HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes **September 27, 2010**

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, September 27, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in City Hall. Dirk Cheatham, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Mindy McGee, Linda Wenning, and Ginger Jorgensen. Also present were: Darrell Auxier, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary. Absent board members: Robert Saueressig and Paul Davis. Also absent was Mike Hoffman, Building Inspector

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting. L. Wenning made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by G. Jorgensen - all ayes. ***Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.***

Note: August 23, 2010 HDBR meeting minutes, page 357, application #4 J.D. Jones – paragraph 3 - G. Jorgensen advised L. Waller prior to tonight's meeting - she had seen the structure at 521 Mulberry Street.

1. **Steve Rizzo – *C. of A.*** to replace or repair window on southwest corner; and replace or repair front door.
   Location: **512 Cragmont St.** Zoned: Local Business (LB)

Mr. Rizzo commented that the window that is mentioned in his application is pretty much in disrepair – have it held in as best as he can so it doesn't fall out into the street. Mr. Rizzo explained what he wants to do, basically still exploring his options on it, but it needs to be done soon but wanted to make sure he ran it before this board before hand. Mr. Rizzo said he is looking into just possible replacement or repair of the current window in its same style – the other thing he is looking into is possibly replacing it based on how cost prohibitive the other is with a glass block which after he looked it up it is stylistically correct for the building that he has although it is not an identical replacement to what is currently there. But, again, Mr. Rizzo said pricing – still pricing things out, getting some quotes but it looks at though the glass block option might be a much more cost effective way for him to replace and repair that end of the building.

As far as the front door goes, Mr. Rizzo said again this is the same kind of thing – starting to get some quotes on repair of the existing wood door and is kind of afraid in its current condition he is looking at a complete rebuild of it which, again, cost wise might be a little bit prohibitive for him at this time – so he would like to be able to replace it with an identical looking door but maybe of a new construction method, something he can install that would possibly be a little bit more secure than his current door – better insulated – basically better protection for the business that is inside more than anything. D. Cheatham asked Mr. Rizzo if those are the original doors on the building or did Mr. Rizzo know. Mr. Rizzo answered that to his knowledge, but he couldn't tell D. Cheatham for sure – believes they are from looking at older photographs of the building, they seem at least very similar if not the original. D. Cheatham told Mr. Rizzo that he went by there and looked at the top which is the major problem, but is the rest of it? Mr. Rizzo replied that actually the bottom sill is basically rotted away – have some angle brackets at the top that are keeping it from being in the shrubs out front at the moment but if we get a good solid wind he is kind of paranoid that he will lose some pieces. Mr. Rizzo said it (repair) needs to be done rapidly – hoping whichever way he can have it finished by the end of October before winter gets … because he doesn't know if it is going to make it another season.

Board member, G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Rizzo if he has someone he is going to speak to about repairing. Mr. Rizzo said he has talked with Jack Patchin – actually had him come in one time to give a quote on repair, but after taking a better look will have Mr. Patchin

come back and give a second quote of actual just replacement or building of a new window because he is not an expert and would like to get Mr. Patchin's opinion on it, but the state of some of the wood in the window, is not sure how it can be saved without just being completely replaced – so, he (Mr. Patchin) is the primary person … G. Jorgensen then asked Mr. Rizzo if he (Mr. Patchin) had given a diagnosis. Yes, per Mr. Rizzo – the original estimate, if it is a repairable situation, is a little over $1,800.00 for the window – pricing out the glass block and material wise is a little less than half of that – so, depending on the labor involved it might be a $600.00-$700.00 savings over the two to go that route. Mr. Rizzo said, again, he would like to preserve the original look of it if possible, but there are limitations as to what he can afford to do with it – and, the glass block is not out of the realm of the stylistic period of the building – glass block was predominately used for windows especially on the curved ends. Mr. Rizzo noted he does not want to do anything outside of the bounds of what would be acceptable for the building – just doesn't know that he will be able to adequately replace what's currently there. G. Jorgensen told Mr. Rizzo that of course always according to the Guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards – historic windows should be retained and maintained if at all possible – like Mr. Rizzo said, the glass block would be an appropriate replacement if it comes to that. D. Cheatham asked Mr. Rizzo if the same size of glass block is still made – the same as what is in there. Mr. Rizzo answered that actually they make a size that is proportionally about the same as the ceramic brick that the building itself is made out of on that corner – didn't want the glass block to really stand out in any abnormal way – a 6-in. x 6-in. glass block would give him almost identical grout lines to what the actual mortar lines in the building itself are so it would kind of look naturally like it was just part of the building – wanted to make sure that it's not … don't want it to stand out and go … would like for it to look, if he does change it out from the glass that is in there, wants it to look as much like its always been there as he can possibly get it. G. Jorgensen stated it is a unique building.

G. Jorgensen asked the applicant what about the rest of the windows, is he going to just keep and maintain? Mr. Rizzo explained that the rest of the windows that are downstairs he will basically scrape, paint, do some caulking, and replace some wood pieces where need be – but, they are not in terrible state, not as bad a state of repair as that corner - that corner of the building sort of gets the brunt of everything that comes into town so the back side of the building, the sides … gets hammered every time a weather front comes in.

M. McGee asked Mr. Rizzo if he has had a quote on a replacement front door. Mr. Rizzo said what he got a quote on was actually something that would be a similar number of panels of glass on the door – actually what he got the quote on would be a metal exterior door – again, because of the business in there he would like something a little more substantial than what's on there, but the plan would be to paint it the same color as the original door so basically from the street he didn't think would even know it was a _____ door of the building. However, Mr. Rizzo said he has not given up on the idea of being able to plane, clean up, or try to fix the original door it's just that he knows the meetings here are only held so often and this is something he needs to act on – bring before this board – see what his options were before he gets too far in or gets too far behind on it.

In addressing Mr. Rizzo, D. Cheatham confirmed what Mr. Rizzo basically wants to do is to leave his options open. Yes, per Mr. Rizzo – wanted to make sure that if his option turns out to be glass block is his best route to go, again, like he said, it is something that needs to be done soon and would rather put the idea out now to find out where the thoughts are on it before he even either pursues getting quotes on it if it's something that can't be done, or get too far into it where it's too late for him to do something about it.

G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Rizzo if his building is for sale right now. Mr. Rizzo answered that it is right now. G. Jorgensen then asked Mr. Rizzo if he is sure he wants to change the design of the … because that's only one – there's going to be one sticking out. Mr. Rizzo answered he is just trying to figure out which way to go, and noted that, again, this is mostly just exploratory – would like to find out if it is an option that he can pursue so that he knows what his options are to go ahead and follow through with because like he said, by the end of October the window needs to be either finished or started on before we start getting anymore snow or cold – really just doesn't think it is going to handle it. Mr. Rizzo said he did consider that with the building being up for sale – the changing of the façade of it to something … he is considering that and, again, if there isn't a substantial price difference, his plan is to go with original replacement of the existing window. G. Jorgensen told Mr. Rizzo when you're selling a building that amount of money he is talking about is not that substantial when you think about reducing the price and that sort of thing. Mr. Rizzo noted they have been trying to sell it for well over a year and one-half with very little, if any interest, so he kind of has to look at it as if he is still going to be in it for some time until somebody comes in and changes that option for me and so he is kind of planning everything as though it is still going to be his building for several years because depending on how the market goes, it very well may be and he didn't want to quick fix things just so it looks pretty before he sells it because – A. he doesn't want to give it to somebody in that condition and B. – if he winds up not being able to sell it, he doesn't want to have to go back and refix everything over again that he did – so, that's why he is kind of weighing his options to make sure he does it right and does it permanent. G. Jorgensen noted it is up to the board to decide for the life of the building not just one owner. Mr. Rizzo stated that he didn't know if the glass block would really put anyone off, again, because of the style of the building – it's not unfitting for the design, but again it might be something that is maybe a personal preference – someone may or may not … the view from the window is really not one that would upset anyone if it was obstructed anyway – it's really not looking out to much – basically the street is about all you see from there, so the blockage of some of the passing cars and things that go by might almost be more pleasant to someone that wants to purchase it, but it is something that he is trying to consider. Mr. Rizzo stated he has a lot of thinking to do in the next couple of weeks before he gets things going. G. Jorgensen said she just wanted to emphasize again that their (the board) first option is repair. Yes, per Mr. Rizzo – and that is his first option as well – it's going to be what can be repaired if _____ of the window winds up doubling or tripling – the repair cost of the window is just going to be something that he financially just cannot do – would have a big gaping hole in his building unless he can find an alternative method.

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

M. McGee than asked for clarification – wanted to make sure what the board is voting for – voting for repair if possible – first choice – and if not, it's okay to go ahead and do the metal door and the glass wall. G. Jorgensen told M. McGee it is good that she clarified that – that is correct.

Roll call – all ayes. ***Application approved as applied.***

2. **Chris and Carol Horne – *C. of A.*** to remove existing fence on north and east sides of property (not on street); replace with fence of similar characteristics and material (wood).
   Location: **506 W. Second St.**
   Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Application presented by Chris Horne. D. Cheatham noted that he is very familiar with the house and thinks he knows what Mr. Horne is doing, but maybe Mr. Horne should inform the board. Mr. Horne explained he has a long yard which has a wood fence around the parameter and the fence on the west side was replaced already – they are replacing the north and the east sides. Mr. Horne noted it is a rotting, wood fence that is falling down and just wants to replace.

D. Cheatham said he didn't see any problem with the application – it's not visible from the fence and the Hornes are replacing it with the same …

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

Roll call – all ayes. ***Application approved as applied.***

3. **West Madison United Methodist Church – *C. of A.*** to replace front door entrance awning with a covered front porch. Porch to have asphalt shingles and wood 4-in. x 4-in. posts on each side of front door.
   Location: **1100 W. Main St.**
   Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

Mr. Terry Morris explained to the board members that at one time the church had a metal awning on it and it just covered the door – what happened was they were having trouble with wood rotting around the windows and door frame. They have taken down the awning and would like to replace it with a wood awning to cover over the top of the window and come down the side. They now have to replace rotten wood from around the window and door.

L. Wenning asked if in the past the arched window was over the awning. Yes, per Mr. Morris. D. Cheatham confirmed with Mr. Morris that this window would now be covered.

G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Morris what he just said – they have to replace the window? Mr. Morris said they have to replace the wood around the window. G. Jorgensen stated it looks as though the front is just a regular gable – is that how they are going to do it? Again, yes, per Mr. Morris – just put a regular _____ over the window to protect it. G. Jorgensen asked if they are going to try and shape it to the Gothic. Mr. Morris said "yes." G. Jorgensen said she was just wondering how it is going to look. Mr. Morris explained it will come around the window and down the side like an overhang to protect some of the wood around the door.

D. Cheatham asked Mr. Morris what about the posts. Mr. Morris explained the posts are going to be attached to the rail that is in front of it – there is a handrail that goes down the whole length of the ramp – just going to attach the posts to the ramp. D. Cheatham also asked if they are going to be just regular 4 x 4 square posts. Yes sir, per Mr. Morris. D. Cheatham asked if there is something they can do to maybe make that blend in with the style of the church – the architecture of the church instead of just plain posts. Mr. Morris said they could probably put some kind of decorative posts in. D. Cheatham commented that he thought it would look better. Mr. Morris explained the reason they were going to go with 4 x 4 posts is because the handrail itself is 4 x 4's and it goes all the way down the ramp so they wanted to blend in with them. M. McGee asked

Mr. Morris if he was saying that it will attach onto the handrail that is closet to the street – come out and then … Mr. Morris said it will attach to the street end and then come out to attach to the rail right "there." (Photographs and drawings provided)

L. Wenning asked if they will still be able to see the window. Mr. Morris answered there will be nothing blocking the window – will still be able to see the window – like he said, they just want to protect the wood that is there.

M. McGee asked if it's going to just be a gable with shingles. D. Cheatham commented "very basic." G. Jorgensen said it will be to keep the rain off the people that are coming up there.

G. Jorgensen stated this doesn't really fit the style of the church at all – it's a Gothic style church. She asked Mr. Morris if he knew it is a Gothic style church- is really old – already been … is that aluminum siding? Yes, per Mr. Morris. Additionally, G. Jorgensen said it has already lost some of the details to it. D. Cheatham asked Mr. Morris if he knew if there has ever been an overhang or awning there before. Mr. Morris answered they did have a metal one – just barely covered the door – was on there once before and had a little set of handrails that it attached to – that's all there was. G. Jorgensen noted that the church is considered contributing. D. Cheatham stated he had a little problem with just the basic design of it – it just seemed to him like its too plain for an older building let alone a church – thought maybe it might be a little bit more architecture involved to set it off rather than just be plain Jane. G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Morris if maybe he had talked with anyone in town for suggestions as to a design for the roof. Mr. Morris said they had only discussed it in the church – church members. D. Cheatham said he knows the church probably doesn't have a lot of money to deal with – understands. G. Jorgensen commented that she wondered if there is anyone who could come up with a better suggestion – something that wouldn't cost anymore but would help add to the design. D. Cheatham added - and to add to the look of the church.

D. Cheatham asked Mr. Morris if he would like to take this back to the church and maybe just talk about it a little bit more and maybe investigate and see maybe if somebody might even donate their time to give suggestions on what might be a little bit more appropriate. He can, yes, per Mr. Morris. D. Cheatham said to just table the application until next meeting. Mr. Morris was agreeable to this. G. Jorgensen advised that there are a number of people in town that offer that assistance – that's what they do. D. Cheatham said perhaps Historic Madison might be the first stop – John Stacier – he is in the crowd this evening – Mr. Morris might touch base with him this evening and John might have some suggestions. D. Cheatham said that the church is a very important part of our town and thought we need to maintain the integrity of it as much as we can.
G. Jorgensen told Mr. Morris the board would like to help as much as possible to give some direction as to something that would fit a little bit better.

Application Tabled.

4. **Andrew D. and Andrew L. Lytle – Microdome Wireless Networks, Inc. – *C. of A.*** to cover concrete block on loading dock with Hardie Board and replace missing trim; remove third (as viewing from left to right from Jefferson Street) glass block window; reduce first glass block window to same size as second block window; remove and replace glass block with custom wood frame windows to match building; make custom wood headers (façade) to replicate the existing brick window headers; addition of overhang on each entrance utilizing pitched copper roof and ornamentation to match existing windows; southern entrance to be handicap accessible; two new solid core, raised panels doors with glass panes on each side; and to replace existing downspouts with copper downspouts.
   Location: **202 Jefferson St.**
   Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

This application presented following the Jefferson County Courthouse application as Andrew D. and Andrew L. arrived late.

Application was thoroughly reviewed.

Roll call – all ayes. ***Application approved as applied.***

Tabled Application:

5. **American Structurepoint, Inc. (Client Representative for Jefferson County Commissioners – Jefferson County Courthouse – *C. of A.*** to replace existing, non-original 1960's windows with new wood double-hung window with true-divided lights. The new window unit will match as closely as possible the historic wood window sash remaining on the first floor and third floor east and southwest elevations and will fit the original window opening. Original wood windows will be restored and reinstalled in their original openings; construct new elevator addition at the south elevation with minimal physical connection to original courthouse (three-story with basement).
   Location: **300 E. Main St.**
   Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Application presented by: American Structurepoint representatives, Robert Creviston (Project Manager) and Pat Jacobs; Jefferson County Commissioner, Tom Pietrykowski; and Jefferson County attorney, Wil Goering.

Mr. Creviston said the plan he provided is the latest plan – the way it is laid out today. Mr. Creviston noted it is basically the same plan, he thinks, that was submitted before with the application – except they did add a door. Mr. Creviston explained this is predominately a three-story ADA compliant elevator addition that they are adding to the south side of the existing courthouse. And before the board they have a set of plans showing the first, second, and third floors – there is a basement that he did not bring a plan floor – not much to show – but there will be a basement connection and the connecting corridor would be through the central existing windows at the back of the courthouse that aligns with the front entrance off of Main Street – off that corridor; the elevator addition is approximately 2,200 square feet for all floors. Mr. Creviston said they looked at attempting to replace the existing elevator which right now is on the west end of the building – left side – there is not an elevator manufacture that makes elevators that small in a commercial elevator to get one in there let alone one that is ADA compliant. Mr. Creviston said as the board can see on the plan, right next to the existing elevator is the Treasurer's office and that is a historic vault with a vaulted ceiling – did

not want to tear into those walls; the new ADA compliant elevator would not fit in that location; they looked at the rest of the courthouse and couldn't find a location anywhere that would stack amongst all the existing offices. Mr. Creviston explained they thought the only option was to add an elevator addition to the south on the available land there. Mr. Creviston said the entrance he mentioned is on the left hand side or the west side of the elevator addition – code requires them to have one stairwell that exits directly to the exterior and the two existing stairwells in the building did not do that so to meet current building code they had to add another door to get an exit directly out – so that would face Jefferson Street; on the right hand side – east side of the elevator addition is an entrance that the Sheriff would use to bring offenders in and out of the courthouse – so that door would be a secure door; going to the last – the board has the exterior elevations – the addition would connect up to a curtain wall window system which would immediately attach to the existing courthouse and then from there it is a brick structure; the windows they show in that addition would replicate the wooden windows that are on the existing courthouse. Mr. Creviston told the board members just for their information they did take this to the State and at first one of their objections was the fact if you look at the south elevation, the addition did not appear central to the building – was not symmetrical, and the reason it is that way is that there is an existing chiller that sits on the south elevation that prevents them from being able to slide farther to the east; that chiller is going to remain – going to ask for an alternate bid to put in a new chiller but that chiller will remain; they did manage to connect to the existing courthouse to that central symmetrical entrance but once you get out into the elevator addition, it does go farther to the west; there is an alley adjacent to this that they don't feel you can really tell that _____ – four story building across the alley – the predominate view is from Jefferson Street to the west and to the east is the jail and Sheriff's Dept. so the west is really the only view you can see from the street.

Mr. Creviston told the board for their information, the plan right now is to hopefully restore the first floor windows which are original to the building – with the exception of the east elevation the balance of windows, which are 14-ft. tall and really were in that old original two-story courtroom which was divided with that third floor that was added in the 60's, and when they added that third floor in there, it is a concrete floor, they altered these windows – so the upper windows are 1960's windows – they are not historic in that regard you know as being original – they were replacement. Mr. Creviston provided some photographs for the board to look at. Mr. Creviston stated on the first page, the photo on the left, if the board looked right in the center of that window, the double hung, they could see there is a horizontal trim piece in there that was added – these windows were rebuilt in the 1960 remodel to allow a vent that would go through that wood piece on some of these locations, not every window, but some of these locations that go in through the pan coil unit that heats and cools the building; in the remodel they are putting in new pan coils that will not need that _____ so that gives them the opportunity to replace these windows with a window that would better replicate the original windows that would have been on the courthouse. Mr. Creviston further stated that the windows themselves are all having to be removed because of the mold that was in the building after the fire – after it sat there for a year pretty much baking in there the mold got pretty bad and got progressively worse as time went on; but from the water infiltration it got into all the wood of all these windows except one which was sealed up on the inside, but got into all the wood so in order to give the building a clean bill of health, everyone of these pieces of wood have to be removed and mold remediated. Mr. Creviston noted that the problem with leaving them in place is that the mold spores are already in the wood and that's evidenced by the fact when they did take the first couple of windows out there was mold growing in behind the wood – so, it was getting bad – even if the windows are dried out it wouldn't take much humidity for the mold to start growing again. MicroAir

is doing the air quality testing for the building and they are the ones that are insisting that the windows need to come out to give them a clean bill of health.
Mr. Creviston stated they have already removed the first floor windows – they were carefully removed, tagged to their original location, and to each piece – they have that plan – they have not removed the upper windows because they are not the historic original windows and they are going to replace those with replica windows to match the original. This is the plan per Mr. Creviston.

County attorney, Wil Goering, commented they had a contractor that was doing mold remediation, Custom U.S., and they estimated for them the cost of restoration of all the windows verses replacement of all the windows – restoration of all the windows, not including installation, was estimated at $980,000.00 – replacement windows is estimated at $330,000 – their insurance company has made it very clear that their only interest is replacement of the windows and of course those are only estimates, the final cost of this would be determined by bidding and if you look at the structure and the way those windows are slightly different and built in to the rows of bricks, installation and customization is going to be very expensive in itself – so, what we're talking about here is that the plan is certainly to restore the windows on the first floor, if they have the money available, if not, will only work with insurance money – might be looking at replacement windows that are true wood windows that have the correct profile and would replicate the original windows, if that becomes necessary just because of the cost – so, looking at cost here to the taxpayers of about $650,000.00 plus the cost of installation, if they have to go that route – but, they are looking for ways to pay for that otherwise.
Mr. Goering said the first plan would be, as was described, is to replace only the second and third floor windows – the big windows and restore the first floor windows.

D. Cheatham stated he is totally for restoring the first floor windows – always seem to be able to find money to do everything else, doesn't think this is going to be problem either – eventually – talking about a building that has been a staple in our county for 200 years. Mr. Goering said he solely agreed with D. Cheatham and the commissioners support that position however they do not control the checkbook. D. Cheatham said he understood. Mr. Goering noted if the funds are available, the plan would be to restore those first floor windows as they are original to the building. D. Cheatham said he is not against replacing the windows – the 1960's windows, at all, maintaining the appearance and so forth – but he would really like to see some effort put in as far as getting the money to save the downstairs windows, that's his opinion. G. Jorgensen stated this estimate – that is to replace all of the windows or just …? Mr. Goering answered that the $330,000.00 is to replace all of the windows – can see that the estimated cost of restoration per window for the big windows at $25,000.00 a window and the small windows, there are 14 of those, at $14,400 so that is why you get the cost of restoration, the total, and then the replacement cost – again, this is an estimate, the final cost will be determined by bid. Mr. Creviston commented they did get three estimates and they were all in the same ballpark. G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Creviston – they did get three estimates? – she hadn't heard that. G. Jorgensen said as they did justify and they said they are in the replacement business, they are not in the restoration business, the ones that gave this estimate – she just wanted everyone to know that, but … but she asked did they did get two others that came in that same area? L. Wenning asked if all of the small windows were taken out that they are talking about restoring. Mr. Creviston answered that generally speaking – the tall 14-ft. windows are the 1960's windows – if you look at the second page of the photos at the lower picture there, that is a photo of the east end adjacent to the jail and if you look through the scaffolding, the windows on the right side of that picture are all double hung – if you look at the third window on the left side, can see it is not a double

hung window – that is a 1960's window also – for some reason that was a replacement – and then the one adjacent to that is a 1960's window, but all the double hung are original. G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Creviston, but you are planning on keeping the lower windows, is that right? Mr. Creviston said that is definitely their desire. Mr. Creviston said they are sensitive to the fact it would be great to keep those original windows – they totally agree to that. G. Jorgensen said – there's not an issue with them at this point, right, they can be restored, there is not a mold issue with them? Mr. Creviston responded by saying there is a mold issue – can see on the next page at the top, they are all stored inside the courthouse pretty much close to where they came out, they have all been tagged like he said before, some of them have been shrink wrapped together but there is still mold in that wood that needs to be removed – that will be done in the second phase. M. McGee asked if the cost of restoring includes the mold remediation. Yes, per Mr. Creviston.

D. Auxier said folks, to clarify they (the applicants) are here tonight for approval of the change in appearance they are proposing to the second floor windows and they are here for the elevator. That is correct per Mr. Creviston. Further, Mr. Creviston said he would mention right now they do have five or six other items – changes – wanted to mention all of these after done with this – maybe let everyone know – in case there is an issue. Mr. Goering said in response to D. Auxier, the appearance of the first floor windows, whether they replace them or restore them, would be identical, same profile, would be wood, and match the original windows if they have to replace them. And, he said the second floor windows will actually look more historic than the windows that were in there before the fire because they had been completely altered in the 1960's with vents and _____. D. Auxier said he thought his point, whichever way they go on the lower windows, they don't need a Certificate of Appropriateness as long as they appear the same as they do now. Mr. Goering noted they just thought they would appear now and inform the Historic Board of Review … also have some other things they want to bring up – understand that they probably don't need one for that and that is what they've really been told on several items from the beginning – just thought they would come in and present everything so that the information was out here – knows there were some questions asked at the last meeting according to what he read in the newspaper, so thought they would meet again – have been meeting with the folks from the community and some people on this board since last summer to provide information – not everybody was aware of those things. G. Jorgensen said she just wanted to mention that when we are talking about replacing original with replacements, the decision on whether they look alike can be, it's a matter of opinion, it's not just replacing wood with wood – a lot, as they know, a lot of windows may sound the same on paper but they are not the same in person and she did not want that statement (D. Auxier's statement) to be a statement of the board because the board needs to make the decision whether or not something is the same – looks the same – it's not just a generic thing, it needs to go before the board. D. Auxier said, I'm sorry, I'm giving a legal opinion that if they replicate them, they don't need approval. G. Jorgensen then said, but, I disagree with that. D. Auxier then said, I know you disagree with it. G. Jorgensen said "I'm on the board." D. Auxier told her she has not pointed out where in the Ordinance where that is required. G. Jorgensen said, yes I did – last week she pointed it out where it is in the ordinance and then asked D. Auxier if he wanted her to get it out again. Yes, per D. Auxier. While waiting for G. Jorgensen to locate verbiage in the ordinance, Mr. Goering said what they would like to suggest is that their plan is to restore those windows, if they have to replicate the windows, they will come back with that information just so there's not an issue here about that. M. McGee said that is what she is suggesting too. Right, right per G. Jorgensen – it's just a disagreement between herself and the board attorney is what it is. Mr. Goering said he understood. D. Cheatham noted there is a lot here to consider. G. Jorgensen said there is a disagreement about his (D. Auxier) interpretation. County

commissioner, Tom Pietrykowski, commented this is why they are coming before the board and there are some other points they would like to bring out now so the board is aware of it so when the changes come up later they will know – thinks there are some minor changes they want the board to be aware of. In referring to the Historic Ordinance, G. Jorgensen said it is Section 7 – "Certificate of Appropriateness required and it is under A, number 3 – and it says "conspicuous change in the exterior appearance of existing buildings classified as historic by additions, reconstruction, or alteration other than changes in character" and whether or not it conspicuous is a matter for this board to decide." D. Auxier noted if it is a replication, by definition means something that is identical to what was there before – would not be a conspicuous change in appearance – now, can understand the board being concerned about whether in fact it is in fact going to be a replication, the county has indicated their willingness to come back and demonstrate that it is going to be replication, if that is the route they go. G. Jorgensen said it is not an issue with this particular application, it's how it is applied in the future – does not want someone saying "well, it looks the same to me" and that not be the case – she does not want that to occur. D. Auxier again stated it is required to be a conspicuous change – one that is obvious, one that stands out. M. McGee said if they (the applicants) agree to come back if they have to … D. Auxier stated it is not an issue tonight. That's right, per G. Jorgensen.

L. Wenning asked if the insurance company – the top windows are going to be replaced – is the insurance company still coming up with the cost of the restoration of the smaller windows. Mr. Goering stated the insurance company would not pay the difference between the … they will pay for replacement but not pay for restoration so they have to look elsewhere for money, but they will still pay the cost of replacement – have to find the difference someplace else.

Mr. Creviston said he had some other items – looking at the elevation on page A2 01 just for a brief second (second to the last page) looking at the south elevations – if you look at the right hand side you can see the existing brick chimney, at the second floor line they need to put in a fresh air intake for the boiler – this is a code issue to meet air quality standards in the building – that will be 24-in. wide by 60-in. high; the exact look – that will be a public bid situation that could be a lot different depending on the manufacturer; on the east side of the building – there is an ADA ramp that does not meet current ADA code, accessibility code, so will be redoing that ramp and the railings on it – the ramp will get a little bit longer – this ramp is a little too steep and does not have the required landings at the start of it and at the turning point; the handrails will be – the existing handrails coming down the stairs on the outside are just threaded pipe handrails in black and they are proposing to do the same to match the existing handrails on the ramp right now – just replace those but they will be a little bit longer – will have concrete curbs on it too that is required by ADA code; the two handrails on the north side of the building, coming out the door on Main Street, there is a rail that comes up on either side of those steps – those are also pipe handrails that they will replace – one side possibly – will leave it up to the contractor but one was bent during the fire – the same thing on the west side, there is one that comes right up to the entry, it looks like a pretzel now – so will have to either repair it if they can, straighten it out or cut out the bad section and put in a new piece of pipe that will be the same pipe to match; they are going to paint the exterior of the building – the paint that is up there now is just basically a white primer – the paint will be the identical colors that was on the building prior to the fire, the day of the fire – had those color samples if anybody wanted to see them – basically a two tone color – trim will be painted one color and the horizontal siding, bricks, and gabling were painted a light color; the other issue and did not have anything here to show the board – there is no way to do this historically – correct code requires any exit out of a building to have an

emergency light that lights up the stairs that is in a stairway and every one of these entrances has stairs – has to be immediately adjacent to the exit, would be a battery backup system so would only come on in the case of an emergency, they would light up at night if there is a power failure, will see them all the time – there are a bunch of manufactures that make different looking ones and until they bid it – will try to compare apples for apples, but until they bid it and specify a couple of them, they don't know what it will look like, but it is required by code. Mr. Creviston said the final one is the cupola – looking at the exterior elevations on the plans, the cupola has been ordered and this cupola, the commissioners decided – think they all decided that they want this cupola to be a little more maintenance free – this cupola is entirely made out of aluminum – the aluminum framing system on the interior of this and all outside of this will be aluminum, the louvers are aluminum, and one of the things they decided early on after consultation with historic preservationists is that they would eliminate … there were four windows at the bottom (pointed out the four windows) the choice was to eliminate those windows since they were not original to the building from the 1869 photos that they have – they have eliminated that and because it is aluminum, just wanted to mention that he has been working closely with the successful bidder on this, the cupola, and they've done a little over 4,000 installations of cupolas all around the world actually and of all the firms he checked out, he thought they were lucky to get them because they are the best – there are still some things that they cannot replicate in aluminum that you can do in wood – the changes will be very subtle, they will not be identical, but it will look predominately just like this cupola here; they came and got a couple of pieces that were salvaged from the fire, he measured every single salvaged piece that he could find, and since there wasn't a cupola to measure they tried to replicate based on scaling photographs – it was pretty intricate what they were trying to do to figure out radiuses of wood and things like that to duplicate this, to replicate this cupola and not having anything to measure – so if somebody comes along and says that's six inches shorter than the photograph, it could be – it could be 6-in. shorter, it could be absolutely perfect. Mr. Goering advised that Campbellsburg Industries did come up shortly after the fire when the cupola was still on the courthouse grounds and documented it, measured it, and helped to develop the specifications and they are the ones that are constructing it – it is scheduled to be installed the week of October 25 and it will be bought in in two pieces – trucked in – will use cranes to put it into place. Mr. Goering provided some photographs that he said they just got last week of it in progress – the top right hand side is actually the weather vane on top – it a little hard to see because it is obviously horizontal there instead of vertical, but that's what they are seeing – then have a section of the dome and a section of the barrel. Mr. Creviston advised that the dome has not been completed yet, they still have the ribs to put on it so it looks a lot different right now but it will not … Mr. Creviston provided the colors they picked out – explained this is a prefinished, manufactured, baked on finish that they selected that closely matches "this" which is the paint below on the building – and then for the dome they selected "this" anodized gold finish – they did want the paint the same identical color that it was before the fire, but this is close as they could come – as everyone could see, it is pretty close.

D. Cheatham asked for questions from the board. G. Jorgensen reviewed they are applying for the windows, and the board is approving the upper windows to be replaced, and the lower windows to be restored – they (the applicants) are not asking for anything else right now as they are restoring the windows – just replacement of the upper windows, not doing anything with the handrails as applicants are just replacing like for like so the board … and the addition she said she did want to mention too that the National Parks Service, the Midwest regional office who is our State Historic Preservation office did approve this plan.

End of Tape 1 – Side A

Tape 1 – Side B – **Blank**
Utilizing limited notes:

Due to construction limitations, the cupola would be conformed so as to have a flat appearance rather than a dome. Numerous concerns regarding this.

John Stacier with Historic Madison, Inc. said he would like to give a pat n the back to the commissioners for doing the best possible – very appreciative but had concerns over the items that cannot be replicated for the cupola. Mr. Creviston explained that originally the dome was convex in two directions which now cannot be done but the ribs will pretty much make the flatter appearance go away and will still have insets. Mr. Goering agreed with Mr. Stacier, some audience members, and the board members that it should not be flat – should be rounded. Mr. Creviston will work with the contractor on this issue.

Ultimately, the application was voted on as applied with the exception if the first floor windows cannot be restored, the applicants will return to this board for review of replacement windows. Roll call – all ayes. ***Application approved as applied with the exception if the first floor windows cannot be restored, the applicants will return to this board for review of replacement windows.***

Business – Old or New:

Audience member, Walt Dubbeld, announced he has purchased the house located at 521 Mulberry Street (see August 23, 2010 HDBR meeting minutes). His immediate plans are to jack up the house, replace sill plates, new roof, and stabilization. He believes the house to be solid and have great bones.

G. Jorgensen stated she thought it would be a nice gesture to provide a meeting agenda to all audience members at each HDBR meeting.

M. McGee announced she has been contacted by a couple of folks who expressed concerns regarding banner signs that are perhaps staying up longer than the ordinance allowed time of three (3) months.

D. Cheatham told L. Waller he would get with her tomorrow to set up a time for another special HDBR meeting.

No further business to be brought before the board.

M. McGee made the motion to adjourn – seconded by L. Wenning

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

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

Louann Waller
Louann Waller, Secretary