

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW**

Minutes

April 27, 2020

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, April 27, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom Conferencing. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Ken McWilliams, Mike Pittman, Susan Schmidt, Owen McCall, Betsy Lyman and Thomas Stark. Also present: Brian Martin, Building Inspector; Devon Sharpe, attorney; and Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.

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. Each applicant will be asked to sign the gold affidavit on the podium which states the required signage was up for the required amount of time. N. Schell 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.

**3/23/2020 Minutes:**

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on March 23<sup>rd</sup> and had any corrections or additions.

K. McWilliams moved to approve the minutes – seconded by S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

J. Wilber	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
T. Stark	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
K. McWilliams	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
S. Schmidt	Approved

**Minutes stand approved.**

**Extended Applications:**

1. Mark Cady – C. of A. to replace doors with fiberglass doors. Replace windows with aluminum clad windows.  
Location: **801 E Main St.** Zoned: General Business (GB)

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Donald Ball was present and represented the applicant. N. Schell noted the applicant has requested an amendment to the application to include the removal of the smaller windows on the west and east facades and the installation of HVAC grates under the windows on the west and east facades.

J. Wilber asked about the window pattern. D. Ball stated he did not know the pattern but was willing to use what pattern the board recommended. K. McWilliams asked about the HVAC units. D. Ball stated they wanted to make the building safer and they would be using in PTAC units in each room. The smaller windows will be removed because they will be located within the showers. D. Ball stated the screen size for the PTAC units will be placed under the windows and will not be larger than the width of the window.

D. Ball stated the windows will be blended within the siding. They have plenty of siding from the rear and from the location of the PTAC unit screens. K. McWilliams wasn't sure the age of the siding would allow for it to be patched. D. Ball stated the aluminum canopies will be removed to improve the look of the building. K. McWilliams recommended the window design be 4/4. D. Ball agreed.

K. McWilliams asked about the doors on the basement level. D. Ball explained that those doors would enter into a laundry room, an exercise room, and a meeting room. D. Ball stated the double doors will lead into the meeting room. The single door to the north of the double doors enters into an electrical room while the single door to the south will lead into the exercise room.

Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

T. Stark asked about changes to the south entrance. D. Ball stated there were no changes to that entrance. T. Stark asked about ADA access. D. Ball stated the ADA access would be on the north side. B. Lyman asked about how many doors would be replaced. D. Ball answered all 6 doors. T. Stark asked if a solid door could be used with a single light. D. Ball stated the electrical door and the staircase emergency exit door would be a solid door. The entry doors into the basement and the main entrance would be the wood grained fiberglass doors with a single light.

B. Lyman asked about changes to the window or door openings. D. Ball answered there were no changes to the opening sizes. D. Ball discussed the window material from the brochure. B. Martin asked about if all the windows would be the same material. D. Ball stated yes because of the visibility.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances  Windows	39-42  60-63	40-42  56-59	<p>K. McWilliams – It is kind of difficult because the commercial guidelines doesn’t address multi-family or hotel style buildings. The guidelines never talk about replacing replacement doors or windows. Under commercial guidelines on page 40-42 the doors need to be complementary to the style of the building. I don’t find the guidelines helpful. The utilities is even less helpful in this because it does not address PTAC units. The applicant is willing to use the 4/4 windows as discussed. The removal of the excess wiring and awnings will improve the building.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree. I think this will be a vast improvement and appreciate the amount of work being put into this building. I wish they could reside it but understand that it is cost prohibitive.</p> <p>T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman – Looking at the door guidelines that owners are encouraged to replace missing or severely damaged unserviceable historic doors with new doors that replicate the originals or other historic examples, I would just encourage the applicant to work with N. Schell on the selection of the doors. The oval is not as appropriate as the square light. The sizes of the doors and windows will not be altered but the suggestion by staff is to use a 4/4 window. There are 4/4 windows available within that series selected by the applicant. I agree with K. McWilliams on the HVAC but they should be as hidden as possible.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I agree for the same reasons. Instead of installing the grids on the outside there is an option for an internal grid on the windows. That would make the windows easier to maintain while maintaining the look of the grids.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. S. Schmidt made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved to 801 E Main St. with the applicant working with N. Schell on the appropriate doors and windows.”

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

**Roll Call:**





Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

<b>Building Element</b>	<b>Residential Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Porches	49, 50	--	<p>T. Stark – Per the guidelines on page 49-50, balconies which are visible from the street should not be enclosed. However, this is on the side of the house and is minimally visible from the street. I believe the materials that are being used are appropriate. I think because of the visibility of it, the project should be approved.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I feel that every house is contributing to the National Historic District because of its architecturally significant features. I feel that the porch is one of those architecturally significant features and by removing it we are taking the house one step away from contributing to the historic district. I feel that it is visible, and it should not be enclosed.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I agree with B. Lyman for the same reasons.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I think the porch the applicants want to enclose will enhance the livability of the home. It is minimally visible from the street. The porch has already been semi enclosed for several years. The proposal makes the house more functional. I would approve the request along with the handrail.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree with M. Pittman for the same reasons.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I am a big fan of functionality, but I think the porches on these types of homes is significant. I think it is one of the biggest significant features of the home. Therefore, I agree with B. Lyman.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. M. Pittman made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved as submitted by David Powell.”

Motion was seconded S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

J. Wilber            Disapproved  
O. McCall           Abstained  
T. Stark              Approved  
B. Lyman             Disapproved  
K. McWilliams     Disapproved  
M. Pittman          Approved  
S. Schmidt          Approved

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

J. Wilber stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed.

**Historic District Board of Review**

**April 27, 2020**

- 4. Sherry Eblen - C. of A. to replace wood window on rear with a metal and glass door.  
 Location: **612 E Main St.** Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Sherry Eblen were present and noted the rear door entered into the basement rather than the first floor.

T. Stark asked about if the entire bay would be replaced or just the center window. S. Eblen stated it was just the center window. J. Wilber asked about the steps in the yard. S. Eblen stated they were original to the house.

B. Lyman asked about the door material. S. Eblen stated it was a metal door. T. Stark asked if the leaded glass window was the planned design. S. Eblen answered yes.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39-42	40-42	B. Lyman – I am conflicted on this because as N. Schell pointed out in the staff report that the guidelines do not cover replacing a window with a door. However, it does say that original windows should be preserved in their original size, location, and design. I think by saying that the guidelines they are trying to encourage the idea that original windows should not be changed into doors. I understand the limited visibility of this one and since the garages are in the back the homeowner needs a way to enter the house from the backyard. I would be inclined to make an exception due to those items. On the steps it is my understanding that porches recommend wood. S. Eblen noted that the two designs were not exactly what would be installed. The idea is to allow for a larger landing with a couple of steps to meet the sidewalk. B. Lyman asked about the width. S. Eblen guessed it would be around 5-ft. S. Eblen noted the steps will include an iron railing. S. Eblen noted the iron railing will match the front railing which is located on concrete steps. B. Lyman noted she is fine with the applicant using the same material as the front steps. M. Pittman – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons. K. McWilliams – I agree for the same reasons. S. Schmidt – I agree for the same reasons. T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for the same reasons.
Windows	60-63	56-59	

J. Wilber asked for a motion. B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that a COA for 612 E Main Street to replace on the rear a wood window with a metal and glass door with concrete pad and steps similar to the one on the north of the house be approved.”

Motion was seconded S. Schmidt.

**Roll Call:**

- J. Wilber           Approved
- O. McCall           Approved



Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
ng	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	
ent: Same Exterior	X			Including non-preferred materials such as vinyl siding & windows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff review opportunity for applicant to use material/design of the architect's building.</li> </ul>
Modern Material fabric:		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
Approval of elements not otherwise present:			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>
or Replacement:	X (Same Material/design)	X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some review opportunity for applicant to use material/design of the architect's building.</li> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>
ing:	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>3 no response</li> </ul>	
:		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	What is a Pier?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>would like to see</li> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>
ne:						
cleaning, or Tuck	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity for applicant to use material/design of the architect's building.</li> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>
features		x (If stone features are "fake")	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree if not "fake". Perhaps "fake" home.</li> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Bricks/Masonry/Stone:</b>						
c) Addition of Stucco			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree only if this is replacing stone or masonry. If not, should be staff review.</li> <li>Staff approval for all</li> </ul>
<b>Siding:</b>						
a) Materials: Repair or Replacement	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or if existing material is not appropriate and proposed material meets guidelines) Hardie Board and equivalents are approved. Hardie board and Smart siding (approved material)	X (New/Different Material does not meet guidelines) Only Vinyl siding		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board approval for vinyl or any other new/different material requires Board approval.</li> </ul>
b) Cleaning and Painting	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 Agree</li> <li>4 no response</li> </ul>	
c) Removal or Introduction of Siding Material		X (Removal of Modern Material to Restore Historic Fabric or introduction of modern material meeting guidelines) Hardie board and Smart siding (approved material)	X (Removal of Historic Fabric or Introduction of Modern Material not meeting guidelines) Depending on condition or X (Removal of Historic Fabric or Introduction of non-preferred Modern Material)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff approval for all</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Awnings:</b>						
a) Replacement of Existing	X (Same Material/Design matching previous)	X (Same Material but does not match previous or new design/material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material and Design not meeting guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>2 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If existing material/design is not appropriate to the building's age and architectural style, staff should provide information and material guidance.</li> <li>Staff approval for all</li> </ul>
b) Removal of Existing (Not Replacing)		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why would we stop removal of awnings that do not meet guidelines?</li> </ul>
<b>Lighting/Security systems:</b>						
a) Installation, Alteration or Removal of Exterior Lighting Fixtures: (not including light bulbs)	Does not include security cameras or lighting	X (Same Material/Design matching previous)	X (Same Material but does not match previous or new design/material meeting guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 Agree</li> <li>4 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If same material/design matching previous is inappropriate to the buildings architectural style, staff provides images and information to the applicant to inform them of more appropriate options.</li> <li>Lighting should never come in front of the board. Staff can handle this element.</li> <li>This should be a "No Review" element</li> <li>LIGHTING IS NOT PERMANENT A MATTER OF PERSONAL TASTE. NOT REVIEWABLE LIKE SIDEWALKS AND TREES.</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Porches/Decks and Porch Elements:</b>						
a) Materials: Repair or Replacement:	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material or approved modern material, different design different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material <b>not meeting guidelines</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provides a realistic drawing showing design, materials and scale of porch that is included with the application.</li> <li>Staff approval for all</li> </ul>
b) Removal or Introduction of a Porch, Deck			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if in back staff could approve</li> <li>Where does the demo work that Jim Pruitt is doing on 2nd street fit?</li> </ul>
c) Enclosure of Existing Porch (i.e. sunroom; creation of new room)		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does <b>NOT</b> Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enclosure of a porch should require Board approval. It is a major change to the exterior appearance of a building.</li> </ul>
d) Convert open deck into covered porch with roof, etc.			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>possible staff approval</li> </ul>
e) Screening-in of existing porch		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provides drawing and material list of screens.</li> </ul>
f) Introduction of Access or Safety Features Using Materials and Design Appropriate to Principal Structure		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please give more information or examples of what this would be.</li> </ul>
g) Repair or Replacement of porch columns and/or railings	X (Same Material/ design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material <b>not meeting guidelines</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance needed to provide applicants with appropriate design of porch posts for style of house.</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Roof and Roof Elements:</b>						
a) Materials: Repair or Replacement	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or if existing material is not appropriate and material meets guidelines)	X (New/Different Material <b>not meeting guidelines</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better definitions of materials that meet guidelines, especially metal roofs.</li> <li>Staff should be able to review in case of leaks or storm damage.</li> </ul>
b) Shape or Form: Alteration, Modification or New			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are half round gutters available that are close in cost to k-style gutters. Half rounds are more appropriate to 1800s buildings. Applicants may choose the more appropriate style gutters if given that information during the application process.</li> <li>Does not need board action</li> </ul>
c) Repair or Replacement of Gutters/Downspouts	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
d) Repair or Replacement of Cresting/Finials, Dormers, Chimneys, and Cornices/Eaves	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design)	X (New/Different Material; Alteration/Removal/Introduction of Element)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
<b>Existing Secondary/Outbuildings/Accessory Structures:</b>						
a) Repair or Replacement of Materials or Elements	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design <b>or different material meeting guidelines</b> )	X (Change in Material <b>not meeting guidelines</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a definition of materials that meet guidelines.</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Doors (Commercial/Residential):</b>						
a) Installation of Storm/Screen Doors:		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does <b>NOT</b> Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
c) Repair or Replacement of existing Doors	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design) X (Same Material, different design) X (New/Different Material) if use approved doors and do not alter size, etc.	X (Change in Material <b>not meeting guidelines</b> )		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> <li>4 Agree</li> <li>3 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a definition of materials that meet guidelines.</li> </ul>
e) Installation of New or Removal of Door Openings			X			
<b>Storefront Elements:</b>						
a) Repair or Replacement of storefront elements	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material or approved, Different Design)	X (New/Different Material; Alteration/Modification/Removal/Introduction of Element)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a definition of materials that meet guidelines.</li> </ul>
<b>Windows and Window Elements:</b>						
a) Installation of Exterior Screens/Storm Windows		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does <b>NOT</b> Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provides brand and style of storm window as part of application.</li> <li>Does not need board action</li> </ul>
b) Installation of Interior Screens/Storm Windows	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>2 no response</li> </ul>	

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Windows and Window Elements:</b>						
c) Repair or Replacement of existing Windows	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, or approved different design or different material meeting guidelines) Clad windows auto approved If use approved windows and do not alter size, etc.	X (New/Different Material not meeting guidelines) Vinyl windows only X (Non preferred Material)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building Inspector provides review of existing windows condition.</li> </ul>
d) Installation of New or Removal of Window Openings			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building Inspector provides review of existing windows condition.</li> <li>Staff approval if replacing original</li> </ul>
e) Shutters: Introduction of Shutters Where They Did Not Previously Exist		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If material and installation meet guidelines.</li> </ul>
f) Shutters: Replacement of Existing Shutters	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (New Material/Design)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If material and installation meet guidelines.</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
<b>Landscape Features:</b>						
b) Repair or Replacement of Pools, Fountains, Gazebos, Pergolas	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With staff review applicants are provided information and images of fences appropriate to the structures architectural style.</li> </ul>
c) Fences and Walls		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
d) Trees and Other Landscaping	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 Agree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	
<b>Signs:</b>		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 Agree</li> <li>5 no response</li> </ul>	
<b>Additions or Expansion of Building Footprint:</b>			X (Design Only)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not understand "design only"</li> </ul>
<b>New Construction:</b>						
a) Principal Building, Porch, Deck, and Other Elements			X (Design Only)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not understand "design only"</li> </ul>
b) Secondary/Outbuildings/Accessory Structures			X (Design Only)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not understand "design only"</li> </ul>
c) Modular or Manufactured Home			X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff approval</li> </ul>

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/Approval	HDBR Review/Approval	Questions/Comments from board member on category	Agree or Disagree	Comments
Relocation or Demolition of Buildings and Outbuildings:		X Staff Review/approve is bldg. constructed after 1932--therefore not covered by Historic Ordinance	X Bldg. constructed prior to 1932 (Design Only)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Agree</li> <li>1 Disagree</li> <li>1 no response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board action required</li> <li>Unless declared unsafe by building inspector then staff only</li> </ul>
<b>Terms that need defined</b>						
Not Appropriate						
Meets guidelines						
Does not meet guidelines						
Restore historic material						
Alteration						
Modification						
Same Material						
Different Material						

Page 17

## Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

**Business – Staff Report:**

## Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Ron Bateman	204 Plum St	3/24/2020	wood and iron fence
Sarah Grey	312 W Third St	4/3/2020	Wood fence
David Rettig	305 E Fourth St	3/25/2020	Allied Aluminum storm windows
Angela Lobb	213 Jefferson St	3/25/2020	ProVia storm windows
Stew and Kim Hizey	417 E Third St	4/23/2020	Wood fence

## Historic District Board of Review: COA Approved by Staff

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Building Element
John Schuring	309 Madison St	4/13/2020	Door
Chris and Ruthie McGarry	712 W Second St	4/13/2020	Siding
Judy Sanders	1122 W Main St	4/22/2020	Door

## Historic District Board of Review: 2019 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Dorsey, Mike & Laurie	613 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace existing wood sliding garage door with steel overhead door to look like a carriage style door.</li> </ul>	Yes
Feltner, Veronika	322 W Third St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace shingle roof with metal roof.</li> </ul>	Yes
Malloy, Kevin & Linda	816 W Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build an 18-ft x 22-ft garage.</li> </ul>	Yes
Rogers, John & Carol Ann	934 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Place a 24-ft x 12-ft storage shed.</li> </ul>	Yes
Jacobs, William	126 West St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>replace handrail on deck and porch.</li> <li>Replace porch columns.</li> </ul>	Yes
Lockridge, Debra	209 Walnut St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace slate roof with faux slate shingles.</li> </ul>	Yes
Marshall, Brian	715 E. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace windows on East side with true divided light aluminum clad window.</li> <li>Replace wood siding with cement board siding on East side.</li> </ul>	Yes
Vonderheide, Jane	207 E. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace second story windows with true divided light 2/2 wood windows.</li> </ul>	In progress

Page 18

## Historic District Board of Review

April 27, 2020

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
DeLuca, John	210 W Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace roof on accessory structure from metal to shingles.</li> </ul>	Yes
Folkner, Larry	322 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>replace 3 upper windows with 1/1 wood windows (1 on East side and 2 on South side).</li> <li>Replace storefront window with a large pane glass window.</li> <li>Remove crown molding from the door.</li> </ul>	Yes
CottageGreen LLC	613 Mulberry St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>install solar panels on shingle roof or standing seam metal roof.</li> <li>Install aluminum clad wood windows or wood windows.</li> </ul>	In progress
CottageGreen LLC	109 E Fifth St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>install solar panels on shingle roof.</li> </ul>	Yes

No further business to be brought before the board.

S. Schmidt made the motion to adjourn - seconded by M. Pittman.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40p.m.

**BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

---

Josh Wilber, Chair

---

Nicole M Schell  
City Planner – Preservation Coordinator