

August 28, 2023

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, August 28, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Mike Pittman presided over the meeting with the following members present: Owen McCall, Carol Ann Rogers, and Sandy Palmer. Also present was Brooke Peach – 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. 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. M. Pittman added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

8/2/2023 Minutes:

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for August 2, 2023 and had any corrections or additions.

O. McCall moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

S. Palmer Abstain

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. Keith Acree/Mark Timmons – C. of A. to add on to existing deck 24'x8' on front but set back 4'.

Location: **810 E. Second St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Mark Timmons was present.

M. Timmons explained they wanted to have more usable space. C. Rogers verified the deck expansion would be set back about four feet front the front of the existing deck and the new railing will match the existing railing.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
9.0 Doors & Entrances	59-61	<p><i>S. Palmer</i> – Locate decks only on the rear ground level of historic buildings or other ground level where the deck is not visible from public view to help reduce the visual impact. The deck should be recessed or set back. This one is set back but it is perfectly visible. Design decks to eliminate physical or visual damage to the significant historic architecture. I assume since there's already a deck there, this would be in conformance with that because it's attaching to the deck that's already there. Decks are not historically accurate and this location is prominent as people come in to the city. It's a significant structure, so I don't agree with adding a deck on the front, but in this case, you're expanding what's already there. I would say it is not in</p>

	<p>conformance had the original application for the deck that's in place now come before us, but in this case, since you're adding to what's already there, it's not going to detract any more than it already does.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree. Since the deck that is already there is architecturally inappropriate as it is and this application is to extend that deck, it's not going to have any further visual impact than already exists especially when viewed from the street level, so I would say the COA should be granted.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p>
--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion. C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Mark Timmons for the proposed addition to the existing deck of 24’x8’ on the east side and set back 4’ front the front.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

S. Palmer	Deny
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. Keith Acree/Mark Timmons – C. of A. to increase western door opening to 7'x9' & install overhead door.

Location: **213 E. Second St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Keith Acree was present.

B. Peach noted the applicant had contacted the mural artist to fix the mural after the installation of the new door opening if approved. M. Pittman asked how often the door would be open and used. K. Acree stated it would be used often to move golf carts in and out.

C. Rogers noted the door in question had been previously infilled and asked what the original size would be. B. Peach stated the infill was of a standard entry door. K. Acree added the previous owners had reopened the doorway.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
26.0 New Construction	106	<p><i>C. Rogers</i> – Historic doors should be retained, but this is not a historic door. Replacement doors should match the original, but the size is being increased to an overhead door. New doors should be located on side or rear elevations and this will be. We don't know what the original door would have been but the proposed new overhead door is in conformance and given the historic function of this building as a warehouse, the increase in size is also in conformance.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p> <p><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 the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Keith Acree for the installation of an overhead door at 213 E. Second St.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved

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

3. Johnny Russell – C. of A. to replace primary entrance door; install black chain link fencing along metal railings; install black chain link gates at entrance to elevated balcony.
Location: **117 Ferry St.** Zoned: **General Business (GB)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Johnny Russell was present.

J. Russell stated he wanted to simply replace/repair the chain link fencing that had been there previously and still was in some areas for safety reasons. C. Rogers verified the proposed new door would be the same size as the existing door. B. Peach noted the proposed replacement door would be located on the non-historic southern addition.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
9.0 Doors & Entrances	88-90	<i>O. McCall</i> – If historic doors are missing or deteriorated beyond repair, install replacement doors that match the originals, but in this case, we don't have original doors anywhere, so there's nothing to match. Replacement doors should be in keeping with the style of the building. This used to be an industrial button factory from a long time ago, but you don't need to try to match whatever kind of door a button factory might've had even if we could figure that out. The proposed door is a Craftsman style door, which is not the style of the time period, but again, it's being converted into a residence, so I don't see a problem with having a Craftsman style door if that's what appeals to you. Although it's technically not in conformance with the guidelines, I think it's okay. Contemporary or utilitarian fences are not appropriate. Inappropriate materials include chain link, but in this case, it's what was there and still is there in some locations, so I don't feel like we can at this point ask you to tear it all down and put up something that would be in conformance with our guidelines. This project proposal may be in technical violation of the guidelines but should be approved nonetheless for the reasons I've stated.
20.0 Fences	59-61	<i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.

M. Pittman asked for a motion.

O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Johnny Russell for the proposed new door and chain link fencing including the gates at 117 Ferry St.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved

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

4. Alex Hammock/Roger Welch – C. of A. to build a new 3BR/3.5BA single family home w/ basement to include 2 car garage, 1BR/1BA storage.

Location: 1030 E. First St.

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Roger Welch and Alex Hammock were present. B. Peach noted the change in elevation drawings provided by the applicants.

A. Hammock noted the proposed new home would be compatible with the other new homes being built in the area. She also stated R. Welch would probably want larger windows than those shown in the elevation drawing. R. Welch also stated he would like to have the option to have a 1-car garage on the top level in addition to the garage on the bottom level.

C. Rogers asked how R. Welch was going to access the garage on the bottom level and R. Welch stated a driveway off of Filmore. R. Welch stated he would like to use either brick or stone on the bottom and a Cementous siding. R. Welch also stated he wanted to add 19th century touches to the exterior design.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted Vickie Young. V. Young asked about the view from Park Ave. historic homes and this more modern structure as a backdrop. She also asked about parking plans given the narrow width of the street and flooding issues.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
23.0 New Construction - Dwellings	94-100	<p><i>C. Rogers</i> – Setbacks should be maintained to other historic buildings, but this does not apply because there are no historic homes along this part of the street. The pattern of building separation and lot coverage should be maintained, and this project does. Minimize ground disturbances during new construction and report any artifacts dating prior to 1870 if discovered. The scale and height of the building should be compatible to other structures along the block and this one will be. The new building should be architecturally compatible and this one will be. Based on what I have already seen the applicants do previously and what has been presented to us here, this is very similar and I agree that it is in conformance.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree.</p>

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
August 28, 2023

		<i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.
--	--	---

M. Pittman asked for a motion.

C. Rogers made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Alexandra Hammock and Roger Welch at 1030 E. First St. for the proposed application to build a new three bedroom three and a half bath single family home with a basement to include a two-car garage and perhaps one bedroom, one bathroom, and storage; also could include a garage on the upper floor.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

S. Palmer Approved

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

5. Andy Crabtree – C. of A. to add a 4'x12'x20'x8' deck on to rear of home.

Location: 1018 Park Ave. **Zoned:** Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Andy Crabtree was present.

A. Crabtree stated he wanted the deck for extended outdoor living space and an area for a river view. He also noted the deck design had been placed further to the western side so that it could also be accessed from the front of the home.

C. Rogers asked about access to the deck from inside the home and A. Crabtree stated he wanted to change the existing windows to either French or sliding doors on the rear of the home. He also noted the only thing visible from Park would be the steps to the deck but that the deck and the door was not readily visible from the public right-of-way.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
27.0 New Construction - Decks	109	<p><i>S. Palmer</i> – Decks should be located on the rear first floor to reduce the visual impact and this one will be with the exception of the stairs. Decks should be designed to eliminate physical damage to significant historical features and should be able to be removed easily. This deck meets all of these guidelines and is conformance.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p>

M. Pittman asked for a motion.

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

S. Palmer Approved

6. Jacqueline Greene – C. of A. to install 24'x20'x7' metal carport in backyard driveway area; build roof over existing wood deck on east side of home.

Zoned: Residential Medium-Density (R-8)

J. Greene stated she wanted a roof over the concrete patio located on the front east side entrance because of the exposure to the elements without covering and stated it would be made of the same material as the existing roof. M. Pittman verified the existing roof on the structure was asphalt shingle and J. Greene agreed it was. S. Palmer asked about the shape of the proposed new porch roof and J. Greene stated it would be a gable roof similar to the front of the home and that it would have guttering to draw water away from the house. M. Pittman asked if the porch posts would match those on the front and J. Greene stated they would. C. Rogers noted that although the proposed porch roof was not in conformance with the guidelines, sometimes the need is more pressing.

J. Greene stated she wanted to put a carport at the rear of the home with access off the alley. She stated there were multiple similar carports in the nearby vicinity and garages on each side of her property. C. Rogers asked if the carport would have a concrete base and J. Greene stated it would although it was currently just grass in that area. During findings of fact, C. Rogers noted the metal to be incompatible with the guidelines and J. Greene stated she would do a wood carport structure but that for time's sake in submission of the application, she proposed a metal carport because of its availability.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
12.0 New Construction – Outbuildings	116-117	<i>C. Rogers</i> – The design of new garages or other accessory buildings should be compatible with dwellings in the historic district. New accessory buildings should respect and blend with the architectural style and scale of the associated dwelling. Site new garages and accessory buildings appropriately on the lot.
14.0 Porches	68-70	This will be at the back of the lot and it's not visible unless you drive down that alley. Detached new garages and out buildings should be on the rear of the dwelling or set back which is what the applicant is doing. It's not going to be an attached garage or accessory building. The new materials used for the building

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Ron Bateman was present.

R. Bateman stated the submitted drawings were the footprint of the 1844 Archibald Taylor residence. He also noted the additions that were added in the 1880s. R. Bateman described the research he’d done as part of this restoration project including dendrology reports and construction details. He also noted the home’s importance to the Underground Railroad.

R. Bateman stated the material list was not finalized but that he desired wood siding and historic windows but that if those were not possible, he would work with staff to ensure all materials met federal SOI standards and local guidelines.

O. McCall noted the chimney in the elevation drawings and asked if the historic chimney was still present. R. Bateman stated it was and that it would be kept.

S. Palmer stated the HDBR would prefer a specific list of materials when issuing a COA so that there would be no confusion as to materials. R. Bateman stated his goal at this time was to simply get the HDBR approval for his proposed strategy of restoring the home to its original footprint but that if possible, he would like to get an overall project approval so that he could work with staff if necessary on specific materials like siding and windows.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
26.0 New Construction	106	<p><i>O. McCall</i> – New additions guidelines may sound a bit odd, but they are the best fit for this project. New additions should be compatible with the existing building’s height, scale, size, and mass so they do not overpower the building. These do not apply because you’re going back to the original footprint. The massing and size will be appropriate for that reason. The design elements will be compatible because they are going to be consistent with the 1840s building. The windows, doors, and roof form are placed by historic evidence, so these are also appropriate. Vinyl siding and pressed wood are not appropriate materials and the applicant wants to use either wood or materials that adhere to SOI and local guidelines. Wood windows are the most appropriate and that’s what the applicant is proposing. The project is in 100% conformance.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</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 the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Ron Bateman for the restoration of the 1844 footprint and design at 627 Walnut St to comply with the Secretary of Interior standards and local guidelines.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman Approved

- O. McCallApproved
- C. RogersApproved
- S. PalmerApproved

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

Old/New Business:

No new or old business.

Staff Report:

August 2023 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Tina Stambaugh	116 Jefferson St.	Replace existing shingle roof with standing seam metal roof
Rachel Fox / Betty Jefferies	129 E. Main St.	Install vinyl sign on front windows; install 40”x48” polymetal sign at right angle on front of building; install 40” daisy on front of building
Paul & Teresa Walters	618 E. Second	Install 12”x24” & 15”x24” freestanding wooden signs
Joesph Jackson	701 E. Main St.	Replace existing wood/ brick porch columns w/ wood columns & railings to match architectural details of home
Lisa Farris	803 E. Second St.	Replace existing deteriorated wood windows w/ aluminum clad wood windows of same shape, size, & design

August 2022 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
-----------	---------	-----	-------------------

Katie Beck	206 E. Main St.	restore the historic appearance of the storefront located at 206 E. Main St. based upon photographic evidence	In-Progress
Paula Bell	229 W. Main St.	Install 1 vinyl sign on each front primary window of the storefront for a total of 2 signs	Yes
Eric Shuck	308 E. Third St.	Replace damaged front entry door with new ¾ lite wood & glass entry door	Yes
Matthew Barron	504 East St.	Replace windows on rear & sides of structure with aluminum clad wood windows; install seamless high-capacity gutters as specified in the application	Yes
Jeff & Cherri Knox	628 West St.	Replace a standing seam metal roof with asphalt shingle roof	Yes
Steven & Elizabeth Thomas	208 E. Second St.	Install replacement 2/2 or 6/6 fiberglass windows of same size	Yes
Michael O’Dea	803 Filmore St.	Complete the project as submitted (rear deck railing, windows, siding)	Yes
Kevin & Linda Malloy	816 W. Second St.	Add roof over existing patio	Yes
Chad Gray	124 East St.	Construct a 20’ awning extending the rear roof of the structure	Yes
Mark Viterna	716 W. Third St.	Install exposed fastener metal roof, wood garage door, & 1 32”x48” aluminum clad window on each gable peak	Yes
Paul & Teresa Walters	618 E. Second	Build garage & small overhang	Yes

S. Palmer made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by O. McCall.

Meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Josh Wilber, Chairman

Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist