

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

October 25, 2021

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, October 25, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following members present: Jerry Wade, Thomas Stark, Mike Pittman, Jerome Vernon, Ken McWilliams, and Owen McCall. Also present was Brooke Peach – Historic Preservationist and Scott Gross – Building Inspector.

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.

9/27/2021 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for September 27, 2021 and had any corrections or additions.

T. Stark moved to approve the minutes – seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

J. Vernon Approved

O. McCall Approved

T. Stark Approved

J. Wilber Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wade Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

Minutes stand approved.**Applications:**

1. **Melissa & Todd Miller** – C. of A. to: demo current structure & rebuild to the exact footprint; add on to existing floor plan either at rear of home or as camelback.
Location: **718 W. Third St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Melissa Miller was present.

J. Wilber asked M. Miller if she would still meet all set-back requirements with the camelback plan. M. Miller stated she'd already received approval from the BZA for zero lot-line setbacks on the west side of the property.

O. McCall asked S. Gross to explain the unsafe structure declaration pertaining to this application. S. Gross explained he inspected the property and found extensive and widespread termite damage to the point where the sill plate was mostly deteriorated leaving the structure supported primarily by the exterior siding. O. McCall asked if the structure posed a risk to workers attempting to repair the building and structurally reinforce it and S. Gross said that it would. S. Gross said needed to be reinforced but that he did not see any way it could be feasible.

J. Wilber asked M. Miller to specifically explain the types of materials she wanted to use. M. Miller stated she would use Hardie board siding and aluminum clad wood windows. K

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
August 23, 2021

McWilliams asked about the potential for a garage but M. Miller stated due to the lot size, she does not anticipate adding a garage.

J. Vernon asked if the lot would be levelled to accommodate the longer design of the new home. M. Miller stated they may have to do some leveling but that the new home would follow the exact footprint of the existing home with the exception of extending 10’ further back and the second story camelback addition which would mimic a neighbor’s home. J. Vernon asked if M. Miller would retain the historic front fence and she stated they would.

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
New Construction – Infill Buildings New Construction - Additions	69-71	68	<p><i>O. McCall</i> – This is a pretty simple application because there is a demolition order in effect and so the only thing that can be done is to rebuild. The fact she is using the same footprint, it is consistent with the guidelines. The addition also follows all guidelines because it mirrors additions done to similar historic homes of neighbors.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wade</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> - I agree for same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of facts, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Melissa Miller at 718 W. Third St. to rebuild the house with a 10’ addition on the rear.”

Seconded by M. Pittman

Roll Call:

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

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

2. **Dale Wells** – C. of A. to: build an attic addition to house 1 room, ½ bath, 4 wood doors (1 front, 3 rear), using wood, asphalt shingles, wood/aluminum clad windows, 8 exterior lights, Hardie board siding.
 Location: **1037 W. Main St.** Zoned: Medium-Density Residential (R-8)

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
October 25, 2021

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Dale Wells was present.

D. Wells stated the front would eventually mimic the addition on the rear of the home when completed with the exception that there would be a single door unit rather than 3 door units. K. McWilliams asked if the front addition would extend above the red brick on the first floor and if there would be any changes to the stucco coating on the front façade. D. Wells stated if anything, he may remove the stucco in order to make the structure look like it did historically and to make the right side match the left.

J. Wilber clarified with D. Wells the application was simply for the attic addition; both agreed it was. J. Wilber asked what type of materials would be installed and D. Wells responded Hardie board siding. T. Stark asked if the front addition would mimic the rear and D. Wells stated it would with the exception of having one set of doors instead of three. K. McWilliams asked if that design was included in the application. B. Peach stated the sketch was provided by D. Wells and included in the application; it was given to detail the addition that D. Wells requested.

J. Wilber asked D. Wells what inspired him to build the attic addition. D. Wells stated this building was the first store built in west Madison; it was built in several additions. J. Wilber asked D. Wells why he specifically built up another level. D. Wells stated the home did not have a bedroom when he purchased it so he built this addition to be the only bedroom in the house.

K. McWilliams asked if D. Wells had thought about using brick. D. Wells said he would've like to have used brick but that he felt the weight of that material could compromise and stress the historic fabric & materials. K. McWilliams asked B. Peach if the proposed rooftop addition would impact the home's contributing status. B. Peach replied that it very likely would and provided an explanation of what is contributing v. non-contributing as well as NPS guidance on rooftop additions. D. Wells stated he would be willing to change the entire design of the front portion of the addition because he did not want to do anything to damage the home's historic character or contributing status.

J. Wilber asked D. Wells if he would agree to extend the application to develop a redesign on an addition that would be more sensitive to the historic character of the home and align to both local and national guidelines on additions.

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
New Construction - Infill Buildings	69-71		<i>O. McCall</i> – This is a pretty simple application because there is a demolition order in effect and so the only thing that can be done is to rebuild. The fact she is using the same footprint, it is consistent with the guidelines. The addition also follows all guidelines because it mirrors additions done to similar historic homes of neighbors. <i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>J. Wade</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>K. McWilliams</i> - I agree for same reasons.
New Construction - Additions	68		

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review delay the application at 1037 W. Main St. for one month.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Page 5
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 25, 2021

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the demolition. M. Pittman made the following motion, “I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review, based on the previous findings of fact, the HDBR grant a COA for the demolition of the shed on the rear of the property.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

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

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Infill Buildings	69-71		<p><i>M. Pittman</i> – The new building shall be compatible in terms of height with adjacent buildings, and this is. New buildings shall be compatible with adjacent buildings and located at the rear of the property and this will be. New buildings should be compatible in terms of set-backs and this will be. It meets all the guidelines.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wade</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the building of the garage. J. Wade made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, the HDBR approve the COA for 412 East St. to build the 24’ x40’ garage with cement floor, tin siding, tin roof, the overhead door, security lighting, either aluminum clad or wood windows, and a building height of 10’.”

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

- J. Vernon Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- T. Stark Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

Page 6
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 25, 2021

J. Wilber Approved
 K. McWilliams Approved
 J. Wade Approved

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

4. Kristi Nichols / Patrick Lynch – C. of A. to: extend existing room by 3’ on north/east corner of home using same materials as existing; tear off existing deck & replace with larger deck 22’x25’ with gable roof using same materials as current deck.
 Location: **820 Fillmore St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Patrick Lynch was present.

T. Stark asked what the step-down from the original gable on the home to the gable on the proposed deck. P. Lynch stated it would be approximately 6-12 inches. J. Vernon asked if the new deck was going to be larger than the existing deck and P. Lynch stated it would be. J. Vernon also asked if the deck would be held up by posts and whether anything like a patio would be placed under the deck. P. Lynch stated it would be posts and perhaps potentially something like that would be underneath, but there are no specific plans at the moment.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted there was none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Additions New Construction - Decks	68 64		<p>T. Stark – So additions to historic homes should be added to the rear; should be simpler and smaller than the original building, which is why I asked the question about the step-down of the gables; should be of compatible design, roof shape, materials, color, and location of window, door, and cornice heights; should not imitate earlier historic style, so we’re good there; should reflect the current design style but be compatible with the original structure; should avoid extensive removal or damage of the historic structure and we’re fine on both of those. Porches are preferred to decks, but decks are acceptable on the rear of the building, which is what you’re doing; should be of simple design; should be painted or stained to match the color of the building. According to the findings of fact for the addition and the deck, you’ve met all the requirements. K. McWilliams – I agree for the same reasons. O. McCall – I agree for same reasons. J. Vernon – I agree for the same reasons. J. Wilber – I agree for same reasons. J. Wade – I agree for same reasons. M. Pittman – I agree for same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the building of the garage. J. Wade made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the HDDBR grant a COA to Kristi Nichols and Patrick Lynch located at 820 Fillmore St. for a 3’ extension on an existing room on the front of the home using the same materials as existing and tearing down the existing deck and replacing it with a larger 22’x25’ deck with a gabled roof using existing materials and painting and staining to match the house.”

Seconded by J. Vernon.

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 25, 2021

Roll Call:

J. Vernon Approved

O. McCall Approved

T. Stark Approved

M. Pittman Approved

J. Wilber Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Wade Approved

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

5. Chris & Gina Lynn – C. of A. to: demolish two rear chimneys.
 Location: **214 W. Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Chris & Gina Lynn were present.

C. Lynn stated they intended to keep both chimneys, but when they started taking down the chimneys on one side, we were going to do a header across, but found there was too much weight and extensive deterioration. The first chimney came down – this would be the one on the right if you're facing the rear of the home. It's the one that missing. The one on the left side was leaking and crumbling. This all happened really fast. On the first week of October, we had a crew that started to dismantle the chimney and we found it was really deteriorated. G. Lynn stated we got the call from the City right after the left one was taken down. We were trying to save both, but they were missing bricks and both deteriorated to the point some bricks were falling off. These chimneys had been cut down prior to us purchasing the home.

J. Wilber asked if the Lynns knew how far down the damage went on the chimneys. C. Lynn stated the chimney on the left side was already down when they arrived on site. G. Lynn stated they wanted to cap the chimney on the right side, but the contractors determined it was unsafe and probably would not hold the weight of a cap. J. Wilber asked to confirm that the chimneys were taken down previously. G. Lynn stated the chimneys used to be much taller, but that they had been reduced in height prior to their purchase. J. Wilber asked if there was interior damage from the chimneys. G. Lynn stated the interior had been gutted and it was hard to tell prior damage from new, but that there was evidence of leaking. G. Lynn stated their contractor, Brian Martin, tried to save the chimneys, but determined it was just too unsafe to keep them.

K. McWilliams asked if they were going to shingle over it. C. Lynn stated that was the plan if their COA application was approved. C. Lynn also stated they would certainly retain the front chimney.

M. Pittman stated he's had a lot of experience with chimneys and most of it not good, but stated most chimneys do leak. Based on the extent of deterioration that was present, M. Pittman stated he feels the Lynns had no other choice. G. Lynn stated even trying to fix it, it would've most likely kept leaking.

O. McCall asked why they could not just rebuild the chimneys to how they were previously. C. Lynn stated they would prefer to remove the chimneys and shingle over the openings, but if they must, they could build a faux chimney with an internal membrane. Getting the resources and time to rebuild the chimneys is difficult. Our mason said it would probably take months before he could get to it. G. Lynn stated that would create more problems with leaking in the home.

J. Vernon asked what B. Martin’s recommendations were regarding the chimneys. C. Lynn stated B. Martin wanted to keep both chimneys but that they needed to come down due to the
 Page 8
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 25, 2021

deterioration. B. Martin was very saddened by that, but he felt the best course of action was to remove the chimneys and shingle over the openings. J. Vernon asked whether B. Martin determined the existing chimney structure below the roof line would support rebuilding new chimneys. G. Lynn stated that was correct.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted there was none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Chimneys	38		<p><i>J. Wade</i> – Chimneys are often decorative but should be maintained and preserved in accordance with the guidelines. They should not be removed or altered if they are significant. They should be repointed and cleaned. If they become unstable or collapse, they should be rebuilt to match the original. Chimney caps should be of slate, metal, or stone. Chimneys should not be covered with stucco or other veneers. It would appear that this proposed project is not within the guidelines. However, based on the circumstances, I am not opposed to the project.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree it does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – Chimneys are decorative – we don’t utilize our chimneys today like they did in the past. It sounds like you’ve tried to save these chimneys. You didn’t go in with the intention to remove them, but the existing chimney cannot support the tops. While it doesn’t meet guideline three, we must also recognize when we have to use our heads on this. You are keeping the front one.</p> <p><i>J. Wade</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I do not agree. I think they are in a unique situation where they are forced to save either the chimneys or the house. I vote to save the house.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I recuse myself for conflict of interest.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the building of the garage. J. Wade made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the HDDBR deny a COA to Chris and Gina Lynn at 214 W. Second St. to demolish the chimneys.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

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

J. Wade

Deny

Page 9
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 25, 2021

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness was denied. An approved Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

Old/New Business:

B. Peach stated that in July 2021, she did a staff approval on a sign for 709 W. Main St. In early October, an error was detected in the mathematical calculation. Our sign ordinance states signs shall be no larger than 16 sq. feet in size. However, this sign was much larger. It should not have been approved by staff, but rather have been forwarded to the HDDBR for review. Steps have been put into place to ensure this will not happen again. B. Peach offered an apology to both the HDDBR and the public for the error.

J. Wilber asked B. Peach to name the steps that have been put into place. B. Peach stated all sign applications are reviewed by S. Gross but that the Director of Planning, Nicole Schell, will also review all sign applications as well. In addition, all math will be double-checked, and a copy of the sign ordinance will be attached to each application along with notes how the sign is either in or is not in conformance. If the sign is found not to be in conformance to the ordinance, the application will be automatically forwarded to the HDDBR.

J. Wilber asked if the owners of the sign had been notified and B. Peach replied that she had spoken to the owners verbally to let them know what happened. B. Peach stated she also spoke with the HDDBR attorney, Devon Sharpe, who determined that since the COA was already approved and issued and the sign was installed, the sign shall remain in place.

O. McCall asked how big the sign in question was. B. Peach replied 31 sq. feet in size. M. Pittman suggested the sign company should also provide the calculated square feet on each application. O. McCall asked if the City could pay for a new sign that is in conformance to the ordinance. B. Peach stated she could not answer that but could ask. J. Wilber stated he would like to ask the Mayor. K. McWilliams agreed. T. Stark asked J. Wilber if he would have the answer to share at the November meeting and J. Wilber replied he would.

J. Wilber asked for public comment.

Kevin Carlson, 301 Jefferson St., owner of Carlson Sign stated he has been in business for 36 years and that in those 36 years, he has always conformed to the guidelines regardless of the type of sign. When he started out, K. Carlson stated window lettering could only be 8” and that an HDDBR member had measured one of his signs finding one of the letters to be a ½ inch off. K. Carlson stated he had to scrape that letter off and redo it. He also stated he had a sign that was lower than the 9’ clearance on the sidewalk and was asked to raise it several inches. K. Carlson stated he has always followed the guidelines, but that the company that did the sign in question, which has been in business twice as long, should’ve known the ordinance; if it didn’t conform, they knew it had to go before the HDDBR. Another sign, the Magpie sign, has larger letters than 8” and covers more than 50% of the window. Rivertown Grill also has signs covering their window – those aren’t allowed either. K. Carlson stated he felt slighted by this error.

Julie Truax, 316 Mill St., stated she lived about ½ a block from the new restaurant and that the sign, no matter the size, is inappropriate for the historic district and the neighborhood. If one starts at Cragmont St., the business signs in the area are not inappropriate, but the Mad Love sign is out of context. I do agree the sign is too big. Throughout the years, I’ve had to change signs and K. Carlson has always ensured the signs are appropriate. J. Wade asked for clarification of inappropriate. J. Truax responded the lighting made the sign gauche and that it is not designed to look historic at all. Maybe without the lighting it might be okay, but it’s too Las Vegas to me. J. Wade asked B. Peach if the guidelines addressed anything about personal preferences. B. Peach stated the only thing the sign ordinance states regarding lights is that they cannot be flashing or in motion; signs cannot be backlit (similar to signs like Taco Bell to where they’re in a box with

lighting in the middle illuminating the sign from within). Lighted signs are not prohibited including neon.

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
October 25, 2021

Kim Kennard, 709 W. Main St., stated she is the owner of Mad Love. She stated Mad Love stands for Madison Love and the sign was designed with inspiration by examining photographs of Madison’s Main St. in the 1930s. This sign is a replication of those. As far as the size goes, we hired the sign company to design it and that’s what they did. Since my husband and I have moved to Madison almost a year ago, we’ve become a big part of the community. Our house is on the Christmas tour, so not only are we opening a new restaurant, but we’re opening our house up. We’re trying to bring more people into Madison and our goal is to help the community and everyone prosper. There’s a huge mural, the Kindness mural, and who knows how big those letters are, but kindness is what our whole theme is. Our sign is not meant to offend or disrespect anyone in the community, but to provide a great place for people to gather. J. Wilber asked K. Kennard if we can get some reconciliation on the size of the sign, would you be agreeable. K. Kennard stated the sign was very expensive but let us know. J. Wade asked as part of the design process both you and Jeff Kennard had ideas, but I’m sure Heitz also offered options, so how did we get to the final design and size? K. Kennard stated she wasn’t sure about the size, but that she designed the sign and Heitz offered several renderings. We chose one and that’s it – they submitted it. J. Wade asked if Heitz submitted the application and K. Kennard stated they did.

K. Carlson added K. Kennard was correct that signs back in that time were huge, but Link Ludington wrote the sign ordinance along with others. L. Ludington stated he was on an advisory committee but not directly involved in writing the sign ordinance. K. Carlson stated the City in 1981 moved away from these larger signs and gawdy look. K. Carlson stated he doesn’t like the sign ordinance either, but everyone must stick to it – including Mr. Heitz. All I’m asking is either we all follow the guidelines, or we don’t; if that sign stands, I should be able to produce signs as big as I want to as well.

J. Wilber stated he appreciated the public comment and he wants everyone to understand this was a mistake; everyone makes mistakes and no one should be condemned for it. We now need to come to some reconciliation if possible. There have been comments both positive and negative. B. Peach and I will speak with the Mayor and report back to the HDDBR next meeting.

B. Peach responded to K. Carlson’s earlier comments on the signs at Rivertown Grill and Magpie stating the Rivertown “signs” were actually photographs and did not have any wording to express the business or its function so therefore were not actually considered signs. The Magpie sign was approved based on calculations of clear versus filled areas; it’s not simply about the overall shape size, but the voids and fills.

J. Wilber reminded the HDDBR about the upcoming preservation awards in November and asked Board members to submit nominations to B. Peach. J. Wilber noted there is no additional new business from either the Board or public.

Staff Report:

October 2021 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Dana Riddle	406 E. Main St.	Aluminum sign
HMI	301 W. Second St.	Aluminum signs – one on pole on north yard west of house next to walkway & stairs; one on southeast corner of lot on rock wall
Jody Stevenson	830 East St.	Aluminum sign
Robin Keen	322 W. Main St.	Vinyl sign on window

Page 11
Historic District Board of Review
October 25, 2021

323 E. Main LLC/Colin Flynn	323-25 E. Main St.	Wood or aluminum clad wood windows
Linda Lytle	416 St. Michaels Ave.	Metal gutters, wood porch posts, & Hardie board siding (work done prior to COA – PACE project)
Jeremy McCloskey	815 E. First St.	Wood or aluminum clad wood windows, Hardie board siding & soffits
HMI	118 W. Third St.	Wooden ADA ramp located on west side (rear of property) between museum & gardens

October 2020 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completed to COA
Jeannie Batto	317 East St.	10' x 15' porch on north rear of home; replace existing door & windows with a door w/ sidelights & double hung aluminum clad window	In progress
Paul Davis	708 E. First St.	Remove 1 full-size window on enclosed east side of home & install transom; remove existing windows & install 1 double hung vinyl window; remove 2 windows @ northwest corner & install 1 double hung vinyl window; install 2 vinyl doors	In progress
Ron & Barbara Frazee	621 Walnut St.	Remove rear (west) chimney; build 5' x 13' addition	In progress
Ron & Barbara Frazee	829 W. Main St.	Remove east chimney & 2 rear (southern) chimneys; replace windows	Yes

K. McWilliams made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by J. Wade.

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW


Josh Wilber, Chair



Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist