

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

August 22, 2016

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, August 22, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall, 101 W. Main St., Madison, IN 47250. Ron Hopper, Chairman, called the meeting to order with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Ann Roller, Valecia Crisafulli, Mike Dorsey, Penny Sanchez and Betsy Lyman. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; David Sutter, Board Attorney; and Louann Waller, Planning Secretary.

Minutes:

P. Newhouse moved that we approve the minutes from the August 22, 2016 meeting. R. Hopper seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

P. Newhouse Approved
 R. Hopper Approved
 B. Lyman Approved
 M. Dorsey Abstained (he was not in attendance)
 V. Crisafulli Approved
 P. Sanchez Abstained (she was not in attendance)

The minutes were approved as published.

New Applications:

1. Allison and James Hall – C. of A. to replace one (1) lower level window and two (2) second story windows on the east façade; to replace nine (9) windows on the south side; and to replace two (2) second story windows on the west side.

Location: 309 Elm St.

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

D. Sutter, Board Attorney, suggested that for clarity the Board acknowledge for the record that the first applicant who was scheduled for this meeting did not have their public signs up for the required amount of time.

R. Hopper stated that Allison and James Hall who had requested a C. of A. to replace one lower level window at 309 Elm Street did not have their signage up for the required amount of time so their application will be heard at the September meeting. D. Sutter said that the applicants were not in attendance, so he suggested a motion be made to extend the application to the September meeting. He asked M. Johnson if they had been contacted. M. Johnson said yes, by letter and he had called them.

V. Crisafulli moved to extend the Hall's application to the September meeting. M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

V. Crisafulli Approved
 R. Hopper Approved
 P. Newhouse Approved
 P. Sanchez Approved
 M. Dorsey Approved
 B. Lyman Approved

The motion passed and the application will be extended to the September meeting.

2. Kevin Hudson – C. of A. to replace three large metal framed glass windows on the east façade with four smaller glass framed wood windows; replace two large metal framed glass windows at the north side with three smaller glass framed wood windows.

Location: 814 E. Second Street

Zoned: General Business (GB)

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
August 22, 2016

M. Johnson showed PowerPoint images of the applicant's structure as it looked before and after the work. R. Hopper stated that Mr. Hudson had already completed the work because he wasn't aware that his commercial building was within the Historic District and that he had to come before the Board. Mr. Hudson brought a map that he picked up in the Plan and Zoning office and said that he believed his building was outside the Historic District boundary. He handed the map to Chairman Hopper.

V. Crisafulli stated that she had the map that was in the Guideline book and had looked at it very carefully and said that he definitely is within the boundary. She asked to see the map Mr. Hudson had brought. D. Sutter, Board attorney, asked Mr. Hudson if he was looking at the Zoning Map or the Historic District Map. K. Hudson said the Historic District. He stated that he had been at that location for 27 years and has never been in the Historic District that he is aware of.

D. Sutter read the description of the Historic District that was in the Historic District Ordinance Overlay: "The boundaries of the Historic District shall be part of the area identified in the National Register of Historic Places listing bounded by the Ohio River on the south, the toe of the hill on the north and the corporate limits on both the east and the west. The boundaries designated on the zoning map city of Madison and the boundaries of the Historic District shall coincide with the boundaries as designated herein."

V. Crisafulli and M. Dorsey looked at the map that Mr. Hudson brought. V. Crisafulli said that she recalled at some point that there were separate boundaries and guidelines for the National Register District and for the local district and also for the Landmark District which she thought could be confusing and was obviously confusing in this instance. She then gave the map that was in the Guidelines book to Mr. Hudson to show him the boundaries and pointed out that it didn't have the jog in the line that was on the map he brought to the meeting.

R. Hopper asked if Mr. Hudson would show his map to the attorney and stated that according to what D. Sutter had read he would be included because his property is within the corporate limits east and west and the Ohio River from the toe of the hill. Mr. Hudson then discussed the maps with David Sutter. The map that Mr. Hudson brought showed the primary and secondary areas of the Historic District.

B. Lyman asked if Mr. Hudson's property was in the secondary area of the Historic District. D. Sutter said yes. R. Hopper said that we all learned something today. B. Lyman said welcome to the Historic District. K. Hudson said it was a long wait for the invitation.

P. Newhouse asked why the change was made to the windows. K. Hudson said because the glass was cracked. She said, and you didn't want to replace the glass? K. Hudson said it would have been very costly. He said he was going to sell the building and the windows were at the dangerous point that when he shut the door the windows would shake. P. Newhouse asked if it was a service station at one time. K. Hudson said yes and that he didn't want to replace the windows and that he was spending money he didn't want to spend. He said he was in business for 26 years but the road closure really devastated his business and he never did recover from that and the property is now for sale. He got a job. He worked the business for 26 years and Madison didn't really care about him then either. When the road was closed no one came to see him about anything. B. Lyman asked when the business was operating, what was he doing? He said auto sales.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions from the Board or the audience. M. Johnson said he had a comment. He stated that he had made contact with the contractor, and that he knows the boundaries now and that he made sure of that. B. Lyman asked Mr. Hudson what type of windows he put in. Mr. Hudson said vinyl windows. She also asked what type of wall was put up behind the board siding. He said a stud wall. She asked if it was finished on the inside. He said no, but it will be if the application is approved, but it isn't right now.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions from the Board or the audience. Hearing none, he asked if anyone would like to make a motion. V. Crisafulli said she would make a motion but first she had a comment for Mr. Hudson. She stated that she thought we were all sorry that he had to go through this. She said that he had a business here for many years and had gone through some adverse times. She added that she was sorry that he didn't have good communication from the city during the bridge construction and she was sorry he had to go through that. She said that didn't change the job the Board had to do to uphold the Guidelines. Mr. Hudson said he knew that.

V. Crisafulli moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the noncontributing commercial property at 814 E. Second Street to replace the three large metal framed glass windows on the east façade with four smaller glass framed wood windows and replace two large metal framed glass windows on the north side with three smaller glass framed windows. She paused and said this says wood and I believe you said that wasn't correct. Mr. Hudson said that the building right across from him did the same thing by taking larger windows out and put smaller windows in and replaced windows, covered ones and put them back and they put vinyl in. V. Crisafulli said that what this new Board is trying to do is uphold the Guidelines to the extent that we possibly could. Mr. Hudson asked why a building across the street was different than his? V. Crisafulli said that was a fair question and one that she didn't know we had an answer to, but the Board was trying to put into place some fairer procedures to everyone. She continued with her motion to say; this application was submitted on July 26, 2016 and discussed on August 22, 2016. In support of this motion the Commercial Design Review Guidelines state on page 4, the Madison Historic District boundary includes the city's older residential and commercial areas. The Design Review Guidelines apply to properties within this boundary. While the property at 814 E. Second is rated noncontributing to the district, it clearly is located within the boundaries that we saw in our booklet and the Guidelines apply. Moreover the vernacular gas station design of this property represents an important period of Madison's history and the country's history and its character should be maintained. Page 56; if replacement windows are necessary, they should match the original in size, materials, and number arrangement of lights. Page 58; most vinyl windows don't look like historic wood windows, their texture and thinness are inappropriate for Madison's historic buildings and historic wood and metal windows are sustainable and represent embodied energy and are made of materials that are natural to the environment and are renewable. And on page 28, with respect to the siding, the materials should ideally be replaced with the same materials and with profiles, dimensions and textures to match the original as closely as possible. Finally, this property is highly visible along one of the most important gateways to the city, an entry point that is undergoing significant improvement as a result of the Project 421 Gateway and the city's new Comprehensive Plan. The most recent draft of the Comprehensive Plan says "Few physical features have as great an impact on the perception of a city's identity as the Gateway." For these reasons the proposal as submitted is deemed incompatible with the Historic District Guidelines and a COA should be denied.

Mr. Hudson stated that the reason the Gateway looks like a ghetto now is because no one was there for them when we needed it. He said the whole strip looks bad because they had no help. No one cared about them then. They said there was money taken up to help us but we never got it. He added that he is trying to sell it now. V. Crisafulli said that she understood how he felt.

The motion was seconded by B. Lyman

Roll Call:

A. Roller	Disapproved
P. Newhouse	Disapproved
M. Dorsey	Disapproved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Sanchez	Disapproved
R. Hopper	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved

The motion to deny the application a Certificate of Appropriateness did not pass, so a C. of A. will be issued.

3. Joan Irvine – C. of A. to replace five windows on the north façade to match those of a neighboring property.

Location: 104 E. Third Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

As Mark Johnson displayed the photos and drawings of the windows the applicant provided, B. Lyman asked if the replacement windows would be aluminum clad windows. J. Irvine said that was correct. B. Lyman asked if the applicant intended on taking out the sill or frame. She said she would only be replacing the current divided light windows with the Marvin windows and had a photo she passed around to the Board members that represented what the results would look like. She added that new shutters would be hung on the current hardware. B. Lyman asked why the windows were being replaced. J. Irvine stated that they were painting the front of the building and they were old, adding that the 30 year windows weren't historic. She said her husband had tried to reglaze them but that was too big of a job and that there was Plexiglas on the inside of the windows that didn't operate and were not designed to open. She said it would be nice to have a window that opened, they had a bedroom inside. B. Lyman asked what the applicant was planning to do with the windows she was taking out. She said nothing, that they were 30 year old windows that were built by Roger Welch and that she didn't think they would be valuable to anyone. B. Lyman suggested she donate them to the ReStore. The applicant said she would do that.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or the audience. Hearing none he asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

A. Roller moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on July 27 and discussed on August 22 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for windows pages 60 to 63. The applicant will be replacing the existing wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows. These wood windows are not original to the house. The aluminum clad wood windows are appropriate, therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

M. Dorsey	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
R. Hopper	Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

4. Kenny and Paula Honeycutt – C. of A. to replace frosted interior glass of door and windows on the West façade; replace 4' solid steel security door, with a 7'x7' luxury series French door on the East side; replace existing metal awning over rear door with a 30'x16' sheet metal seamed awning.

Location: 420 Walnut Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Louann Waller said that she wanted to say that the packet for the application was phenomenal. The Board gave the applicants a round of applause. B. Lyman said that she thought Paula should give lessons. Paula said that she hoped she never had to do another one.

R. Hopper asked if the applicants had anything they wanted to say about their project. P. Honeycutt said that they were excited to be here. K. Honeycutt said they were from Centerville, about two hours north

and that this was their weekend, retirement home. He said that they are retiring in two years and then it would be their full time home. R. Hopper said welcome.

B. Lyman said that she had a question about the double hung windows and that she wasn't quite clear on how Glass Unlimited was going to deal with that. K. Honeycutt said that what they will do is remove the aluminum frames and build a frame for a window to set into and then the wood frame would be wrapped in aluminum and then a window would set inside the frame. P. Honeycutt said that she had plants and they need air. B. Lyman asked what the width would be on one double hung window. P. Honeycutt said the width would be three and a half foot glass itself and the height of both of them together will be about five feet. She added that the larger windows as you are going in will be four feet by five feet. The frames will be built first and then the glass will be ordered to fit it precisely. B. Lyman asked if the exterior would be aluminum or vinyl. K. Honeycutt said the wood frame would be all aluminum, trimmed out in aluminum but would like to put just the vinyl around the glass that sit inside the frame, but everything else would be all aluminum trimmed. He added that at the top of the windows there is a big aluminum strip there now right below the glass blocks. They want to put aluminum underneath those too so will match all the aluminum wraps for the front. B. Lyman stated that vinyl is not a historic material and asked if they would consider instead of vinyl windows making those aluminum wrapped windows. K. Honeycutt said to go with the aluminum clad windows would be \$3,000 more. P. Honeycutt said it was a 10 year warranty for aluminum windows and a 20 year warranty for vinyl. She stated that they are not doing this for resale. They want the best that Polaris windows offered.

A. Roller said, so you are building a wooden frame and sticking a vinyl window into that frame. K. Honeycutt said yes, two vinyl windows, double hung that would slid into the frame and that the only vinyl that you would see would be the inch, inch and a half around the glass. She asked if they made a window that was wood aluminum clad. K. Honeycutt said yes they did but it was a lot more expensive and less efficient according to Mike Prickett at Glass Unlimited, and the warranty was about half of the vinyl window. B. Lyman said that sounded off and wondered if it did to anyone else. V. Crisafulli agreed and said that every study she had seen said it was just the opposite.

B. Lyman stated that one of the things the Board was trying to do was to maintain historic storefronts so they look like storefronts. K. Honeycutt said that there had been a great job down there. B. Lyman asked them to imagine all the storefronts putting in double hung windows and how that would change the total look of all the buildings. She added that was one of her concerns; how they were changing the look of those with the double hung windows. She asked if they had considered leaving a couple of those as plate glass and said she had a large plate glass window in her own house and was happily surprised when she found out that tempered plate glass was not that expensive compared to what she saw the applicants were paying for their windows. She asked if they would consider making the angled windows double hung and retaining the plate glass in the front windows. K. Honeycutt said the ones in the front were the ones that get the most airflow and if they did just the angled glass windows, they wouldn't get very much air flow.

B. Lyman said that she had worked with Glass Unlimited on her windows and found that the insulated glass had a short warranty and the ones in her house had failed and putting in single pane tempered glass was a cost savings. She said that was just an idea and she was one member of the Board. B. Lyman showed the Board and the applicants a photo of the storefront in 2002 when the windows were clear glass showing the front windows were not divided and had one single pane of glass. The applicants stated that they had been told that the original front was straight across and didn't have the angled front. B. Lyman said that the survey dated the structure to 1910 but wasn't sure that was correct. P. Honeycutt said she knew the building was constructed in 1930.

P. Newhouse asked if the applicants would be adding drapes to the windows. P. Honeycutt said her son-in-law worked for a commercial shade company. P. Newhouse asked if they would be room darkening drapes and if that would constrict air flow. P. Honeycutt said they would have shades upfront and that they would have air flow so they could pull the shades down and still have air flow.

K. Honeycutt said they would only replace the glass on the front door. M. Dorsey asked if the windows would have vinyl showing on the inch or inch and a half around the windows. K. Honeycutt said yes. P. Honeycutt said it would match the aluminum color.

V. Crisafulli said she had a question for the Board and stated that she was not going to be able to vote for vinyl windows and that as soon as we allow it for one, then we appear to be inconsistent with the way we apply these Guidelines. A. Roller said that this was a contributing building and the other was a noncontributing building and that made a big difference to her.

M. Dorsey asked the applicants if they would be willing to modify their application as far as the vinyl portion. K. Honeycutt said yes, if that was what they had to do, that was what they would do. B. Lyman stated that the Board was most concerned about the front façade of the building, while what they wanted to do with the back was fine. She added that as people walked by the front of the building, because it was so close, they can see it is vinyl. She said that the Board wasn't trying to make it more expensive for them, but was working to keep the charming look of the town. K. Honeycutt said he understood. P. Honeycutt said it was going to be \$3,000 more. B. Lyman suggested they look at plate glass. V. Crisafulli said there could be less expensive options. B. Lyman stated that there were also steel framed windows with smaller panes of glass and that if they checked around there could be other suppliers. K. Honeycutt asked if there were other suppliers. M. Johnson suggested Sun Windows out of Owensboro, Kentucky. K. Honeycutt said that his understanding was that any contractor in Madison had to be approved by Madison and that they were not allowed to come in here to do the windows. M. Johnson said that the City required them to be registered and have a certificate of liability and to pay for the certificate. There was a discussion of other options that the applicants could consider.

M. Johnson suggested that there be a discussion of the awning to be constructed along the back side of the building. B. Lyman asked about the material that would be used for the awning. The applicants said it would be barn metal. P. Honeycutt said if the Board was familiar with the Antique Mall, it would have an awning similar to that. K. Honeycutt said it would be a sheet metal roof that would come out 16 feet and the posts would be 6 X 6 cedar posts. P. Honeycutt said the beams would be exposed. K. Honeycutt said that everything else would be treated and the sides would be wrapped in aluminum. P. Honeycutt said there would not be a deck. B. Lyman said that in one plan they had four posts and in the other one they had three. K. Honeycutt said they weren't sure structurally what they would need. M. Johnson asked what the total length would be. K. Honeycutt said 30 feet wide and 16 foot out. M. Johnson said that was pushing it and would advise using four posts.

R. Hopper asked if the applicants would agree to do the wood with the aluminum wrapped frame windows. K. Honeycutt said yes. R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions. M. Dorsey said because of the scope he would like to break this down into three motions; the front, the door in the back and the awning. D. Sutter said yes, that was a better practice on larger projects.

M. Dorsey moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 420 Walnut Street to replace six frosted glass windows with clear, double hung all aluminum clad windows and replace the frosted glass in the front door with clear solid glass. This is supported by the Commercial Design Guidelines on page 56 and 57 and by the Residential Guidelines on pages 60 and 61 which indicate that aluminum framed windows are acceptable replacements and in addition the current windows are not original to the structure.

V. Crisafulli seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

A. Roller	Approved
P. Sanchez	Approved
V. Crisafulli	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved

R. Hopper Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

M. Dorsey moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 420 Walnut Street to replace one four-foot solid steel security door with a seven by seven wood framed Luxury Series French door supported by the Residential Design Guidelines page 39 and 40 stating that replacement doors should be of wood with or without glass lights and should be a complement to the style of the house.

Ron Hopper said that he would like to add that we should clarify that it is on the east side. M. Dorsey said yes, it is on the east side.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved
B. Lyman Approved
M. Dorsey Approved
P. Newhouse Approved
V. Crisafulli Approved
P. Sanchez Approved
A. Roller Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

M. Dorsey moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 420 Walnut Street for the proposed awning approximately 32 by 16 as proposed. The proposed awning materials are supported by the Residential Design Guidelines for roofs, pages 53 and 54. In addition the current awning is not original to the structure, again on the east side and the number of posts to be appropriate to the building code.

M. Johnson asked what kind of material would be used for the awning. K. Honeycutt said the ribbed metal or barn metal.

V. Crisafulli asked to what extent this would be visible from the alley. A photo was displayed showing how it would look from the alley. V. Crisafulli said that she wasn't seeing much visibility at all.

P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

V. Crisafulli Approved
A. Roller Approved
P. Sanchez Approved
B. Lyman Approved
R. Hopper Approved
M. Dorsey Approved
P. Newhouse Approved

The motion passed and a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued.

B. Lyman asked if there would be any building permits required for this. M. Johnson said yes for the awning. B. Lyman told the applicants that they would need to see M. Johnson for that.

**Historic District Board of Review
August 22, 2016**

R. Hopper asked if there was any Old Business for the Board. Hearing none he asked if there was any New Business.

B. Lyman discussed the use of a worksheet for the Board. Copies had been distributed to the audience. She stated that the idea came from attending Zoning Board meetings. She said before the Zoning Board votes they ask themselves a series of questions to help them and the audience know that the same standards are being applied consistently. She gave an example of how this would be useful when applicants have last minute changes.

V. Crisafulli said she appreciated Betsy and Louann's work on this and she was willing to try it and see how it goes. R. Hopper said that even as a seasoned person it would be helpful because it was concise. D. Sutter stated that there may be times when Board members want to approve something even when it is not consistent with the Ordinance or the Guidelines based on an applicant's situation. His recommendation if the Board did want to use this is to take a vote on this at the beginning of the next meeting to give everyone some time and see if there are more questions or comments.

V. Crisafulli said that she knew that we had all seen this and that she was willing to put a motion on the table tonight so if we use it at the next meeting we can discuss how useful it was. She added that this may keep us from voting on something that we are planning to use at the next meeting. D. Sutter said his concern was that the public may need time to review it and could have comments. He said there would be copies in Louann's office if people want to come and have a look at it. He said the worksheet was not changing the ordinance and guidelines. R. Hopper said it was basically consolidating what the Board does so it would be more of a worksheet for the Board rather than the public. V. Crisafulli said that she thought applicants should get a copy of this. D. Sutter said absolutely. R. Hopper said that if no one objects to this the Board will take a look at this and if anyone has any suggestions or comments they can give them to Louann or Betsy and we will vote on this at the next meeting.

V. Crisafulli stated that she was going to be attending the Indiana Walk and Bike Summit in Indianapolis next week. She said that she had attended it two years ago and it was a fabulous conference.

B. Lyman asked R. Hopper if there was any update on the applicants for the Planner position. R. Hopper said that the committee has narrowed it down to three applicants. One of the applicants withdraw, another applicant was interviewed in person and the third applicant is schedule to be interviewed September 9th. Louann said it would be the day after Labor Day. R. Hopper said that once that had taken place the committee would be making a recommendation to the Mayor and ultimately it would be his decision as to which of the two candidates. He added that hopefully, within a short while, we would get someone on board.

V. Crisafulli moved the meeting be adjourned. M. Dorsey seconded. R. Hopper asked all those in favor say aye. All agreed. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:39 p.m.

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Louann Waller, Secretary*

* B. Lyman prepared a draft of the minutes. A final review was done by L. Waller before it was sent to the Board