

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

April 15, 2019

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a special meeting on Monday, April 15, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Valecia Crisafulli presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Josh Wilber, Sonny Ash, Susan Schmidt, Owen McCall, John Collins, and Betsy Lyman. Also present: Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.

Business - New:

V. Crisafulli laid out process to be followed for the meeting. V. Crisafulli opened floor for comments.

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Demolition	Elks building is a building where it is returning to the value, but it doesn't have anything to do with the owners' return on economic value. There is a return on its value to the community. (O. McCall expressed surprise to this interpretation because he felt it meant return on value to the owner.)	Valecia
Demolition	J. Wilber stated he thought it was also economic return to the owner. J. Wilber stated this only occurs if the board fails to approve the demolition. J. Wilber didn't feel like the board has gone through the process properly.	Josh
Demolition	S. Schmidt asked why secondary non-contributing structures need approval for demolition. J. Wilber stated it was because of the way the ordinance was written.	Susan
Demolition	J. Collins stated the board should consider items which can be fast-tracked.	John
Demolition	J. Wilber asked about the definition of return on value	Josh
Demolition	O. McCall stated the state code has it appraised by a qualified real estate appraiser.	Owen
Demolition	S. Schmidt asked if the board could look at the taxes or how it is appraised	Susan
Demolition	If someone can calculate the price of the improvements and how much the property would be worth with them compared to the cost, if that property value is less than the cost of the improvements then they don't have a return on value	John
Demolition	if a dollar more than the appraisal is offered then is that an economic return	Betsy
Demolition	is there value in doing something for the common good with properties staying in tact rather than allowing developers to tear buildings down to flip lots (B. Lyman stated the criteria covers then question in balancing the public and the owner.)	Valecia
Demolition	V. Crisafulli asked if the new process of going through the criteria in the finding of fact worked at the last meeting. Board agreed.	Valecia
Demolition	change order of the criteria and move A to the bottom	Betsy
Demolition	Discussion on character defining features and how the board determines if the building is still contributing	Owen, Betsy, and Sonny

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

April 15, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Recommended/Not Recommended	wording is not strong enough	Valecia
Recommended/Not Recommended	shouldn't the wording be more flexible	Owen
Recommended/Not Recommended	I think the language should be appropriate and not appropriate (V. Crisafulli and B. Lyman agreed)	Sonny
Recommended/Not Recommended	items underneath each category should be carefully determined because the guidelines are not law	Josh
Recommended/Not Recommended	the guidelines inform the decision of the board and are more than just suggestions because they are backed by the ordinance	John
Recommended/Not Recommended	have a set list of building materials which will be approved by the board	Susan
Recommended/Not Recommended	should fast track more building items (S. Schmidt agreed)	John
Recommended/Not Recommended	good images but needs more on each type of window and door which are appropriate for each style	Sonny
Recommended/Not Recommended	needs additional photos on what is appropriate	Betsy
Recommended/Not Recommended	discussion on including suppliers	Susan and Josh
Recommended/Not Recommended	break out into guidelines (approved by council) and additional items such as materials which are appropriate, contractors, suppliers, etc.	John
Recommended/Not Recommended	New Albany website is a good example of including resources online	Betsy
visibility from street	ordinance sites street as public right of way	Josh
visibility from street	resolution defining public right of way by historic board in 1980s	Nicole
visibility from street	don't want to limit to front facades	Valecia
visibility from street	mentioned barn tour by HMI	Betsy
visibility from street	mixed public comment on what is visible (street only vs street/alley)	Josh
visibility from street	needs to be a good mix	John
visibility from street	should board rate alleys based on drivability (some alleys are grass)	Nicole
visibility from street	avoid visibility in terms of sight lines (if you can only see it from a sliver from this certain point should be avoided)	Valecia
historic/not historic	adding variations to rating. V. Crisafulli stated this topic came up at the state preservation conference and would like to table this topic to discuss this topic with conference attendees and Indiana Landmarks	Valecia

Historic District Board of Review

April 15, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
Map	Discussed the different districts and stated she thought the only map which should be included is the local district map to not cause confusion between the districts	Nicole
Map	discussion on primary vs secondary area map and recommended only including the map included within the revised guidelines and passing it with an ordinance amendment	Nicole
Map	Should other maps be included (NRHP and NHL) within the introduction	Valecia
Map	include maps in appendix	Betsy
Map	Request survey and create new map (O. McCall agreed)	Josh
Map	clarify that these guidelines are for the local district and not the NRHP and NHL	Josh/Valecia
alternative materials	board agreed that this information is covered in the separate chapters	
alternative materials	would this get rid of the matrix? (N. Schell answered yes)	Betsy
alternative materials	B. Lyman didn't want to see this section removed because it provides a way to review new materials	Betsy
alternative materials	The matrix could remain and the rest of the policy is removed (matrix and alternative materials list to appendix - V. Crisafulli)	Josh
alternative materials	why isn't an alternative materials list given to applicants?	Sonny
alternative materials	board has never adopted materials list	Nicole
alternative materials	board to approve a materials list	Valecia
Awnings	board was faced with awning application where the metal awnings would have been appropriate and the guidelines say they are not appropriate	Nicole
Awnings	add with reasonable consideration for sun/heat on residential structures for awning location	Valecia
chapter 3 (Building materials)	move entire chapter to appendix	Valecia
chapter 3 (Building materials)	chapter includes items like siding	Nicole
chapter 3 (Building materials)	keep chapter where it is	Valecia
chapter 3 (Building materials)	separate chapter into individual chapters	Betsy
lighting	should be a part of the guidelines	Sonny
lighting	maybe styles of lighting which are not appropriate and chapter should remain (B. Lyman agreed)	Valecia
lighting	add appendix on appropriate lighting but remove it from guidelines	Josh
lighting	add examples of good lighting	Betsy

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

April 15, 2019

Topic	Correction/Comments	Comment from
lighting	review new lights only not a replacement fixture	Josh
lighting	lighting is an exterior feature and the board reviews all exterior features	Valecia
barn metal roofing	board approved exposed fastener metal roof on Tower Tack	Owen
barn metal roofing	not precedent setting board	Sonny
barn metal roofing	should be removed because it is not always not appropriate	Josh
barn metal roofing	barn metal needs to be changed with a better definition (exposed fastener metal roofing)	Owen
barn metal roofing	need to define appropriate vs not appropriate	Betsy
barn metal roofing	in most instances exposed fastener metal roofing is not appropriate but the board may approve it on a case by case basis	Valecia
barn metal roofing	board has previously approved metal roofing because neighborhood has similar roofing	Valecia/Josh
Chimney	should be removed if no fireplace	Susan
Chimney	some chimneys never went to a fireplace	Owen
Chimney	chimney is a defining features (Sonny agreed)	Betsy
Chimney	chimney can be a stylistic feature	Owen
Chimney	visibility is a criteria	Owen/Betsy
Chimney	should not be allowed to remove architecturally significant	Betsy
Chimney	needs to have flexibility and allow people to remove the chimney if they are having issues with it leaking	Susan
garages that face street	there are streets which have garages that face streets	Owen/Josh
garages that face street	garages that face the street are typically not appropriate but are reviewed on case by case basis and could be deemed appropriate by the board	Betsy
vinyl windows	vinyl not approved in historic districts was heard at conference	Valecia
vinyl windows	vinyl can be made now to have the same look as the historic windows and if we allow them on part of the house then the board should allow them on all sides	Josh
vinyl windows	most of the time vinyl windows are not appropriate, but they can be deemed appropriate on a case by case basis	Josh
vinyl windows	installation is key on whether the replacement windows look correct	Betsy

No further business to be brought before the board.

J. Collins made the motion to adjourn - seconded by O. McCall.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35p.m.

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

April 15, 2019

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Valecia Crisafulli, Chair

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation
Coordinator