

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 22, 2021

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, February 22, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following members present: Thomas Stark, Ken McWilliams, Jerome Vernon, Mike Pittman, and Owen McCall. Also present were Brian Martin – Building Inspector, Devon Sharpe –Board Attorney, Brooke Peach – Historic Preservationist, and Nicole Schell – Director of Planning.

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. 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. J. Wilber added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

1/25/2021 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on February 22, 2020 and had any corrections or additions.

M. Pittman moved to approve the minutes -- seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Abstain

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

T. Stark Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. Prickett – C. of A. to north side -- replace front door with fiberglass door and transom, construct gable roof over front door; east side -- 2 new transom windows; west side -- infill basement window; south side -- replace basement door, replace main level window with patio door.

Location: **927 W. First St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach noted Mike Prickett was not present when this application was announced. This application was tabled to the end of the meeting but even after all other applications were heard, B. Peach noted M. Prickett was still not present. N. Schell noted this application is found incomplete due to the fact no representation was present. This application will be heard at the April 2021 meeting.

2. Mike Prickett – C. of A. to build a new 20’ x 17’ garage with vinyl siding, one 3’ x 3’ vinyl window and fiberglass shingle roof

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

- 3. Michael Rawert – C. of A. to install vinyl replacement windows on sides and rear that will match the details, size, shape, and design of the existing windows.
Location: **811-13 E. Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach gave a brief property description, showed photos provided by the applicant, and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Michael Rawert was present.

M. Rawert noted Brian Martin, the building inspector, did go down and declare it an unsafe structure in the rear, so we do have to take that off, but our plan is to not really change a lot. We do want to fix the rot with a natural product that may be a little thicker [siding] because that’s just the way it’s made now. Other than that, we’re going to do roofing and other things to bring it back to its original existence if possible.

J. Wilber asked about the proposal to have vinyl windows put in instead of wood as replacement. M. Rawert noted just for the sides using a product from Spirit Distributions. They actually build them to the exact specs of the window, so we don’t have to change any structural sizes. It gives us a more budget friendly, energy efficient, window with the same aesthetic. It was also noted the wood windows on the front of the home would be salvaged.

T. Stark inquired about the muntins and asked for an example of the proposed windows. M. Rawert explained he had a picture on his phone, showed it to the Board, and that these windows have a fixed muntin. Several Commissioners noted they agreed with T. Stark and noted they would also like to see an example.

J. Vernon noted the East side of the building’s primary visibility from the bridge approach makes him question the use of vinyl replacement windows. T. Stark noted the windows on the rear and West sides are not as visible, but the 4 on the East are.

J. Wilber asked for public comments and noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Windows	60-63		<p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I think the concern is the vinyl windows. We prefer wood aluminum clad. You indicated you looked in that direction, but still are asking for vinyl, so is your mind set? <i>M. Rawert</i> – No, it’s not set on vinyl. It was just so much cheaper when looking to replace and replicate old windows. And to get those customized in wood, I’ve not had much luck. <i>J. Vernon</i> - The other question I had is if this window replacement going to be done at the same time as the other rebuild? <i>M. Rawert</i> – That would be ideal. I’m also going through the Pace process as an option, so that may change my timeline, but hopefully it will all be happening at the same time.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – The guidelines clearly indicate windows are a prominent part of historic buildings in downtown Madison. The</p>

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

		<p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree with what T. Stark said, but I would like to add the guidelines specify the existing wood windows must be 80% deteriorated for replacement. If you look at these windows, they're in amazingly good shape for how old they are. They just need some love and to be restored. If you repair them, it's not as cheap as vinyl windows, and protect them by putting a minimalist storm window on the outside; the one you can hardly see. Then, you have both the look and the energy efficiency that you're looking for.</p> <p><i>M. Rawert</i> – I didn't know that was an option.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with a lot of what's been said, but I also applaud you for taking on a project of this magnitude. I'm not so opposed to the vinyl windows that aren't really visible from the street and I would like to see a sample. I don't think we've discussed this, but we can table this until next month so you can bring us a sample and we can take another look at approval. Like <i>O. McCall</i> pointed out, the muntins, especially the one in the middle, are important especially because, like T. Stark pointed out, because of the high visibility of your home.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – Michael, God bless you brother for working on this house. I agree with what M. Pittman said that East and South are highly visible and really important.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I echo what's been said by most members regarding the vinyl windows.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

J. Wilber - You have four options that you've heard from the Board members today. We can go forward with the vote on the vinyl windows. I can't say for sure, but you may be able to see where that vote may go given the discussions. Or you can table this and bring us back some options, and we can discuss this at our next meeting.

M. Rawert stated he was good with tabling, but asks for clarification. J. Wilber noted no work could begin on the windows, but other portions of his project that have been approved could be started. N. Schell noted no work on PACE grant portions may begin until after the grant is approved.

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, "for the property at 811-813 E. Second St., I propose we table this application to the April meeting."

Seconded by T. Stark

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

J. Melton noted R. Cole is elderly and disabled with a very limited income. She stated the windows were in terrible condition and B. Peach concurred stating she had gone to the home to survey the windows. They had gotten a USDA grant for \$10,000 to cover the window replacement and had to go with vinyl due to the pricing. N. Scheil noted the applicant should apply for the PACE grant and use the USDA funds as the matching portion.

J. Wilber asked the if the application may be delayed to give the applicant time to apply for PACE which may cover the cost of aluminum clad windows which would be more in line with the guidelines. J. Melton agreed.

J. Wilber asked for public comments and noted there were none.

J. Wilber asked for a motion. M. Pittman made the following motion, “I move that we table the application to the May meeting.”

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wilber Approved

The motion to table the application passed. The application will be moved to the May agenda.

5. Stethanie Fox - C. of A. to place a 10’x16’ wooden storage shed on the property 25’ from side properties and 35’ back from properties.
Location: **1016 Park Ave.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Stethanie Fox and Reverend Nathan Grissom from Madison Pilgrim Holiness Church were present.

N. Grissom clarified the setbacks listed in the application were not correct, but that he would follow all appropriate setback ordinances.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding finding of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Madison Pilgrim Holiness Church and Stethanie Fox for the installation of the proposed wooden shed at 1016 Park Avenue following all setback requirement.

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

- T. Stark Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- J. Vernon Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved
- J. Wilber 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.

- 6. Stethanie Fox – C. of A. to demolish 5 chimneys. Zoned: General Business (GB)
 Location: **1004 Park Ave.**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Stethanie Fox and Reverend Nathan Grissom from Madison Pilgrim Holiness Church were present.

N. Grissom noted the very deteriorated condition of the chimneys and the cost of repair of \$7250 being a financial burden the church could not afford. T. Stark suggested PACE grant. B. Peach noted she had sent information on that and another federal grant to S. Fox. N. Grissom noted he wanted the chimneys removed. J. Wilber and J. Vernon noted the importance of historic chimneys to the overall character of the historic district. N. Grissom asked for at least the non-historic chimney be allowed to be removed.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Chimneys	38		<i>M. Pittman</i> – I am not a fan of chimneys that are not in use. They are nothing but constant maintenance. But, our guidelines say if it is a historic chimney, it does need to be rebuilt. You wouldn’t need to rebuild it to the picture B. Peach found. I mean, because there’s

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

		<p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I had one further question. Did someone determine whether the brick chimneys are supported only by the roof structure?</p> <p><i>N. Grissom</i> – No, there’s brick all the way up the wall. Well, on page 38 of our guidelines, it does say if the chimney is a part of the original architecture, it should not be altered or removed. I do not approve.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I would also have to not approve. They are original to the 1876 design and are architecturally significant and should either be rebuilt or stabilized and do whatever is necessary around the roof level.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree with what’s been said before. I cannot approve this for those reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – This is a tough one for me. M. Pittman echoed some things that I understand and I understand your predicament, so this is a tough one. I don’t think I’ve ever seen anything like this where you don’t see something on the inside. The building itself, and I think you guys know, is architecturally significant to Madison. I remember when I got here, it was one of the first buildings I noticed because I lived on First Street. The chimneys on those are significant and they represent that history. I know it’s difficult financially, but it’s tough to go against the guidelines on this. I mean, these are probably way more architecturally significant than any other applications that I’ve seen. For those reasons, I cannot approve it. But, I do urge you to look at the PACE grant that was discussed earlier.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams motioned, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I recommend the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny the COA for the proposed project at Madison Holiness Pilgrim Church at 1004 Park Avenue with the exception of the approval to remove the concrete block chimney.

Motion was seconded M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Wilber Approved

.....

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

B. Peach noted the applicant requested to postpone his application to the next meeting.
 J. Wilber asked for a motion. M. Pittman motioned, “I move that we table the application for 222 W. Second St. until the next meeting.”

Motion was seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Wilber Approved

M. Pittman Approved

The motion to table the application until the April 26, 2021 meeting was approved.

8. Brian Martin – C. of A. to add a new deck to the rear of home that will have 3 steel columns and 1 steel beam each painted white, composite decking installed over porch floor structure, metal handrail painted black.

Location: **819 W. First St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Brian Martin was present.

B. Martin noted he’s worked with Andrew Lineford with IPDH for all the flood and elevation certificates for quite a while now and these structures will all be included in the final submittal to the state.

K. McWilliams noted an issue with B. Martin applying for deck COAs because of a discussion 3 months prior at another HDDBR meeting for other COAs. B. Martin noted the owner requested these changes.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Decks	64		<p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – Decks should be at the rear of buildings and the stain or paint should match the building. This is a new building, so this will match all those conditions. I approve.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – It meets the guidelines, so I approve.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I approve for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

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.

- 10. Brian Martin – C. of A. to add a new deck to the rear of home that will have 3 steel columns and 1 steel beam each painted white, composite decking installed over porch floor structure, metal handrail painted black.

Location: **825 W. First St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Brian Martin was present.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Decks	64		<p><i>O. McCall</i> – New construction decks should be built at the rear of the house and the stain or paint should match the colors of the building. You’ve obviously met these requirements. The design is consistent with the already approved home design. I approve.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I approve for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I, too, agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, the Madison HDBR grant a COA to Brian Martin for the proposed deck to be added to the rear of the home located at 825 W. First St.”

Motion was seconded O. McCall.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Todd Calvert, owner of L&L Properties, was present.

T. Calvert noted he would like to build this garage for storage and a place for tenets to park their vehicles. All the setbacks are in place and the siding will match with the existing siding on the house. J. Wilber asked if the roof pitch would be the same and T. Calvert acknowledged it would.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Garage	45		<p><i>M. Pittman</i> – Garages should be at the rear of the lot, which this. It should conform to the existing structure, which this does. And T. Calvert has done a wonderful job of developing the houses around him and kept them in great condition.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – Approve for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – Approve for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – Approve for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I, too, agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison HDDBR grant a COA to L&L Properties for the proposed garage and shed style carport located at the rear of 1012 W. Main St.”

Motion was seconded T. Stark.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wilber 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

March 22, 2021

T. Calvert noted after some interior work he noticed the windows were originally like 8” off the floor, now they’re like 2 ½’ off the floor, so he’d like to take it back to the original. J. Wilber confirmed the windows would be restored to their historic size in a 2/2 design.

J. Wilber asked for any questions from the Board or for public comment. He noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49-50		<p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – For historic buildings where there are vacant lots, new construction is encouraged and should be compatible in scale, height, and materials. We have 7 bullets here. They’re all covered. The windows are prominent building components and the historic windows will be actually restored. And, porches are one of the most defining portions of our homes. It’s not being moved or taken down, but it’s being partially enclosed. When porches are enclosed, the guidelines encourage this treatment to be done on side porches and this is. It meets all guidelines.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I, too, agree for the same reasons.</p>
Infill – Additions	68		
Windows	60-63		

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison HDBR grant a COA to L&L Properties for the replacement of the rear shed roof with a gabled roof, installation of 3 windows, and partial enclosure of the side porch located at 1018 W. Main St.”

Motion was seconded M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wilber Approved

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

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49-50		<p><i>T. Stark</i> – Porches are one of the most defining characteristics of a historic home. In most cases, most porches should be maintained, retained, and, if needed repaired. New porches should be consistent with the historic appearance of the building to which they are attached. If the historic porch is missing, it is appropriate to replace it. Replacement porches should use the same materials and styles that are compatible with the building to which they are attached and when possible be based on historic photographic or documentary evidence. Removing a front porch that has been added where there was not one historically may also be appropriate in some cases. Your proposed project meets all these guidelines and will look very attractive on the front of that house.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I, too, agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison HDBR grant a COA to Matthew Benzer for the proposed front porch located at 1213 W. Main St.”

Motion was seconded T. Stark.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Vernon Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wilber 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.

Old Business:

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications			
Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material & Project
Riverton, LLC	108 St. Michael's St.	2/19/2021	Aluminum, acrylic signs
Ralph London	108 W. Main St.	2/19/2021	Vinyl window signs
Michael & Kimberly Roark	1035 W. Main St.	2/22/2021	Aluminum clad, wood/fiberglass, wood, LP Smartsiding
Fred Shimfessel	706 E. Second St.	2/24/2021	Wood, canvas awning
John DeLuca	210 W. Second St.	3/3/2021	Wrought iron fence/gate
Mike Prickett	927 W. First St.	3/3/2021	Aluminum clad window, cedar siding
Kevin Watkins	222 W. Second St.	3/5/2021	Wood clapboard siding
L&L Properties, LLC	1018 W. Main St.	3/5/2021	Remove awnings, aluminum clad windows
Jerry Wade/ Mad Paddle Brewery	301 West St.	3/4/2021	Steel, paint
Anne & Tony Schroeder	750 West St.	3/4/2021	Wood
Madison Main Street Program	321 W. Main	3/5/2021	Polymetal, vinyl
Brian Martin	819 W. First St.	3/5/2021	Steel, wood, composite, shingle
Brian Martin	823 W. First St.	3/5/2021	Steel, wood, composite, shingle
Brian Martin	825 W. First St.	3/5/2021	Steel, wood, composite, shingle
Joe Craig	810 E. Second St.	3/12/2021	Wood, shingle
Kim & Jeff Kennard	506 E. Main St.	3/15/2021	Wrought iron
West Main St.,	1213 W. Main St.	3/19/2021	6' wood picket fence & 2 gates

Page 14

Historic District Board of Review

March 22, 2021

Historic District Board of Review: Denied Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Denial	Material
Sean Wiseman	940 W. Second St.	3/4/2021	Exposed fastener metal roof
Ronald Frazee	829 W. Main St.	3/10/2021	Wood (capital style awning – would cover historic transom)

M. Pittman made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by O. McCall.

Meeting adjourned at 7:07p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW



Josh Wilbur, Chair



Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist