

December 27, 2022

T. Stark gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. Once the application is announced the applicant or representative will come up to the microphone to answer any questions. B. Peach will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. T. Stark added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

T. Stark asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for December 5, 2022 and had any corrections or additions. T. Stark noted two changes, one of page three and one of page four.

Roll Call:

O. McCall Approved

Minutes stand approved.

1. Linda Martin – C. of A. to fill in partial basement & build 48'x48' structure attached to front façade after unsafe demolition of everything but front façade.

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Linda Martin was present.

L. Martin stated the front door would be replaced, the front window repaired, and that the rear addition may not extend 48' in length but be close. C. Rogers asked if the signage would be removed off the front and what the purpose of the structure would be. L. Martin stated the signage would be removed and the building would most likely be used for storage. M. Pittman asked what materials would be on the sides of the addition and L. Martin replied corrugated metal. T. Stark asked what material would be used if the roof were raised 2' and L. Martin replied metal.

T. Stark asked for public comment and noted.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Rear Additions		62	<p><i>M. Pittman</i> – It sounds like you’re using nearly the same materials as what is on the building currently, so that is no issue. It’s compatible with the street orientation and scale. The addition will be distinguishable from the front façade.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

			<i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.
--	--	--	--

T. Stark asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a COA to Linda Martin for the proposed work at 128 Mulberry St. to demolish the structure except for the front façade, potentially increasing the height of the roof 2’, and to build an addition to be approximately 48’ in length and 48’ in width.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

2. Tim & Sandra Lauk – C. of A. to build a front porch; extend the existing rear porch roof
Location: **902 W. Second St.** Zoned: **HDR (Historic District Residential)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tim and Sandra Lauk were present.

C. Rogers verified the porch steps would be located on the east side and T. Lauk agreed stating the steps would not protrude past the home. O. McCall questioned the porch column design. T. Lauk stated the columns would be round and very slightly tapered (maybe a 1” or 1.5” difference from top to bottom) and would not have brick at the bottom. T. Lauk stated he wanted to reopen the transom and install new molding around the front door and wanted the columns to match. T. Stark asked if the applicants would consider tightening up the front porch to not extend past the windows. T. Lauk stated the original porch foundation was still present and that he wanted to build on the same footprint as well as have space to be able to sit on the porch. O. McCall stated although the porch may not have been original, it was historically present on the home at some point.

T. Stark asked about the porch materials. T. Lauk stated he wanted to use faced concrete block to look like stone or rock for the porch foundation. T. Lauk also stated the railings would be black aluminum. O. McCall asked if the coating could be taken off the historic parge foundation. T. Lauk stated the coating was installed to prevent water seepage into the foundation. T. Stark asked about the roofing. T. Lauk stated the roof porch, which will not be visible, will be EPDM and the rear porch roof shingle like the existing roof, but that eventually they wanted to install standing seam metal. O. McCall stated Federal railings would typically be made of wood and T. Lauk stated they would be open to using wood or the aluminum railings.

T. Stark asked for public comment and noted.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49-50		<i>O. McCall</i> – The porch will not be enclosed on the primary façade, so that is in conformance. It is appropriate to replace missing porches and that is what is happening here. Replacement porches should use materials and styles compatible to the building and they are. Railings should be made with materials to
Porch Columns & Railings	51		

T. Stark asked for a motion. M. Pittman made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Tim and Sandra Lauk at 902 W. Second St. for the proposed application as submitted including either wood or metal railings.”

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

3. Roger Welch – C. of A. to install 8 dormers on the east & west roof.
Location: **124 W. Fifth St.** Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

R. Welch stated he wanted to amend the application to include three or four dormers. The dormers will be 6' with double-hung 2/2 or 4/4 wood windows, with an overall 19th century design that includes stone sills and headers. T. Stark asked B. Peach to clarify prior COA approvals and current application. B. Peach stated the application was for the dormers only with either 3 or 4 on each side and that everything else had been previously approved in a 2013 COA.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Roofline Additions		63	<i>M. Pittman</i> – Disclosed he had a prior working relationship with R. Welch. The Guidelines state rooftop additions should not be seen from the street, but these are dormers, so that is okay. The additions should be similar in roof-form and these will be. Additions should not detract from the architectural character and

T. Stark asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Roger Welch at 124 W. Fifth St. for the construction of 6-8 dormers at the top of the building.”

Roll Call:

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

- Location: **602 E. Second St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

T. Stark reminded the applicants and the public any exterior changes to the property should be reviewed by preservation staff and that many projects could be reviewed in the office rather than having to go before the full HDBR. C. Rogers echoed the same sentiments. M. Pittman clarified the previous fence was damaged by fallen trees. P. Tally stated the previous fence was made of galvanized pipe. O. McCall asked if the fence would be painted to blend with the primary structure and the applicants agreed it would be.

T. Stark asked for public comment and noted.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

T. Stark asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Martha Binzer at 602 E. Second St. for the wooden fence to be built on a parapet wall to be 36” high and 60’ long with one gate.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

5. Deborah Morris – C. of A. to replace 9 wood windows with 9 vinyl windows of same size, shape, and design.

B. Peach explained the applicant requested an extension due to the fact she was not able to attend the meeting. HDBR agreed to extension and tabled the application to the January 23, 2023 meeting.

6. Chris & Gina Lynn – C. of A. to amend previous COA to replace existing door on the west side of the front of home with a window and trim to match other existing windows on front of home.

B. Peach explained the application was incomplete and needed to be tabled until the January 23, 2023 meeting.

7. Steward Hizey – C. of A. to amend previous COA to add one aluminum clad wood window to the front of home.

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Steward Hizey was present.

M. Pittman asked S. Hizey if the existing front window would be replaced and S. Hizey agreed it would be stating that it was not functional and dangerous. M. Pittman also asked about the width of the house, the applicant stated he did not have the exact dimensions, but both agreed it was approximately 21' wide making it wider than most shotguns. C. Rogers asked if the applicant lived in the home. S. Hizey stated not during the remodel but that he will be. C. Rogers also noted nearby homes that had 2 windows as well. O. McCall asked if the new window would be the same size and design as the existing window and S. Hizey stated it would be. S. Hizey also stated the new windows would be 1/1.

C. Rogers asked B. Peach if it was out of the ordinary to have two windows on the front of a shotgun home. B. Peach stated due to the width, a fine line existed whether this home would be considered a shotgun or front-gable, but that either architectural style could have one or two windows on the front facade ordinarily.

T. Stark asked for public comment and noted.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60-63		<i>O. McCall</i> – There is not enough evidence to determine the existing window is 80% deteriorated mandating replacement, so replacement is not in conformance. The historic 6/6 muntin design is a historic design. Windows should not be added to the primary façade. For all these reasons, this project is not in conformance.

			<p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with C. Rogers. While our Guidelines do state what they state, C. Rogers made an appropriate point and we should make an exception in this case.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree with C. Rogers. Although the window is wood, we cannot determine if it is original. Where I teeter is on adding a window on the front. However, given the fact several other homes on the same street nearby have two windows and the wider width of your home, I agree with C. Rogers and M. Pittman.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I do not agree. If the window is added to the front, matching the existing window would be nearly impossible. Given the fact the</p>
--	--	--	--

T. Stark asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Steward Hizey for the proposed project to add one aluminum clad wood window to the front of the home and to replace the other window with an aluminum clad wood window.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

- T. Stark Approved
- M. Pittman Approved
- O. McCall Deny
- S. Rogers Approved

Old/New Business:

B. Peach showed the HDBR the proposed new COA form format change and approved COA sign to be posted at any job site. T. Stark asked about the specific changes and B. Peach stated wording would not change except for the omission of an existing paragraph that mentions zoning. N. Schell stated staff would make an example draft using the proposed format to show the HDBR at the January meeting.

Staff Report:

December 2022 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Ian Coombs	618 E. Second St.	Install wood staircase on the rear side elevation
Jim Pruett	702 W. Main St.	Replace existing door with window (based on historic evidence)

December 2021 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
Dale Wells	1037 W. Main St.	Build the rooftop/rear addition as proposed	In progress

HMI	118 W. Third St.	Infill a non-historic rear doorway opening	Yes
-----	---------------------	---	-----

C. Rogers made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by O. McCall.

Meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Tom Stark, Vice-Chair

Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist

DRAFT