

June 25, 2022

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.

5/23/2022 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for May 23, 2022 and had any corrections or additions. O. McCall requested to remove the duplicate comments on page 1987. B. Peach made the appropriate changes.

T. Stark moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman

O. McCall

T. Stark

J. Wilber

C. Rogers

S. Palmer

Minutes stand approved.

Special Presentation:

The HDBR heard a presentation about the historic district survey update.

Applications:

1. Bobby Cook / Betty Walters – C. of A. to replace asphalt shingle roof with a metal roof.
Location: **130 Mulberry St.** Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. It was also noted that the decorative bargeboard on the west façade and a central chimney were removed without approval when the roof was replaced. Bobby Cook was present.

B. Cook stated both the roof and chimney were in deteriorated condition and were leaking. He further stated it was cost prohibitive for the homeowner to repair the chimney, so he removed it. The bargeboard, he stated, fell off during the application of the roofing trim, but that a new piece of decorative bargeboard made to the same specifications as the historic piece would be installed in about four weeks.

J. Wilber asked B. Cook if he'd obtained a COA or permission from the City in any way to do this project. B. Cook stated he did not and was not aware that properties off of Main Street needed HDBR review or a COA. M. Pittman asked if there was a fireplace on the interior that was connected to the chimney and B. Cook stated there was not. T. Stark reiterated that nearly

the entire downtown area was in the historic district boundaries and that any work done within that area must be approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53-54		<p><i>T. Stark</i> – The existing roof was asphalt and it was changed out to the exposed fastener metal roof, but our guidelines state original roof forms should be preserved and maintained. You mentioned there had previously been a slate roof, then asphalt, so it sounds like there's been several different styles on this home. Slate should be repaired, but if it's not practical, then another appropriate material should be used. It does sound like at least part of the home had an exposed fastener metal roof, so from that perspective, it makes sense to go ahead with that type of roofing all over. The bargeboard is a significant architectural feature of this house and others downtown. Once historic material is lost, it's gone forever. You can try to replicate it but it's not historic material. I am glad, however, you are going to try to replicate this and put it back up. It should match as closely as possible to the materials, size, and shape of the historic bargeboard. Since you are putting that back up, it is in conformance with our guidelines. Chimneys are critical to the architectural appearance and looking at the photos of that chimney, it does not appear to be in bad condition. It should have been restored and not taken down, so that one is not in compliance with the guidelines.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i>– In this situation, it's better to ask for approval first rather than to ask for forgiveness afterwards. I'm sure you'll do that in the future. You may have gotten approval for the exposed fastener roof because it was on some portions of the roof.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – The work is not in conformance and to not even come in and ask for a COA, likewise. I know the work is already done, but it's not in compliance. Chimneys on a shotgun without a fireplace do nothing but serve as a place to leak and you can't rebuild a masonry chimney; either you have to do faux brick or paint something to look like brick. You putting back the bargeboard, especially out of poplar, is a big sign of good faith.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I know B. Cook is an experienced contractor, so it surprises me that he did this work without going through the proper channels and getting approvals first. This type of behavior has got to stop because one day someone is going to put on an unapproved material and have to remove it. Also, it's the analogy similar to someone putting one cheap vinyl window in a house without approval, then wanting to replace all the windows with cheap vinyl because of the one that was previously put in. We cannot allow that.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree with S. Palmer & M. Pittman in that since there was no fireplace below the chimney, I don't miss it as much as I do the bargeboard. I do appreciate you putting it back because there is a house across the street that has similar detailing as you would expect to see on these type houses.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with O. McCall's comments. I'm not pleased that you did the work without approvals, but I do appreciate and understand that you're here facing the music. Taking down the chimney was pretty significant and I believe you knew it. To not even call the building inspector to come to at the chimney.</p>
Architectural Features			
Chimneys			

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
June 25, 2022

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Bobby Cook and Betty Walters for the proposed already installed exposed fastener metal roof located at 130 Mulberry St.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

O. McCall Denied

M. Pittman Approved

T. Stark Approved

J. Wilber Denied

C. Rogers Approved

S. Palmer Denied

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

J. Wilber asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Bobby Cook and Betty Walters for the proposed replacement of a decorative bargeboard located at 130 Mulberry St.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Roll Call:

O. McCall Approved

M. Pittman Approved

T. Stark Approved

J. Wilber 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

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a COA to Bobby Cook and Betty Walters for the removal of the chimney on the property at 130 Mulberry St.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

O. McCall Approved

M. Pittman Deny

T. Stark Approved

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

- Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

D. Cheatham explained the kitchen addition has composite siding on the exterior, so the new addition would have siding to match that and the roof would tie in to the existing roof of the primary structure.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Discussion	
	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #
New Construction - Additions	68	
<p><i>S. Palmer</i> – The project is in conformance because of the orientation and design.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – The house currently has vinyl windows, so you're wanting to put in vinyl windows on this addition. It seems like once a house has vinyl windows it's like it's now vaccinated against any complaint that we just go with vinyl windows from that point on. The guidelines don't allow for vinyl windows. I would like to encourage you to put in real wood windows or aluminum clad wood windows because when those vinyl windows start sagging and drying which they will do, we can go back in the other direction. We would hopefully like to eventually get this house where it'll have all high-quality windows.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I have no problem with the vinyl window. If you get a good quality vinyl window, it'll last as long as anything else I think.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree with S. Palmer and O. McCall.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree with O. McCall, we need to start going in the right direction in regards to vinyl windows. Everything about the addition is in conformance.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with M. Pittman and C. Rogers on this one. All your other windows are vinyl and this one is going on the back. Vinyl windows have come a long way. I do agree aluminum clad is better, but we're looking at the other materials too. Right now, vinyl windows are not approvable under our guidelines, so it's a point of contention, especially when you don't have a lot of windows.</p>		

roof and other addition to match the rest of the home located at 816 W. First St.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Abstain
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

J. Wilber asked for a motion. J. Wilber made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to install the vinyl windows that match the rest of the home at 816 W. First St.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Deny
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Deny
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

3. Randy Eggenstill – C. of A. to build a roof over the existing deck using wood framing and metal roofing.
Location: **813 W. First St.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Randy Eggenstill was present.

R. Eggenstill stated that in 2013, after speaking with the building inspector at that time, he did not need a permit to build a pergola type roof over the interior portion of the rear deck, so one was built. He further stated originally he placed a membrane mesh roof on top, but the following year, placed a metal roof on the top. R. Eggenstill stated he noted deterioration and began to replace the entire structure without filing for a COA because he thought it would be considered a repair/replace but that the current building inspector asked him to stop work and file for the proper permits and COA due to received complaints.

J. Wilber asked R. Eggenstill how long a metal roof had been installed on the porch pergola roof and R. Eggenstill replied since 2014. J. Wilber also asked if R. Eggenstill had received anything in writing from the previous building inspector and R. Eggenstill stated he had not. M. Pittman asked if the footprint had been altered at all and R. Eggenstill stated it had not.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

T. Stark asked the size of the porch roof structure. R. Eggenspieler stated 10'5" x 10'2".

J. Wilber asked for public comment. B. Peach read comments received from Ben and Becky Canida regarding concerns about the pitch of the roof and drainage issues as well as structural anchor points which had previously caused damage to the neighboring structures. R. Eggenpiller responded that the beams were anchored into the siding portion of the structure but that it had not caused damage and that the roof had proper drainage measures in place. O. McCall asked what the roof pitch was and R. Eggenpiller replied 1/12.

Ken McWilliams also gave comment stating he thought non-historic structures should not be under the purview of the HDBR but up to the building inspector solely. He also stated the Eggenstiller's were good neighbors and that he supported their application.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction - Additions	68		<p><i>O. McCall</i> – There’s really not guidelines for adding a roof over a porch, but the guidelines we do have recommend additions be on the rear and this is. It’s also smaller and simpler. The remainder of the guidelines are not applicable. This project is in conformance with the guidelines.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with O. McCall but I would like to add I believe this is a repair/replace job and should not be here.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree with M. Pittman.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with M. Pittman. This is a different one in that we’re reviewing a project that’s been there for years. Although it didn’t get the proper permits in 2014, it now becomes more of a replacement, but I also do understand why it’s considered new construction</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree because it’s on the rear and the materials are compatible.</p>

J. Wilber 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 Randy Eggenstiller for the proposed roof covering of the rear deck at 816 W. First St."

Seconded by M. Pitman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

4. Bryan & Tara Pierce – C. of A. to replace existing windows with vinyl; infill two doors on the front porch and replace one window on the porch with a doorway opening.
- Location: 1107 W. Main St.**
- Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)**

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant, noting the project had been completed. Bryan and Tara Pierce were present.

B. Pierce stated they had consulted with B. Peach prior to starting the project and was given a COA for the new front window but that because there were three different types of window materials, wood, aluminum, and vinyl, they were confused on which window material to use, so they used vinyl. J. Wilber asked why they installed vinyl windows without approval. T. Pierce stated it was their understanding that as long as the size and grid pattern were the same, so they just chose a single material and replaced all the windows with vinyl. T. Stark reminded the applicants and the audience that any change to the exterior of the home required a COA. J. Wilber stated materials are very important.

T. Stark stated the infill on the porch altered the historic architectural character of the home and that the guidelines don't specifically address such infill, they do state doors and windows should remain in their original positions. That implies there shouldn't be infill. Since there were two doors on the front porch, was this a duplex? B. Pierce stated the home was a single-family residence when they purchased it.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56-58		<i>M. Pittman</i> – The cement board siding meets the guidelines and is a big improvement over the aluminum siding. In looking at the windows, I recognize that front window was an issue given its large size and you're trying to make sense of all the different materials, so I know there are varying opinions on this board about vinyl and I'll leave those comments to them, but I see no issue with the vinyl windows. Replacing it was a good idea. We don't like to infill doors and windows, but with this house, it makes sense what you did. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> – I do not agree. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with M. Pittman. I do not like it being done ahead of time and I know you've already heard that, but rather than relying on advice from other people, meet with B. Peach or look up the guidelines. The other problem is too is as things get changed, it's hard to know what was original. I know you're trying to make things look good but we have a historic property and we want to preserve that and keep the historic designation of our downtown. <i>O. McCall</i> – I do not agree. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I do not agree.
Windows	60-63		
Doors & Entrances	39		

J. Wilber 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 for the project as proposed."

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Deny
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Deny
J. Wilber	Approved

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

S. Palmer	Deny
C. Rogers	Approved

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

5. Brandon Taylor – C. of A. to build a 24’x14’ addition on the rear of the home with vinyl windows and vinyl siding to match the rest of the home.
Location: **1306 W. Second St.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Brandon Taylor was present.

J. Wilber asked if the addition would be on a concrete slab and B. Taylor replied it would be elevated so there would be a crawl space underneath. J. Wilber asked how many windows and B. Taylor replied four. J. Wilber asked if there was an alley behind the home and B. Taylor replied there was and that the addition would come off the rear of the home and extend north toward the alley between the garage and the house. J. Wilber confirmed the rest of the house had vinyl windows and vinyl siding. B. Taylor stated he got quotes to change the siding on the whole home, but it was not feasible. J. Wilber asked if B. Taylor looked at aluminum clad or wood windows and B. Taylor stated he did but that it did not make financial sense to do it when the rest of the home had vinyl.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Additions	68		<p><i>T. Stark</i> – New additions should be compatible in terms of height, scale, materials, and setback and all of that is in conformance. There will also be minimal change to the historic structure, which is what is appropriate when adding additions. It should also be visually compatible to neighboring buildings and it is. The only thing I will say is we’ve been talking vinyl all night, but your home is all vinyl, so it wouldn’t be appropriate for us to request for you to remove all the vinyl. You’ve kept a lot of the historic character, especially on the porch, and there may be even more of it under the vinyl. Overall, you’re in conformance with our guidelines.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I know the vinyl issue has been discussed, and I don’t mean to beat it to death, but other than that, it will be located on the rear, is of the right scale, and it will look like the rest of the house, so I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>M. Pitman</i>– I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. I also want to say this addition will be hard to see from the street. It will be seen from the alley, but it’ll match the rest of the home.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Brandon Taylor for the proposed application to build a 12’x24’ addition on the rear of the house with four vinyl windows and vinyl siding to match existing materials on the rest of the home located at 1306 W. Second St.”

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

5. Riverside Group LLC – C. of A. to build new 1012ft² single-family home using LP smart siding, wood, aluminum clad wood windows, and asphalt shingles.

Location: **410 St. Michael's Ave.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Debbie Snodgrass and Lisa Hammock were present.

T. Stark asked if the home would be elevated on pylons and Lisa Hammock stated the home would be on a solid foundation. O. McCall asked if the roof would be standing seam and D. Snodgrass stated it would actually be asphalt shingle.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Additions	68		<i>S. Palmer</i> – The proposed home is compatible in terms of size, materials, height, scale, neighboring structures, and roof shape. It will be oriented toward the major street and the garage will be facing the alley and in the rear of the structure. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for the same reasons. I would also like to state that construction on empty lots is encouraged and this home will fit well in the neighborhood and in the historic district. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. I echo Tom’s comments and thank you for this beautiful design. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

J. Wilber 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 Riverside Group for the proposed 1012ft² home using LP smart siding, aluminum clad windows, and asphalt shingles at 410 St. Michael’s Ave.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

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

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

J. Wilber Approved
S. Palmer Approved
C. Rogers Approved

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

6. Deborah & Dale Anderson – C. of A. to build a new two-story house to include first floor parking shop and storage area due to narrow lot; second floor residence; size/number of windows subject to change; stone façade area subject to change; plans may change to be garage only subject to sewer evaluation.
Location: **417 Presbyterian Ave.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Debbie and Dale Anderson were present.

D. Anderson stated they would conform to 3’ setbacks and that they were asking for two plans to be approved because they were still evaluating the sewer situation. J. Wilber asked what type of shop would be located on the first level and D. Anderson stated it would be a personal garage space. C. Rogers asked if the entrance into the residential level would be an interior stairway. D. Anderson stated it would be as well as an elevator. C. Rogers also asked if the very modern design would be a distraction in the neighborhood and against the guidelines. T. Stark stated the guidelines encourage modern design on new structures. J. Wilber asked if there was any way to put the garage door on the rear and D. Anderson stated due to the lot size, there was not.

O. McCall asked B. Peach to read the staff report comments. B. Peach read the conformance section of the staff report. S. Palmer noted at least three houses on the same street that had front-facing garages. O. McCall noted that although the front-facing garage was technically against the guidelines, it couldn’t be more compatible with the surrounding area.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted Jan Vethrus. J. Vethrus stated some very prominent African Americans in Madison owned the property and several of the surrounding properties and that she was concerned about such a modern structure. She asked the applicants to be sensitive regarding their structure and the double Federal structure located next door.

J. Wilber also noted Mary Allen. M. Allen stated there were several homes along the street that had front-facing garages.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Infill	69-70		<i>O. McCall</i> – New construction infill should be compatible in terms of height, materials, setbacks, proportions, and roof form. In regards to roof forms, it is different. It is oriented to the major street. Garages should be oriented to the rear, but with this property, that is not possible. Given all of that, this project is in conformance to the guidelines. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons. I would also like to add the roof line is compatible with a single-family structure because it’s essentially half of the roof line of the nearby doubles. <i>M. Pitman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

Seconded by S. Palmer.

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

7. Riverfront Development Commission – C. of A. to build new viewing platform (super overlook) on the site of the existing viewing platform; demolish existing platform.

Location: **120+ E. Vaughn Dr.**
 Zoned: **Open Space (OS)**

8. Louis Joyner Architect – C. of A. to add painted metal spiral staircase to porch renovation project on the west side of home behind the porch and landscaping, making it minimally visible from the street and to provide another means of egress from the bedroom.

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

L. Joyner stated the staircase would be modest, painted black, and be screened by landscaping so that it would be barely visible from the street. T. Stark asked if any additional landscaping was going in and L. Joyner stated there would not be because there was already a lot of landscaping on that side.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Additions	68		<p><i>M. Pittman</i>– This staircase is a great idea because it will provide another means of a fire escape. The guidelines state exterior stairs should be screened and this one is and should not damage architectural features and this will not because it will be located outside of the home. And they’re constructed of metal, so everything meets the guidelines.</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>

Page 12
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

			<i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.
--	--	--	--

J. Wilber 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 John Morgan at 403 W. First St. to construct a spiral staircase as proposed.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved
S. Palmer	Approved
C. Rogers	Approved

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

9. City of Madison – C. of A. to demolish the non-historic structure.
Location: **822 E. First St.**
Zoned: **General Business (GB)**
- B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tony Steinhardt was present.
- T. Steinhardt stated the City was asking to demolish the building as part of the Gateway Improvement Project using ReadI funds, which were not as much as expected, so the originally planned comfort station and restrooms planned will not be located here. Instead, the site will serve as a small parking lot with landscaping.
- S. Palmer asked B. Peach about the demolition ordinance requiring notice. B. Peach responded that was only for non-rated buildings when the HDBR denied a COA for demolition.
- J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	71-72		<i>T. Stark</i> – Our guidelines state demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district and this building obviously does not. Potential reuse or sale of the building should be explored as should mothballing, but it's not a historic building. The project is in conformance with the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

Page 13
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to the City of Madison for the proposed demolition of a non-historic building located at 822 E. First St.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Wilber Approved

S. Palmer Approved

C. Rogers Approved

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

12. City of Madison – C. of A. to demolish the non-historic structure.

Location: **150 Harrison St.**

Zoned: **General Business (GB)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tony Steinhardt was present.

J. Wilber stated with the new survey update, the number of demolitions are counted, but it is important to note that of the 72, most, like the previous and these next two, are non-historic non-contributing buildings.

T. Steinhardt added this site will be landscaped and used for a new public art installation.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	71-72		<i>S. Palmer</i> – Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district and this building does not, so this project is in conformance with the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> - I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

J. Wilber 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 the City of Madison for the demolition of a non-historic building located at 150 Harrison St.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

Page 14
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

- T. Stark

Approved
- M. Pittman

Approved
- O. McCall

Approved
- J. Wilber

Approved
- S. Palmer

Approved
- C. Rogers

Approved

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

12. City of Madison – C. of A. to demolish the non-historic structure.
Location: **150 Harrison St.**

Zoned: **General Business (GB)**
- B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tony Steinhardt was present.
- J. Wilber stated with the new survey update, the number of demolitions are counted, but it is important to note that of the 72, most, like the previous and these next two, are non-historic non-contributing buildings.
- T. Steinhardt added this site will be landscaped and used for a new public art installation.
- J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	71-72		<i>O. McCall</i> – Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district and this building does not, so this project is in conformance with the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> - I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

J. Wilber 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 the City of Madison for the demolition of a non-historic building located at 150 Harrison St.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

- T. Stark

Approved
- M. Pittman

Approved
- O. McCall

Approved

Page 15
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

J. Wilber Approved
S. Palmer Approved
C. Rogers Approved

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

12. City of Madison – C. of A. to demolish the non-historic structure. Zoned: **Open Space (OS)**
Location: **400 W. Vaughn Dr.**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Tony Steinhardt was present.

T. Steinhardt added this structure is what most people know as the Crystal Beach bathrooms. The new remodel has allowed for bathrooms in the primary structure and the repairs needed for this one to be make it ADA compliant and functional are expensive and unnecessary.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	71-72		<i>O. McCall</i> – Demolition may be appropriate if the building does not contribute to the historic character of the district and this building does not. It cannot be reused or sold and the denial of demolition would not cause economic hardship. Demolishing it is completely within the guidelines. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> - I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

J. Wilber 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 the City of Madison for the demolition of a non-historic building located at 150 Harrison St.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved
M. Pittman Approved
O. McCall Approved
J. Wilber Approved
S. Palmer Approved
C. Rogers Approved

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

Location: 701 Broadway Ave.

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Katie Mason was present.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Signs		48-51	<p><i>M. Pitman</i> – Commercial businesses traditionally have a variety of sign designs and placements and so does KDH. Signs should be of traditional materials and these are metal, which doesn't really fit the guidelines but you're replacing what's already there. Signs should be in proportion to the building and these are. They are larger than the ordinance allows but they're replacing signs of the same size. Our guidelines encourage signs that resemble logos and these will have the logos. Signs should have no more than three colors and traditional lettering and these do. And the lettering sizes are appropriate. These meet the guidelines.</p> <p><i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with O. McCall that it is not in conformance, but given the current sign's size and the location, I find it acceptable.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – Signs number one and three are fine, but sign two is too big. It's more than 24 square feet so it violates our ordinance.</p>

Seconded by C. Rogers.

T. Stark
Approved

O. McCall *Approved*

J. Wilber
Approved

Page 17
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

S. Palmer Approved

C. Rogers Approved

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

14. Signarama Dixie – C. of A. to install signage at several Norton King’s Daughter’s Health properties.
Location: **630 N. Broadway Ave.** Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Katie Mason was present.

J. Wilber noted the same issues as the previous application in that the signs were over ordinance size limit. K. Mason noted the freestanding sign would be placed on the same posts as the existing sign. M. Pittman noted the larger sign size would be helpful to people going to the downtown KDH medical facility.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Signs		48-51	<i>T. Stark</i> – As we said earlier, the signs are going to be made of metal with acrylic lettering, which is in conformance with the guidelines. Lettering, colors, and placement location are in conformance. While two of the three signs are over size by our ordinance, they are replacing existing signs of the same size, so it is in conformance. <i>C. Rogers</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for the same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with T. Stark. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Signarama Dixie for the proposed application to install a new sign made of metal and acrylic or vinyl sized approximately to the specifications as determined by the application and the guidelines located at 630 N. Broadway Ave.”

Seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Wilber Approved

S. Palmer Approved

C. Rogers Approved

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

Old/New Business:

J. Vethrus spoke about the significance of the 707 Walnut St. because it was owned by William Anderson, a prominent figure in Madison’s Underground Railroad history. She asked for an inspection prior to the demolition to document the age, condition, and materials.

M. Pittman mentioned 123 Mill St. project that was approved in November 2021 to install a retaining wall. Currently, the site has a rock wall and three unapproved structures. M. Pittman asked B. Peach to have HDBR attorney D. Sharpe send a letter about the structure violation and pending retaining wall project.

Staff Report:

June 2022 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Bryan & Tara Pierce	1107 W. Main St.	Replace existing aluminum siding with smooth side LP cementitious siding of the same reveal (w/ conditions)
Mary Ann Jacobs	923 W. Main St.	Replace existing vinyl siding with smooth LP SmartSide lap siding
Jody Bennett	102 Walnut St.	Replace sliding garage doors with new doors that replicate the historic appearance of typical garage doors of that period; install wood windows on garage; replace garage & porch shingle roofs with standing seam metal roofs
J. Michael & Starla Raley	427 Mulberry St.	Replace c. 1930 wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows (4/4 in front top, 2/2 in front bottom windows, 1/1 on remaining facades)
Ryan Rodgers	804 E. First St.	Install 3’ wood picket fence on all four sides of the property
John & Melanie Harrell	313 W. Third St.	Remove existing screen door at the front entrance & replace with a full-view glass storm door; remove existing non-historic metal garage door on west end of garage & replace with a new metal garage door
Signarama Dixie	701 Broadway Ave.	Install 42”x84” aluminum sign w/ vinyl letters flat on the building; install 24”x24” aluminum sign on existing frame w/ 12’x12” surveillance sign mounted below
Signarama Dixie	600 West St.	Install 48”x96” , 36”x60” , & 24”x24” aluminum sign w/ acrylic letters flat on the building or freestanding

Page 19
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022

Signarama Dixie	630 N. Broadway Ave.	Install 6 12"x18", 24"x36", & 3 24"x24" aluminum signs w/ vinyl letters flat on the building or freestanding
Sandra Bailey	736 W. Third St.	Remove canvas awnings, replace 14' wood picket fence with a wrought iron fence, replace front porch & rear porch deck wood floor with composite deck flooring, and add a wrought iron handrail on the front porch
Historic Madison Inc.	118 W. Third St.	Install a salvaged historic iron fence on south side of property along the Third St. frontage in order to restore the original historic appearance of a fenced yard
Dwight Lindsay	719 W. Second St.	Install either LP smart or Hardie board siding over the existing asbestos siding
Signarama Dixie	201 Milton St.	Remove existing "Maintenance" sign & replace it with a new aluminum panel sign
Chris Heitz	323 Mulberry St.	Install a 25"x48" internally illuminated projecting sign
Signarama Dixie	621 West St.	Remove an existing fence sign & replace with a 36"x60" aluminum welded box sign w/ 1/2" acrylic letters

June 2021 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
Gary Zaveri	831 E. Main St.	Install 5'x6' freestanding sign on hill	Yes
Howard & Lisa Cutshall	907 & 909 W. Second St.	Install vinyl windows on the side & rear of the building	Installed aluminum clad instead
Jacqueline Matteson (Maggie Brim)	219-21 Walnut St.	Demolish rear chimney	Yes
Dave Patterson	107 E. Fifth St.	Build a porch the same length of home	In progress
Riverside Group, LLC (Lisa Hammock)	1128 W. Second St.	Demolish home & garage	Yes

M. Pittman made a motion to adjourn the meeting -- seconded by J. Wilber.

Meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Page 20
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2022



Josh Wilber, Chair



Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist