over the meeting with the following members present: Happy Smith, Carol Ann Rogers, Ken McWilliams, William Jewell, Jed Skillman, and Sandy Palmer. Also present was Nicole M Schell – Director of Planning and Brenna Haley – Historic Preservationist.

M. Pittman 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. Haley will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. M. Pittman added that at the end of each application, the board will vote.

7/22/2024 Minutes:

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on July 22, 2024, and had any corrections or additions.

S. Palmer moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by H. Smith.

Roll Call:

S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved
H. Smith	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
K. McWilliams	Abstain
W. Jewell	Abstain
J. Skillman	Abstain

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. Lea Ann Williams – C. of A. replace rotting wood windows on back porch with white vinyl windows.
Location: 227 W First St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Lea Ann Williams was present.

M. Pittman thanked L. Williams for getting estimates for the window repair. She stated she got eight names, called five of them, and got three estimates back. M. Pittman asked for any questions or comments from the board.

K. McWilliams asked which direction L. Williams would like to go. She said that she thought the reasons to go with wood were presented nicely, but all of the estimates are out of her price range. The vinyl windows she had proposed were double-glazed, which she was interested in for energy efficiency. She also planned to include the grids to match the rest of the house.

Page 2
 Historic District Board of Review
 August 26, 2024

S. Palmer asked about the window grids matching the current wooden windows. L. Williams confirmed that the new windows should match the grids exactly. She stated that the new windows would open, where the current windows do not.

H. Smith asked for clarification that the windows replacing the existing windows will really be like-for-like in size. L. Williams confirmed. H. Smith stated that she didn't feel that the vinyl really matches the wood, and that she believes the difference between the two is noticeable. She then asked for the difference in price between the wood replacement/repair and the vinyl replacements. L. Williams said that the vinyl came in around \$5800, where the lowest priced wood option was about \$10,000. The highest wood price was \$16,000.

K. McWilliams asked who manufactured the vinyl windows. L. Williams said that the windows come from Glass Unlimited, but she was unsure who the manufacturer was. N. Schell found that the windows are Ecolite by Provia.

H. Smith offered the possibility of waiting to replace the windows until the PACE applications open back up for next year to ensure proper wood replacement/repair. L. Williams stated that she would prefer to just get the windows done as soon as possible, because her sister will be moving into the house and the current windows are drafty.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Lee Roszczyński of 605 W. Second St., said that her house has the same type of wooden windows as L. Williams' house, and she confirmed the expense of replacing those wood windows. She cited the weather and climate of Madison as a challenge for retaining wooden windows and that many historic houses in the country are shifting to vinyl to address those issues.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
18.0 WINDOWS	p. 82-86	<p><i>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines</i> – 18.0 WINDOWS p. 82-86</p> <p>18.1 Retain and preserve historic windows including all significant related elements such as frames, sashes, shutters, hardware, old glass, sills, trim and moldings.</p> <p>18.2 Maintain existing historic windows where possible. Follow guidelines for wood or metal maintenance, as relevant.</p> <p>18.3 Repair existing historic windows where possible, rather than replacing entire window units. Use techniques such as wood epoxies and wood patches to repair and strengthen deteriorated wood elements. Replace only those elements that cannot be repaired. Reproduction glass is desirable but not required.</p> <p>18.4 Replace in kind, using replacement windows that match the existing historic elements as closely as possible. If replacement is necessary, consider first replacing only the deteriorated element, such as a single sash, rather than the entire frame. Any new replacement windows shall match the original in all dimensions, materials, and detailing as closely as possible. Wood windows or alternative materials such as composite or aluminum-clad with a baked enamel finish may be approvable. Some modern windows do not accurately resemble historic windows and may not be approvable by the HDBR. Replacing sash windows with sliding or fixed-light windows may not be approvable by the HDBR.</p> <p>18.5 Use storm windows to improve energy efficiency where needed. New storm units should have a finish compatible with the color of the house. Storm windows for double-hung sash should have horizontal dividers that are in alignment with the horizontal meeting rails of the original upper and lower sashes. Interior storm windows of full-view design or which have matching sash meeting rails may be appropriate.</p>

	<p>18.6 Tinted glass is not appropriate in the historic district in any area visible from public view. Energy-saving or "low-E" glass may be used only if it is not tinted.</p> <p>18.7 New windows must match the originals in overall size and opening area and should have three dimensional muntins with either true divided lights (TDL) or simulated divided lights (SDL) which have three dimensional grilles on both the interior and exterior sides and a shadow bar between the panes. Snap-in grilles or grilles between glass are not appropriate for windows.</p> <p>18.8 New window openings shall not alter the historic character of the building or cause damage to historic materials or other significant architectural features. New window openings shall not be added to the primary façade or elevations readily visible from the public right-of-way. New window openings may be added at rear or side elevations not readily visible.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – This meets the guidelines. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – This does not meet the guidelines. The guidelines are very clear that we're not supposed to have vinyl windows. We are supposed to retain and preserve historic windows. This doesn't mean that this owner hasn't done due diligence, but if we are just reading what's on the page, we are to repair our historic windows. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree with Happy. I don't feel these meet strict guidelines, but the rest of the house already has vinyl. <i>S. Palmer</i> – It does not meet the guidelines, but this is probably going to be an exception. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with Carol Ann.</p>
--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion: "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a certificate of appropriateness to Lea Ann Williams at 227 West First St. to replace her windows with vinyl windows." The motion was seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Denied
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- W. Jewell Approved
- S. Palmer Denied

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

- 2. Billy Cline – C. of A. to add 9' addition to north of existing structure and convert 12' of main level to living space.
 Location: 121 Central Ave. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Billy Cline was present.

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
August 26, 2024

B. Cline explained that he built the original garage structure in about 2005. It has a block foundation and wood stick construction. He plans to remove the roof and add an eight-foot addition, rather than the originally proposed nine-foot addition. The second story would be an apartment and the bottom story would be open space. The drawings he provided were made in paint, and thus not to scale. The structure would have two garage doors, one to fit a car and one to fit a golf cart. There would also be a man door, which is currently present on the structure.

S. Palmer asked if the image was of the alley side, and B. Cline confirmed that it was, and that the structure will face the new park.

H. Smith asked how tall the building would be once completed. B. Cline stated that the first floor would be nine feet tall, and the second floor would eight feet tall. He did not have the exact height of the roof, but guess it would be near eight feet tall to be able to accommodate a dormer. H. Smith asked if the new garage addition would be visible from Central Avenue, and B. Cline confirmed that it would be visible above his home's roofline.

W. Jewell said he was having a hard time visualizing the proposed structure based on the provided drawings. B. Cline said the drawing was not to scale and that it was done in paint, so it is just a mock up. W. Jewell asked if the lot was zoned as multi-family. N. Schell confirmed that the lot was recently split into two parcels in anticipation of the addition of the dwelling unit on the garage.

J. Skillman asked if B. Cline lived in the house on Central Ave. B. Cline confirmed that he lives there part time. H. Smith brought up the issue of proportionality in the guidelines and how this addition might be overpowering to the houses around it. B. Cline explained that the lot itself is actually quite long, which might help in terms of the overall look as far as proportionality goes. He then asked if the proportionality clause was even relevant considering the garage would become another dwelling. Both K. McWilliams and S. Palmer confirmed that it is still relevant, as the clause is for the entire neighborhood, not just the individual lots.

H. Smith asked if B. Cline intended to sell the new dwelling as a separate house or if he intended to keep it as a garage apartment. B. Cline confirmed that he intends to keep it for his personal use. W. Jewell asked if B. Cline could have to go to a zero-lot line variance since the proposed application showed a nine-foot addition to the garage. B. Cline denied the variance, instead explaining that it will be a four-foot easement for a retaining wall and a three-foot sidewalk. W. Jewell said he was still having trouble visualizing the structure.

M. Pittman asked the board if a picture of the proposed structure would help, which the board confirmed. B. Cline clarified that the structure will be 36 feet long by 24 feet wide. The current structure is 28 feet by 24 feet.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Ryan Rodgers of 804 E First St. explained that he owns the two brick structures in front of this garage, and he felt from the renderings that the proposed structure will not fit. He asked if Zoning had approved the proposal with setbacks. N. Schell stated that zoning has not reviewed the application, because B. Cline intends to meet the required setbacks of three feet. R. Rodgers expressed concern about that, but B. Cline cited his property survey. R. Rodgers mentioned feeling rattled by the size of the structure and that the property had been surveyed, which in turn defined his property lines without his knowledge. B. Cline offered to look at the property together with R. Rodgers to get everyone on the same page, saying he did not want to be a hindrance to any of his neighbors.

M. Pittman said that the board was still struggling to visualize the structure. B. Cline asked for suggestions to make the plans easier to understand. B. Cline offered to show the board his scaled floor plans for the proposed structure.

K. McWilliams said his overriding concern is that the neighbors are not happy with the idea of the change to the garage. R. Rodgers explained that he has known about the project for a while and is completely supportive of it. He was only concerned about if it would fit.

Page 5
 Historic District Board of Review
 August 26, 2024

J. Skillman read the findings of fact for 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION – ADDITIONS. Before a motion was made for approval, B. Cline asked to make one more comment. He explained that the property is in the floodplain, meaning it would not be possible only have a one-story addition.

The board expressed their concern with the project as it was presented. M. Pittman asked if B. Cline would like to have the project tabled until the next meeting to come back with better imagery. B. Cline agreed to table the application.

M. Pittman asked for a motion. C. Rogers made a motion to table the application.

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- W. Jewell Approved
- S. Palmer Approved

The motion to table the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

- 3. Edward and Lee Roszczyński – C. of A. to replace existing structure with wooden structure that is more appealing.
 Location: 605 W. Second St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Edward and Lee Roszczyński were present.

L. Roszczyński explained that they had had their daughter move in with them which led to an increase in the amount of stuff stored in their garage. She also noted her husband’s proclivity for sports cars and explained that was the reason they needed a new accessory structure in their backyard. It would be a fully wooden structure going where the current tarp structure stands. They also wanted to paint the new wooden structure to match the house.

She also explained that the new structure will be 11 feet tall, 12 feet wide, and 24 feet deep. It will sit in the backyard behind the fence. Only the roof will be visible from First Street.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
24.0 New Construction - Outbuildings	p. 101-102	Madison Historic District Design Guidelines – 24.0 New Construction - Outbuildings p. 101-102 24. 1 The design of new garages and other accessory buildings should be compatible with dwellings in the historic district. New outbuildings should respect and blend with the architectural style and scale of the associated dwelling. 24.2 Site new garages and accessory buildings appropriately on the lot. Locate detached new garages and outbuildings to the rear of a dwelling or set back from the side elevations. Attached garages and

	<p>accessory buildings should be set back from the front façade of the primary dwelling at least one-third of the total depth of the dwelling. 24.3 If reconstruction of a missing garage or outbuilding is desired, it should be based on accurate evidence of the original configuration, form, massing, style, placement, and detail from photographic evidence or other documentation of the original building. 24.4 The outbuilding should maintain a proportional mass, size, and height to ensure it is not taller or wider than the principal building on the lot.</p> <p>24.5 Materials used for new garages and outbuildings should reflect the historical development of the property. Materials used at exterior façades of garages and outbuildings were often different (and less costly) than that of the main dwelling. Materials that are appropriate for new secondary buildings include wood or brick. If frame buildings are constructed, alternative materials may be considered if they resemble traditional wood siding in texture, dimension, and overall appearance. Materials such as T1-11 siding, plywood and oriented strand board (OSB) are not sufficiently durable for exterior use and are not appropriate.</p> <p>24.6 Generally, the eaves and roof ridge of any new outbuilding should not be higher than those of the existing primary building.</p> <p>24.7 Windows which are readily visible from the public right-of-way should be appropriate to the style of the house. Visible pedestrian doors should either be appropriate for the style of house to which the outbuilding relates or be flat with no panels.</p> <p>24.8 Metal garage doors with a paneled design may be appropriate. These doors can be used on garages that are located at the back of the lot and are minimally visible from the street or public right-of-way. If the garage and garage doors are highly visible from a public street or located on a corner lot, solid wood or wood garage doors with a paneled design are more appropriate.</p> <p>24.9 At double garages, two single garage doors rather than one larger, double door should be installed. This will maintain the scale and rhythm of older structures, making a two-car garage seem smaller and more compatible with the primary dwelling.</p> <p>24.10 New carports should be located at the rear of dwellings and not visible. Most carport designs have flat roofs and metal support columns and are not compatible with historic dwelling designs.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – This project is in compliance with the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p>
--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a certificate of appropriateness for Lee and Edward Roszczyński at 605 W. Second St. for the proposed construction of a new outbuilding in the rear of the dwelling.”

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 August 26, 2024

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- W. Jewell Approved
- S. Palmer Approved

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

- 4. Ryan Rodgers – C. of A. to construct 20'x20' addition on masonry foundation and replace siding with LP Smart Siding and roof with asphalt shingles.

Location: 917 W. First St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Ryan Rodgers was present.

R. Rodgers explained that Samuel Sloffer purchased the house and wants to add a 20 foot addition. He also wants to remove the vinyl siding and expose the stone underneath, as well as add LP Smart Siding. The addition will continue that new siding and include masonry piers. The project will need to comply with the floodplain regulations and requirements.

H. Smith asked if there would be a carport underneath the addition. R. Rodgers confirms that a car can be parked there, but does not believe that is the intended use. H. Smith asked if he would consider using a taller, more vertical kind of window on the side to better match the neighboring shotgun style houses, but R. Rodgers said the windows wouldn't be visible due to the neighboring house.

J. Skillman asked if the large tree in the backyard would be affected by the addition, but R. Rodgers confirmed that it wouldn't be.

S. Palmer asked to go back to the information about the potential carport. R. Rodgers explained that it would be elevated quite a bit and therefore would have to be ramped to be accessible, but didn't believe the plans would involve a carport due to the elevation.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-ADDITIONS	p. 106-107	<p><i>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines</i> – 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-ADDITIONS p. 106-107</p> <p>26.1 Where possible, locate new additions at the rear so that they have a minimal impact on the façade and other primary elevation of the affected building or adjacent properties.</p> <p>26.2 The overall proportions of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in height, scale, size, and massing so as not to overpower it visually. A new addition should</p>

	<p>never be taller or wider than the original structure unless required by code or a non-aesthetic functional requirement. Observe the principle of “additive massing” where the original structure remains dominant and the additions are adjoining and smaller masses.</p> <p>26.3 The design elements of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, roof forms, massing proportion and spacing of doors and windows, details, surface texture, and location. Contemporary adaptations of the original which clearly look like an addition and reflect the period of construction are encouraged.</p> <p>26.4 Additions should be constructed so that they can be removed from the original building in the future without irreversible damage to significant features. Additions should be set in at least one foot (1’) to show a break between the original structure and the new addition.</p> <p>26.5 Vinyl, aluminum, or pressed wood are not appropriate on additions to historic buildings. Other substitute siding or trim may be allowed. SEE SIDING GUIDELINES.</p> <p>26.6 Wood windows are most appropriate for new additions within the historic district; however, substitute window materials may also be acceptable for new additions. SEE WINDOWS GUIDELINES.</p> <p>26.7 Rooflines of new additions should be similar in form, pitch, and eave height to the roofline of the original building.</p> <p>26.8 Foundations should be similar to or compatible with the existing foundations in material, color, detailing, and height. SEE FOUNDATIONS GUIDELINES.</p> <p>26.9 Consider in your plan older additions or other alterations to existing buildings that have acquired significance over time when planning and building a new addition.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I think this is in compliance. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p>
--	--

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a certificate of appropriateness for Ryan Rodgers at 917 W. Second St.”

Seconded by W. Jewell.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved
- J. Skillman Approved

Page 9
 Historic District Board of Review
 August 26, 2024

S. Palmer Approved

W. Jewell Approved

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

- 5. Sharla Vonch – C. of A. to replace 12 windows.
 Location: 200 Ferry St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Bob Vonch was present.

B. Vonch explained that they were seeking approval to change the windows from wooden with aluminum storms to aluminum clad windows. W. Jewell asked if B. Vonch knew the manufacturer of the windows. B. Vonch stated that they are Quaker windows.

H. Smith clarified that the application was to remove the windows and storms and replace them with a single unit. B. Vonch confirmed. H. Smith stated that the house is not contributing to the historic district, nor is it old enough to, so there is less of a worry with changing the windows.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
18.0 Windows	p. 82-86	18.1 Retain and preserve historic windows including all significant related elements such as frames, sashes, shutters, hardware, old glass, sills, trim and moldings. 18.2 Maintain existing historic windows where possible. Follow guidelines for wood or metal maintenance, as relevant. 18.3 Repair existing historic windows where possible, rather than replacing entire window units. Use techniques such as wood epoxies and wood patches to repair and strengthen deteriorated wood elements. Replace only those elements that cannot be repaired. Reproduction glass is desirable but not required. 18.4 Replace in kind, using replacement windows that match the existing historic elements as closely as possible. If replacement is necessary, consider first replacing only the deteriorated element, such as a single sash, rather than the entire frame. Any new replacement windows shall match the original in all dimensions, materials, and detailing as closely as possible. Wood windows or alternative materials such as composite or aluminum-clad with a baked enamel finish may be approvable. Some modern windows do not accurately resemble historic windows and may not be approvable by the HDBR. Replacing sash windows with sliding or fixed-light windows may not be approvable by the HDBR. 18.5 Use storm windows to improve energy efficiency where needed. New storm units should have a finish compatible with the color of the house. Storm windows for double-hung sash should have horizontal dividers that are in alignment with the horizontal meeting rails of the original upper and lower

		<p>sashes. Interior storm windows of full-view design or which have matching sash meeting rails may be appropriate.</p> <p>18.6 Tinted glass is not appropriate in the historic district in any area visible from public view. Energy-saving or “low-E” glass may be used only if it is not tinted.</p> <p>18.7 New windows must match the originals in overall size and opening area and should have three dimensional muntins with either true divided lights (TDL) or simulated divided lights (SDL) which have three dimensional grilles on both the interior and exterior sides and a shadow bar between the panes. Snap-in grilles or grilles between glass are not appropriate for windows.</p> <p>18.8 New window openings shall not alter the historic character of the building or cause damage to historic materials or other significant architectural features. New window openings shall not be added to the primary façade or elevations readily visible from the public right-of-way. New window openings may be added at rear or side elevations not readily visible.</p> <p><i>W. Jewell</i> – I feel that this meets the guidelines. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p>
--	--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a certificate of appropriateness for Sharla Vonch at 200 Ferry St. to replace all her windows with clad windows.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- S. Palmer Approved
- W. Jewell Approved

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

- 6. Tricia Hackney Bird – C. of A. to replace chain link fence with vinyl privacy fence.
 Location: 708 W. Third St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tricia Hackney Bird was present.

T. Bird explained that she wants to replace the current chain link fence with a vinyl privacy fence. H. Smith asked how tall she wanted to make the fence. T. Bird stated she wishes to make it six feet tall. W. Jewell asked if there would be a gate in the front on Third Street. T. Bird confirmed there would not, as there will be a gate beside the back of the house into the backyard and another beside the garage for access.

M. Pittman asked what kind of guarantee she has on the fence. She stated that she does not know, but the fence comes from Lowe's.

H. Smith explained that she looked around the surrounding neighborhood and saw lot of lower wooden fences, all around four feet tall. She then asked if T. Bird had considered the cost of a wooden fence instead. T. Bird said she hadn't because she wants the fence to last longer than a wood fence would. She said the wood fence would last 8-10 years, whereas a vinyl fence would last 20-25 years.

J. Skillman asked why T. Bird wanted a privacy fence to begin with, as most fences in the area are just picket fences. T. Bird said she wanted it to block the view of the neighbors' backyard, which she claims is not well maintained. C. Rogers said that the main issue with the application is that the fence is strictly vinyl.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
20.0 Fences and Walls	p. 88-90	20.1 Retain and preserve historic cast iron fences and walls. These features contribute to the overall historic appearance of the property. 20.2 Maintain historic cast iron fences and walls. Keep these site features in good repair. 20.3 Repair historic cast iron fence and wall material following the standards for the relevant material, such as wrought iron, wood or masonry. 20.4 Replace in kind. If replacement is necessary, use new materials that match the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern and texture. 20.5 Design new fences that are compatible with the associated building, site and streetscape in height, proportion, scale, texture, material, and design. Appropriate fence materials along front or readily visible side property lines include wood pickets or metal designs. Fence types such as wire, chain-link, and vinyl are not appropriate. 20.6 Fences shall not exceed a height of three (3) feet in front yards and other areas of primary visual concern. Fences at rear yards and other areas not readily seen from the public view may be up to six (6) feet in height. The transition between low front fences and higher rear fences should be made as far to the rear of the enclosed structure or yard as possible, and no more than half the depth of the yard forward of the principal structure. 20.7 Historic retaining walls should be preserved. New retaining walls are appropriate where a distinct change in grade exists. Such walls should be constructed of brick, stone, or concrete block covered with stucco. 20.8 The use of false historical details or other non-original architectural embellishments on existing fences is not appropriate.

	<p>20.9 Contemporary or utilitarian fence materials are not appropriate for fences in the public view. Inappropriate materials include: plastic, vinyl, chain-link, and wire. The use of these materials may be appropriate for rear yards and side yards not visible from the public view. If chain-link fencing is introduced it is recommended to be vinyl coated (dark green or black) to be as unobtrusive as possible. Use plantings such as ivy or other vines to screen metal fences.</p> <p><i>H. Smith</i> – This does not comply because it is very specific that vinyl is not appropriate according to the guidelines. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree with Happy. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I don't agree with the findings of fact. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree it does not meet the guidelines. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree it does not meet the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree with Mike.</p>
--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a certificate of appropriateness to Tricia Bird for the replacement of the chain link fence for vinyl fencing at 708 W. Third St."

Seconded by H. Smith.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Denied
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- C. Rogers Denied
- J. Skillman Approved
- S. Palmer Approved
- W. Jewell Approved

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved.

- 7. Matthew Chandler – C. of A. to construct stairwell vestibule addition to previously approved rooftop terrace to house a bar for guests.
 Location: 221 E. Second St Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

The applicant was not present at meeting, nor was a representative, so the application was tabled until the next meeting.

New/Old Business:

Link Luddington came forward with questions regarding the unclear nature of what can be approved and what cannot. M. Pittman suggested an appointment with himself, Nicole, and Brenna to go over the guidelines and provide clarity.

R. Rodgers came back to the podium and explained that he talked to B. Cline after the application was tabled and agreed to work with him on the application to help get it approved.

Page 13
 Historic District Board of Review
 August 26, 2024

Staff Report:

August 2024 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Alexis Hartman	203 W. Main St.	sign
Charles Ricketts	707 W. First St.	fence
Angela Stader	109 E. Main St.	sign
Glen Spencer	313 East St.	siding
Larry Ikerd	120 E. Second St.	sign
Heidi Geiges	71 E. First St.	fence
Mark Prickett	126 West St.	fence
Maryanne Imes	420 Broadway St.	railing on second story porch

August 2023 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
Jackson, Joseph	701 E. Main St.	porch railings & columns	No
Paul and Teresa Walters	618 E. Second St.	sign	Yes
Stambaugh, Tina	116 Jefferson St.	roof	Yes
Farris, Lisa	803 W Second St	windows	Yes
Brian Deeley	411 E. Third St.	fence	Yes

S. Palmer made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by J. Skillman.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW


 Mike Pittman, Chairman


 Brenna Haley, Historic Preservationist