

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

February 28, 2022

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, February 28, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following members present: Owen McCall, Thomas Stark, and Jerome Vernon. Also present was Brooke Peach – Historic Preservationist and Devon Sharpe – City Attorney.

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.

1/24/2022 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for December 20, 2021 and had any corrections or additions.

O. McCall asked to change the motion for a COA on page 1956 for 111 E. Second St. B. Peach read the amended portion of the minutes to include the corrected COA motion.

T. Stark moved to approve the minutes – seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

J. Vernon	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
T. Stark	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. John Morgan/Louis Joyner Architect – C. of A. C. of A. to rework existing second floor porch railing to meet code-required height of 36” (currently 32”).

Location: **403 W. First St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Louis Joyner was present.

L. Joyner explained the original railing and spindles would be retained but a piece of molding would be added to raise the overall height to 36”. J. Wilber asked if the molding were about 3.5” and L. Joyner stated it was about that.

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
Porch Railings and Columns	51-52		<p><i>J. Vernon</i> – Original porch railings should be rebuilt rather than removed to meet modern building codes. This project meets the guidelines.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for same reasons and this is a great solution to the problem.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p>

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022

J. Wilber asked for a motion. T. Stark made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of facts, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to John Morgan and Louis Joyner, Architect, for the proposed reworking of the second floor railings to meet code-required height of 36” by adding a molding to the top of the existing railing and also by adding the same railing to the southern exposure with both panels having the ability to be removed at 403 W. First St.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

J. Vernon	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
T. Stark	Approved
J. Wilber	Approved

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

2. Fastsigns/Mike Bath/American Legion #9 – C. of A. to retrofit existing letterboard changeable message sign on pole to 6’x3’ LED digital EVMS sign using existing pole/cabinet structure.

Location: **707 Jefferson St.**

Zoned: **General Business (GB)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Adam Dupre from Fastsigns and Mike Bath from the American Legion was present.

T. Stark noted the subcommittee meetings were not held as scheduled. B. Peach stated the first meeting had to be cancelled and there were problems with not everyone getting the second meeting email, so it too had to be cancelled.

J. Wilber stated the term periodically is too generic to specify how often the image would change. A. Dupre stated the sign could be programmed much like a slide show and that change times would be programmed. J. Vernon asked B. Peach if the HDBR or City would provide guidelines to the American Legion for the operation of the sign including specific elements such as font size. B. Peach stated both the sign ordinance and HDBR guidelines were both available on the City’s website and that although it is the duty of the property owner to have knowledge of them and conform to them, the City does diligently attempt to educate the public about them. B. Peach also noted she had conversations with both M. Bath and A. Dupre regarding the ordinance and guidelines. J. Vernon then asked who would oversee the sign to make sure it was in conformance. B. Peach stated both she and the code enforcement officer routinely looked for non-conformance issues. J. Vernon verified with A. Dupre and M. Bath they would have to conform to the ordinances and guidelines.

T. Stark noted many other historic districts do not accept LED signs. He also noted new letters for the existing sign board at the American Legion could be made using a 3D printer or that another type of sign that conforms could be created. T. Stark also verified the proposed LED sign was internally lit and A. Dupre agreed and stated the problem was not simply getting new letters but the requirement of a lift each time the letters had to be changed.

O. McCall stated he worries about future leadership at the American Legion forgetting the reasons why the limitations were put into place. Overall, it would be better to have a conforming sign. M. Bath stated he would include a copy of the sign ordinance with the Standard Operating Procedures.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022

J. Wilber stated one of his objections was the slippery slope approval of this application may cause with other business owners wanting the same type of signs because it would be difficult to see these all over the historic district. T. Stark added that current historic district businesses and sign companies have conformed to district guidelines and ordinances, and none have asked for such a sign as this one.

J. Vernon asked B. Peach if the current guidelines or ordinance specifically address LED signs. B. Peach stated while the wording LED is not included, the ordinance and guidelines do address plastic signs, animation/motion, and internal lighting.

J. Wilber asked for public comments and noted none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Signs		48-51	<p><i>T. Stark</i>– This sign is not in conformance with guidelines 2, 5, 6, & 8 because it is constructed of plastic, it is internally lit with LED light, it does not resemble a logo or symbol, and it has more than 2-3 colors. It is in conformance to guidelines 3 & 7 because it is in proportion to the building, the letters can be changed to conform to traditional styles, & it is appropriate to the style & age of the building. This is a tough one, but I just don’t believe that this particular project is in conformance with the guidelines.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with Owen on the front doors but that the side doors, while its preferable for applicants to come to the HDBR first, the doors are in conformance with the guidelines.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I disagree because the guidelines and ordinances are not specific to dynamic LED signs. It does not conform to guideline 11, but even that is only recommended. Until we have more specific guidance, this sign is okay.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree with T. Stark for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with T. Stark.</p>

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 the American Legion, Mike Bath, and Fastsigns for the proposed project to install a new LED digital EVMS sign using the existing pole and cabinet structure located at 707 Jefferson St.”

Seconded by O. McCall.

Roll Call:

- O. McCall Approved
- J. Vernon Deny
- T. Stark Approved
- J. Wilber Approved

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness was not approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.

- 3. John Heitz – C. of A. to demolish current non-historic addition & rebuild new addition to more closely match the primary historic structure.

Location: **708 E. Second St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. John Heitz was present.

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
January 24, 2022

J. Wilber asked if J. Heitz intends to rebuild the new addition on the same footprint at the old addition and J. Heitz stated it would be the same width but 15 feet longer.

J. Vernon asked if the addition had already been removed and if it would have been visible from the alley. J. Heitz stated it has and that it was visible.

O. McCall asked about the materials that would be used on the addition. J. Heitz stated the windows would be either wood or aluminum clad but that he had not decided on which type of siding to use.

J. Wilber asked for public comment and noted Ryan Rodgers. R. Rodgers stated due to the unavailability of many materials right now, he thought as long as the materials conform to the guidelines, it would be acceptable to approve several types of materials for siding rather than simply limiting it to one.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	80-81		<p><i>O. McCall</i>– New additions should be located at the rear, which this is. It should be smaller than the original & this is. It should be of compatible design & this is. It should not imitate an earlier historic style, which this does not, and it should reflect characteristics of the current building period, which it does. Overall, it fits all the guidelines for the new construction of additions. However, it does not fit the guidelines for demolition because the HDBR should not be approving something that’s already been done. It’s my stance that had you come in prior to demolition, it would have been in conformance because it’s not a historic structure.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree with O. McCall for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – This project includes restoring the windows back to the 2/2 design & restoring the original size. Since several windows are either vinyl replacements or missing, and the new windows will be aluminum clad wood, the windows are in conformance. Based on the historic photograph, you’re restoring the appearance of the historic porch, so that too is in conformance.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p>
New Construction – Additions	68		
Windows	60-63		
Porches	49-50		

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the porch railing. 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 John Heitz for the proposed porch roof, rear and lateral additions, windows, and demolition at 708 E. Second St. subject to the conditions specified in the findings of fact made previously to wit the siding will be LP or some type of smooth cement board siding, eight wood or aluminum clad 2/2 windows with the front reverting to its original historic size and shape, repaired doors, the shingle roof to remain at the same pitch, and the porch will be made of wood and be styled like the pictures submitted in the application.”

Seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

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

**Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022**

O. McCall Approved

J. Wilber Approved

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

- 4. David Cheatham & Amy Cheatham Eberwine – C. of A. to demo existing porch & railing; build new porch & railing in same location except steps will be relocated to be approx.. 2’ further to the east away from western property line.

Location: **816 W. First St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. David Cheatham was present.

T. Stark asked if the steps were to be moved in front of the door and D. Cheatham replied they would not but instead be moved to the western corner of the porch. D. Cheatham also stated the metal railing was bent, rusted through in many places, and too low to meet modern code requirements but that the intent was to replicate the current look of the concrete porch & metal railing. He also stated when the steps were removed, they discovered the left front corner of the foundation was crumbling, so they did reinstall the concrete in order to stop any other damage and provide support.

J. Wilber told D. Cheatham that in order to demolish anything, a person must either come before the HDBR or have the building inspector authorize any unsafe structure.

J. Vernon asked if the project had already been completed. B. Peach stated the concrete porch was poured but that the steps and railing have not been. J. Wilber asked why the concrete portion was not a repair/replace and B. Peach responded that since the footprint is changing, it would not be considered a repair/replace.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49-50		<i>J. Vernon</i> – After reading the guidelines, the demolition of the existing porch and the replacement of the porch and railings are in conformance. <i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree for same reasons. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree for same reasons.

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the porch roof. 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 David Cheatham and Amy Eberwine for the proposed demolition of the existing porch and railings and new concrete construction of the front porch with aluminum railings at a height of 36” and including the relocation of the steps approximately 2-3’ to the east from the current location on the west side of the porch located at 816 W. First St.”

Seconded by J. Vernon.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Approved

J. Vernon Approved

O. McCall Approved

J. Wilber Approved

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

- 5. Suzanne Hollinger – C. of A. to amend 2018 COA and add one faux balcony made of iron and reclaimed wood; install vinyl windows in the existing openings on the north facade.

Location: **310 Broadway St.** Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Suzanne Hollinger and Larry were present.

S. Hollinger stated this application was to modify the previously approved 2018 COA for faux balconies and doors to an additional faux balcony made of reclaimed wood and wrought iron and windows instead of doors. She also stated that she had already purchased the new windows, which were vinyl, due to her understanding she was able to install. S. Hollinger also noted her contractor, Larry Childress, would be wrapping the exterior parts of the windows with aluminum so that the new windows would be aluminum clad vinyl. J. Wilber asked who told S. Hollinger she could install the vinyl windows and S. Hollinger declined to name the person. B. Peach noted this staff approval was in dispute.

J. Wilber asked what material the previous windows were constructed of and L. Childress stated they did not know. J. Wilber then asked B. Peach if the previous COA specified which windows would be installed. B. Peach stated the 2018 COA was for doors and faux balconies but not windows.

O. McCall noted that in 2018, the faux balconies were supposed to be inset 6'. S. Hollinger stated that's not what she wanted. B. Peach stated the 2018 COA specified 2 8' wide x 6' deep. T. Stark clarified the proposed faux balconies would not be designed to hold weight and S. Hollinger agreed. T. Stark asked what the balcony measurements would be and S. Hollinger replied they would fit inside the window frame opening and extend no more than 24" out.

O. McCall asked what type of muntins the windows had. S. Hollinger nor L. Childress knew. B. Peach stated based on the photos, they appear to be internal.

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
Windows		56-59	<p><i>O. McCall</i>– Our guidelines do not address aluminum clad vinyl. Since the muntins are internal and our guidelines address snap on muntins, that is satisfied. Overall, the proposed windows do satisfy the guidelines. In regards to the faux balconies, there was nothing originally there but you are picking something that is period appropriate. The guidelines don't specifically address such things, but it is in conformance to guideline 5.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree for same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – The fact you will not name the staff person makes a big difference for me because we cannot ask that person if in fact they were previously approved. Adding the faux balconies creates a false sense of development, so I do not think those would be appropriate or in conformance. Our guidelines do not support vinyl windows, so I disagree.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I do not agree because these faux balconies would not have been installed during this period on a livery stable and they may cause an issue with traffic through the alley.</p>
Porch Columns & Railings		51-52	

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the porch railing. O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022

COA to Suzanne Hollinger for the three proposed Juliet style balconies with a 24” maximum extension beyond the exterior wall and approve the vinyl windows but with the conditions specified in the findings of fact which is these vinyl windows will actually be aluminum clad on top of the vinyl.”

Seconded by J. Vernon.

Roll Call:

T. Stark	Deny
J. Vernon	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
J. Wilber	Deny

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

6. Michael Rawert – C. of A. to rebuild the rear addition on the same foundation but two-stories tall to replicate the duplex design; add wood windows and steel doors in new openings to the newly built rear addition.

Location: **811 E. Second St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Michael Rawert was present.

M. Rawert noted he had received a building permit in 2021 and that he thought since he had received an unsafe structure declaration to remove the previous addition and the current addition was being built on the same footprint, he did not need a COA. J. Wilber asked D. Sharpe to look at the building permit.

D. Sharpe stated due to the permit, the application did not need to be heard by the HDBR. The application was dismissed.

5. John Bruns – C. of A. to demolish existing single story rear addition; build new two-story rear addition with side front porch.

Location: **1001 W. First St.**

Zoned: **Historic District Residential (HDR)**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Ryan Rodgers was present.

J. Wilber asked if the addition was single story with a garage underneath making it two-story total and R. Rodgers stated it was. J. Wilber also noted the increased size of the proposed new addition would make it visible from the front of the house as well as the side but that it would not be taller than the original primary structure. T. Stark asked if the roof pitch on the primary historic structure would change and R. Rodgers stated it would not.

T. Stark noted the guidelines call for additions to be smaller and simpler but that this proposed addition would be nearly three times as large as the primary historic structure. R. Rodgers stated it was necessary to accommodate the floorplan desired by John Bruns. J. Vernon noted the current rear addition appeared on the 1886 Sanborn Map. R. Rodgers stated the addition was historic and that it had once had a side porch that had been framed in but that due to the deteriorated state of the property, roofing problems caused water to run off onto the primary historic structure and cause some damage but that that problem would be fixed with the proposed addition.

T. Stark asked what types of materials would be used in the new addition construction (e.g., doors, windows, siding). R. Rodgers stated the previous owner had purchased, and left at the

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022

grant and K. McWilliams stated they had. K. McWilliams also pointed out the two neighboring homes had vinyl windows. O. McCall stated the windows did not look to meet the 80% deterioration rating required for replacement, but K. McWilliams replied they were. O. McCall asked about the possibility of doing just 2-3 windows at a time, but K. McWilliams stated that was not feasible.

T. Stark asked about the plans to demolish the central chimney. K. McWilliams stated the interior floorplan would necessitate the removal of the chimney support inside, so there would be no support left to hold it up and that it would most likely fall during that part of construction. J. Vernon stated he believed the central chimney not to be original due to the brick showing.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition		71	<p><i>T. Stark</i>– The guidelines clearly state chimneys are important and should be maintained or even rebuilt or repaired if necessary, so the removal of either the central or rear chimney is not in conformance. The removal of the brick between the porch columns is in conformance with the guidelines because it will help to restore the original appearance of the house. It’s obvious the rear addition is in a severe state of deterioration, so it does conform to the guidelines. The windows do not conform to guidelines 1, 3, & 5 because they will be vinyl.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree with T. Stark with the exception of the chimney demolition because I do not believe the central chimney to be historic.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with J. Vernon.</p>
New Construction - Additions		68	

J. Wilber asked for a motion. J. Vernon made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Carrie Parris / Oystercatcher for the purpose of removing the southern chimney, demolishing the rear addition, removing the brick railing, and replacement of the windows located at 312 Poplar St. subject to the conditions specified in the findings of fact.”

Seconded by J. Wilber.

Roll Call:

T. Stark Deny

J. Vernon Approved

O. McCall Deny

J. Wilber Deny

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

- Patrick Lynch – C. of A. to rebuild roof with 6/12 standing seam gable roof; increase west wall by 8” to correct structural issues; move porch door 3’ & replace door; replace 1 wood window w/ aluminum clad window; replace 1 3’x5’ aluminum clad window w/ 4’x2.5’ aluminum clad window; replace north door w/ new composite door; install 6’x8’ French doors with side lites on south side of home; replace Dutch lap vinyl siding w/ board & batten vinyl siding.

Page 10
 Historic District Board of Review
 February 28, 2022

Location: **820 Fillmore St.**
(HDR)

Zoned: **Historic District Residential**

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. B. Peach also noted a modification to the application received earlier in the day to add an additional 2' to the previously approved front addition. Patrick Lynch was present.

B. Peach noted she disagreed with the NHL survey data which dated the house as c. 1990 and instead stated she believed the house to be c. 1925. P. Lynch agree with B. Peach.

T. Stark asked if the historic rear door would be replaced with a new door and P. Lynch stated it would but noted it was not very visible from the street. T. Stark also asked if the historic wood siding that was uncovered would remain. P. Lynch stated the wood siding could not be repaired and that because there was vinyl siding on the house before, he wanted to replace it with board and batten style vinyl siding.

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
Demolition		71	<p><i>O. McCall</i>– Although historic doors should be maintained and retained, which you are not doing, the door is one that is not visible from any public right of way and it would be awkward given where it is because it will look very different than the new door on the same wall, so it is in conformance. In regards to the demolition, you are proposing to add 8” to the west wall and this, too, is in conformance. The new windows are of aluminum clad wood and also fit the guidelines. The new addition does not adhere to the guidelines because it’s on the front, but it is so minor a change and essentially just expands the already approved addition by 2’, so it is okay. The existing standing seam roof will be replaced with another standing seam roof, but with minor pitch modification and eave extension, so that as well is fine. The siding will be changed from clabbered style vinyl to board and batten style vinyl but it is a complete removal of what was there and the style is changing drastically, so it is not within the guidelines.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree with everything except that I do think the vinyl siding is within the guidelines because regardless of style, he’s replacing vinyl with vinyl.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree with O. McCall for the same reasons.</p> <p><i>J. Wilber</i> – I agree with J. Vernon.</p>
New Construction - Additions		68	

J. Wilber asked for a motion for the porch railing. 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 Patrick Lynch for the proposed demolition of the west wall and reconstruction of 8” to make the roofline symmetrical, demolition of the roof and reconstruction with a new 6/12 pitch with a new standing seam roof, 2 new aluminum clad 2’x4’ wood windows on the east and west side (1 each), replacement of the vinyl siding with board and batten vinyl siding, replacement of the back door and front door with a new fiberglass and glass door, construction of an addition from 3’ to 5’ for additional space in the bathroom, moving the rear porch door by 3’ removing the historic door and transom filling it in with siding and installing a new door that will match the French doors next to it located at 820 Fillmore Alley.”

Seconded by J. Vernon.

Roll Call:

Page 11
 Historic District Board of Review
 February 28, 2022

T. Stark Deny
 J. Vernon Approved
 O. McCall Deny
 J. Wilber Approved

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

Old/New Business:

There was no new or old business before the HDBR.

Staff Report:

February 2022 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Blue Wolf Vape	109 E. Main St.	Fabric awning sign
Zachary Lee	101 E. Main St.	Projecting sign & vinyl window signs
John DeLuca	210 W. Second St.	Exterior storm windows
Rodney Pettit	901 W. First St.	New aluminum clad windows to match historic openings

February 2021 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
Donald & Tamara Courtney	709 E. First St.	20'x17' garage at rear with vinyl siding & windows, fiberglass shingles & steel door	Yes
Kim & Jeff Kennard	506 E. Main St.	12'x16' porch on southeast rear	Yes
Charles Requet	737 Jefferson	Demolish shed	Yes
Richard & Sallie Plass	811 W. First St.	Add 3' to rear porch, enclosing 10'x10' area with vinyl siding, sliding doors, & EPDM roof	Yes
William Tandy	1017 Park Ave.	Build new home	In progress

O. McCall made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by T. Stark.

Meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Page 12
Historic District Board of Review
February 28, 2022

Josh Wilber, Chair

Brooke Peach
Historic Preservationist