

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

June 27, 2016

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, June 27, 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, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey. Absent was Valecia Crisafulli. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Tamara Broadnax, Preservation Support Staff; David Sutter, Board Attorney; and Louann Waller, Planning Secretary.

Minutes

R. Hopper said that approval of the June minutes would have to be delayed until next month because they weren't finished at the time of the meeting. He said that the next thing he would do before hearing the applications is to present a Certificate of Appreciation to Jessica Gray-Butler. He said that she had been our Historic Review person for the past few months and that the Board would like to honor her for her outstanding work, commitment, and assistance as the Historic Planner for the Office of Historic Preservation, August 2015 – June 2016. He said that the Certificate was from all the Board members.

New Applications:

1. Linda Lytle – C. of A. to replace existing wood siding with LP engineered wood siding.

Location: 414 St. Michaels Avenue

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

T. Broadnax presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She said it was a non-contributing residential structure built in 1990. P. Newhouse asked when the structure was built. T. Broadnax said in 1990. L. Lytle said that there was no longer any part of the original house and that the house was originally a one story house that was so rotted it was torn down, and that the foundation in the front is the only thing that is original to the house. P. Newhouse said so we don't really know how old the original house was. The applicant said that the story she heard was that originally it was a shotgun. She stated that it became completely rotted due to water draining down off of the hillside. She said that when they rebuilt her house, they changed the landscaping, but water still washed through it all the time.

T. Broadnax showed pictures looking at the front of the structure and close ups of some of the wood rot and deteriorating wood material. She said that the applicant should have a proposed sample of the siding she was planning on using. L. Lytle said that she didn't bring the material because they gave her the wrong siding; they gave her concrete board instead of what she was going to use. She said what they want to use pressed board that looks like wood, but it's pressed. She said the contractor wanted her to tell the Board that it is LG. M. Dorsey said LP.

P. Newhouse asked the name of the contractor. L. Lytle said Dart Cox, but she didn't know the name of the company. B. Lyman asked the applicant to help her understand the history of the house. B. Lyman asked if it was a shotgun originally. L. Lytle responded yes. B. Lyman said then it rotted because of all the runoff from the hill, and it was rebuilt in 1990. Applicant responded no, that it was rebuilt in 1998 and that she didn't know why it said 1990. B. Lyman then asked if what was rebuilt in 1998, the two story structure is what we see now. The applicant agreed. B. Lyman asked what kind of siding was currently on all sides of the house. L. Lytle responded that aluminum siding was on the house the rest of the way around. P. Newhouse said that it looked like vinyl. L. Lytle responded that she meant vinyl. She then said that she doesn't know why it rotted so fast because that was in 1998 and that was less than 20 years. Referring to the PowerPoint images, the applicant pointed out that some of the boards on the house had completely fallen off and that she had to glue them back on. She said that it looked really bad. P. Newhouse asked if the frames of the windows and doors would also be replaced with engineering wood. She stated that it needs it badly. The applicant responded that she thinks the windows are okay, and that the contractor didn't say anything about them. B. Lyman asked if the proposal was to take all of the siding off. The applicant responded that the only thing that would remain is the porch's decorative molding and trim work.

R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board. M. Dorsey said that he was familiar with the LP product, and that it is a good wood product. L. Lytle responded that the contractor said that it would last longer so that she wouldn't have to replace it again. R. Hopper asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. R. Hopper asked if there was a motion.

M. Dorsey moved that the Madison Historic Board Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 414 St. Michaels Avenue to replace the existing wood siding with LP engineered wood siding as presented and that would qualify as an in-kind material supported by the Residential Design Guidelines on pg.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2016

confirm. P. Newhouse asked about the north side, stating that she couldn't remember what it looked like. D. Butler stated that basically it was a mirror of the south side. The applicant said that the window on that side would be replaced just like the one on the south side with Hardie board, and they would be keeping the door on the north side as an employee entrance to the office. B. Lyman asked if the original window openings would remain so if somebody would want to put them back they could or if the bricks would be altered. The applicant responded no, and that everything would remain the same. The applicant said that they are just being filled in because it will be a bathroom and consultation room. B. Lyman asked if the back porch was original to the house. The applicant responded that as far as he knew it was not. He added that there was a picture that shows the original exterior of the house and the original windows of the house. T. Broadnax said that she did consult with the Historical Society and that they didn't have any pictures to determine if it was original or not.

D. Butler asked T. Broadnax to go through the PowerPoint pictures. The applicant asked if that was all the pictures, because there were more pictures in the online application. He said that one of the photos showed the inside of the back porch with two windows that look into what was the kitchen. He said that he couldn't imagine why you would have those type of windows just to look out on the porch. P. Newhouse asked if the interior wall was brick too. The applicant responded yes. The applicant stated that as far as he knows that it had to be an addition on the original house. M. Dorsey agreed.

B. Lyman asked about the ramp proposed to be built on the south side. She asked if there was a half-wall around the front porch. The applicant responded yes. He said that on the right side of the ramp they would be keeping it as tight as they could all the way against the wall because it has to be five-feet wide for ADA compliance. B. Lyman agreed. The applicant said they would be removing five-feet of the brick half-wall from the south side of the porch to give the ramp access to the porch. He said that they looked at multiple options on where to put the ramp, but this was the only one that worked at all. He said there is another door on the south side of the house, not the one to the back porch, but the one in the middle of the house that they looked at possibly using, but in order to have the ramp go up to that door when you entered into the house, you would hit the steps and there wasn't a five-foot turning radius required for ADA compliance so they would have had to tear up all the steps which wasn't feasible. He stated that pretty much everything they looked at didn't give them much of an option other than to take it up to the front of the porch. M. Johnson said that when he looked at it, this was the logical approach. Any other door would require patients to come in and go through the house and the examining rooms. M. Johnson stated that this is perfect when they come in and can go right into the waiting room, and that anyone in a wheelchair is not going to have any difficulty. B. Lyman asked if there were any issues with the sidewalk. The applicant responded no. B. Lyman also asked if the applicant was removing any of the dormer windows. The applicant responded no. She asked if it were just highlighted to show what the board on the back porch would look like. The applicant responded yes, that the board used on the back porch would match the board on the front of the dormer.

R. Hopper asked if there were any more questions from the Board. B. Lyman responded that she had a lot of them. R. Hopper stated that's ok, that's why we are here. He then asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience. Hearing none he asked for the motion. B. Lyman said that she didn't know if there was anything about handrails in the Commercial Design Review Guidelines. She asked if handrails generally have to be approved as part of design. L. Waller responded yes, and asked if it were listed under porches. B. Lyman stated that there are no porches in Commercial Guidelines. L. Waller stated that the handrail will be required because of insurance purposes. B. Lyman asked if she could mention it to make sure that the applicant is following commercial specifications, and asked if it would be adequate. M. Dorsey stated commercial and ADA specifications.

B. Lyman moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 502 Jefferson Street if constructed according to the plans submitted on June 16, 2016 and discussed at the Board meeting on June 27, 2016 is compatible with the character of the Historic District and adjoining properties. The house was built in the 1920's as a residence and is being converted into a dentist office. An ADA accessible ramp and railing will be constructed along the south side of the structure using treated lumber and enter the porch that is located on the west facade of the building by removing a section of the porch's half wall. This will allow handicap access to the front door. The proposed design is consistent with Madison's Commercial Guidelines pg. 62 that states "ramps should be constructed of concrete or wood and painted in colors compatible with those of the building and should be simple in design." Additionally the plan calls for the

Page 4
 Historic District Board of Review
 June 27, 2016

rear porch windows to be removed above the brick line and replaced with Hardie board siding similar to that used in the front or west upper dormer of the structure. The stone sills will be left in place and the openings maintained should later owners want to restore the windows. The Commercial Guidelines on pg. 56 state "that historic windows should be retained and not covered or painted." In this case the porch was a later addition to the house and the windows are not historic having louvered glass. In addition, three handrails will be part of the plan: a single handrail on the north steps to the main entrance, one on the northeast corner steps by the garage, and an additional single rail on the steps on the north side of the house. There will be three total handrails. The applicant is working with Madison Ironworks to design and construct the handrails and has agreed that they will follow Commercial and ADA specifications. If the proposed plan is followed as submitted and discussed a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

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

3. Sharon Gray and Paul Dicken – C. of A. to install 2 vinyl windows where vinyl and wood currently exists. They are both on the south elevation of the structure.

Location: 410 Broadway Street

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

T. Broadnax presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She said that it is a contributing structure built in 1874. The applicant is proposing to install two vinyl windows on the south elevation. The two windows that are being proposed are minimally visible behind the storm windows and are recessed from the street. The Board has already approved a handicapped door on the south wing of the house. Referring to the slides in the presentation, the applicant said the photograph on the left was taken quite some time ago before she and her husband acquired the house. The applicant stated that she doesn't know how the picture was taken but that it looked elevated somewhat. B. Lyman agreed. The applicant stated that wasn't what you see when you're on the sidewalk or the street. She said that she actually took pictures before she came to the meeting standing in the street and on the sidewalk. The applicant went on to say that this request wasn't part of the original plan to renovate the house. She stated that they wanted to pause the renovation due to budgetary reasons. During the initial renovation inside the house, the windows were damaged. She stated that she had requested that they actually keep the windows intact and now they were not. The house on the outside was deceptively in good shape. She stated that the problem was actually created on the inside, and shared pictures to illustrate. She said that they have walls and floors now and that they are living in the house. The applicant presented pictures of the single window and interior directly under the double windows. She also presented pictures of the first correction that had to be made on the foundation. She said that they lost all floors and walls in the bottom half of the house.

B. Lyman asked what the lost was due to. The applicant responded that there were repairs that weren't made that caused water damage, and there was contamination in the house and the original floors were lost. She said that they had a company from E-town, Kentucky come and try to decontaminate the house and it was not possible. She said that they were there for three weeks. She went on to say that every single original window, particularly the ones in question, are from the 70s or 80s maybe. She said it was a big old house with a bunch of big old windows. She stated that the windows need to be repaired, and that she is doing them herself and that they were intact and survived. The windows under consideration for the application didn't survive. She said that she had to repair the repairs that were made, and presented pictures. She said that this is their second go at correcting the problem with the foundation and the floors. She said that the foundation had to be rebuilt to level it and in doing that it torqued the frames of the windows. She added that the area in the house with the windows under consideration was in the kitchen. She said the house had a new roof, new wiring, and plumbing. In the demolition the house lost its original horsehair plaster. She also showed the Board pictures of the windows from the interior. She explained that the wall where the windows will be located was rebuilt in such a way so the windows will be slightly recessed and exterior wood trim will be

Page 5
 Historic District Board of Review
 June 27, 2016

installed. T. Broadnax explained that when the application was originally submitted, the pictures she was sharing with the Board were not available. She said that there were several sections of the exterior clapboard that needed to be repaired and that would probably be done in the fall. There were several questions from Board members about the windows. The applicant said that there were two separate windows that had been put together to look like one. She explained they had a sash and did move up and down. A. Roller added that is what we call double hung. The applicant agreed. A. Roller asked what S. Gray wanted to put in their place. She said she wanted a window that would push out from the bottom because they have family members that are in wheelchairs and the windows are located over the kitchen cabinets so in order for them to open them they can't push them up. The applicant said she wanted to install windows with a louver that can be pulled out and pushed forward to open the windows. A. Roller asked if the windows would look like a double hung but the bottom will push out to open instead of sliding up and down. The applicant said correct and that they will have to have the windows custom made. She also showed picture of a fence that currently partially blocks the view of the windows from the sidewalk. A. Roller asked if the applicant wanted three windows or just the two. S. Gray stated she was applying to replace three separate windows but that two of them would have a piece milled between them so they could be placed together. She further stated that trim salvaged from other parts of the house would be used to surrounding the new windows. B. Lyman asked if there would be storm windows. S. Gary said no. She said the goal was total accessibility within the first floor of the house. P. Newhouse asked if the single window would also be an awning-style, push out from the bottom type window as well. The applicant said yes, all three windows would be the same.

M. Dorsey asked if restoring the fence is part of the project. The applicant said that right now the fence is made up of stock fence sections that you can buy at Benders and Lowes, and that for this year they are going to put those up again and paint them. She added that a section of the fence had to be taken out to repair something in the back of the house. She plans on having another fence installed probably next spring.

A. Roller asked if the new windows would be vinyl. S. Gray said yes because of the weight, that it makes a difference for someone with disabilities. B. Lyman asked if she had looked into wood with aluminum clad. The applicant said yes, but there was a weight and cost difference and she felt the ones she chose were the most appropriate and looked the best for the house. P. Newhouse stated that she understood the reasoning but that the Board wasn't in favor of vinyl windows and a double hung would be more pleasing to look at on a historic home than an awning push out window. P. Newhouse also noted that a fence would be placed in front of the windows and asked how tall the fence would be. The applicant said it would be raised about a foot and even if someone was at the front gate you wouldn't be able to see the windows. She added that the windows will appear the same as they do now. They will operate differently, but they won't look different. M. Dorsey asked what the distance was between the first or front window to the sidewalk. The applicant guessed that it was about 12 to 14 feet. S. Gray said that because they are close to Main Street they've had people think their home was a shop and had opened the door to their front room. B. Lyman stated that it is a prominent house close to Broadway fountain with a lot of public traffic. P. Newhouse stated that there were extenuating circumstances and she understood the applicant's reasons. R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or the audience.

P. Newhouse moved that the Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project and 410 Broadway Street if constructed according to the application submitted on June 6th and discussed on June 27th 2016 can be compatible with the character of the Madison Historic District. Paragraph 3, page 61 of the Madison Residential Design Guidelines states that vinyl or vinyl clad windows should not be installed on any façade visible from the street views however a fence will be installed in front of the windows partially shielding the view of them from the street. Even though double hung or single hung windows are the most appropriate, three awning type windows could be installed in place of this due to handicap accessibility so according to these guidelines a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. M. Dorsey seconded that.

Roll Call:

B. Lyman	Disapproved – Because the windows are vinyl. The house is so prominent and is a signature house. She stated that she would hate to see vinyl on the house.
R. Hopper	Approved
P. Newhouse	Approved
A. Roller	Approved
M. Dorsey	Approved

Page 6
 Historic District Board of Review
 June 27, 2016

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

R. Hopper stated that he felt the Board agreed with Betsy, but that the circumstances warranted a change. M. Dorsey agreed. B. Lyman said she wasn't against the awning style window, but preferred they be aluminum clad. A. Roller added wood aluminum clad. The Applicant asked that if she found that option would she have to come back before the Board. D. Sutter stated that the Board could alternately approve those materials. S. Gray that she would check into this again. B. Lyman thanked S. Gray for that consideration. S. Gray said she and her husband were trying to restore the dignity and integrity of the house. D. Sutter suggested to amend the motion to approve aluminum clad wood windows, that way the applicant could still put in the ones that had been approved in the first motion, but if she found the other, she could install those.

P. Newhouse said the amendment would be that the preferred alternative would be aluminum clad wood windows. B. Lyman seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

The amendment to the motion passed and will be added to the Certificate of Appropriateness.

4. Jonathan Garlinghouse – C. of A. to place wood-frame, mobile shed at rear of property. The dimensions of shed are 8' x 8' x 8.5'.

Location: 920 W. Main Street

Zoned: Residential Medium Density (R-8)

As J. Garlinghouse was signing papers indicating that he had his signage up for the required amount of time he stated that he didn't know about the need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He added that he thought the house was nice and but felt it was limited on space, so with having a nine month old son and a wife, he needed more storage.

T. Broadnax presented images of the property with a PowerPoint presentation. She indicated that the applicant was a renter of the property and was probably not aware of the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The applicant reviewed the pictures with the Board and added that he was going to add a swing door to the storage unit, a barn looking door and to brace the sides to make it sturdy. He said he will add felt and shingles and wood around the top. R. Hopper asked if it was mobile. The applicant said it was totally mobile. He added that it also added privacy to his back yard from all the people who walk through the alley.

R. Hopper asked if there were any questions from the Board. B. Lyman asked Mark Johnson about the building codes for temporary buildings like this. M. Johnson said that if the material costs are \$500 or less, then a building permit is not needed. A. Roller added that she thought there was something about a concrete pad. M. Johnson said mobile buildings usually had skids so they could be moved. B. Lyman asked if a concrete pad would make the building permanent and then require a building permit. A. Roller asked M. Johnson if that was right. M. Johnson said that would increase the cost of the building and that's where it would come up.

B. Lyman asked how the applicant would move the building. The applicant said that he enclosed the bottom so critters wouldn't get under the building. So he would remove that and then slide a skid boards under it. B. Lyman asked if it was the applicant's intention to move it when he left. The applicant stated that he might leave it there for the next renter that there wasn't much storage space in the house and if they have a kid like he and his wife does they would need the extra space. R. Hopper asked if there were any other questions from the Board or the audience.

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 June 27, 2016

A. Roller moved that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on June 7 and discussed on June 27 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for new construction pages 64 to 71. New garages and outbuildings should be built to the rear of the dwelling or set well back on side elevations. The guidelines are being met, therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. P. Newhouse seconded the motion.

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

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

Old Business

R. Hopper asked if there was any Old Business. He stated that he wasn't here last month so he didn't know if there was anything. Hearing none, he asked if there was any New Business.

New Business

Mark Johnson, Madison Building Inspector gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Board. He stated that this had been a unique month for stop work orders. He showed images of a home at the corner of Plum and First Street across the street from the Canida residence where he issued a Stop Work Order. He stated that the owners knew the correct Historic Madison procedures when they remodeled the house and that he got that taken care of.

He then showed images of a demolition of a garage. He stated the garage was a two story structure that could be seen from Main Street. He said that he had been called in from a vacation day to do an inspection and he noticed some activity going on over there. He made Louann Waller and Tamara Broadnax aware of the situation. He said someone reported that demolition had begun and then he came back Saturday and the whole structure was on the ground. He had issued a Stop Work Order on Friday because the demolition had started. He also stated that a letter was sent to the home owners as required by the ordinance. He showed before and after pictures of the demolition. He stated that he had talked to the homeowner's mother a month ago and told her about the required procedures. He then referred to the photo showing the Stop Work Order posted on the garage. He added that this was a unique structure that spanned three property lines so in order for them to ever rebuild, they would need to get it all on one property. He stated there were several issues involved that would need to be taken care of. M. Johnson said the posting of the Stop Work Order was taken down and that is a State issue.

M. Johnson then returned to the images of the residence at the corner of Plum and First Streets. The Board looked at a photo of what the house looked like before remodeling. M. Johnson said the photo was from Google Earth. The next photo showed what has been done to remodel that part of the house. M. Johnson stated that the owners said that the vinyl windows had been removed, cleaned and put back in. The men doing the construction across the street said otherwise. Originally it had two windows on front with a door and a window and it has been changed around. He pointed to an area where the steps were and the door had been removed. The new siding that has been applied is LP Smart siding which he wasn't sure if the Board had approved as an acceptable material. He said that isn't like Hardie board. He asked if that was approved. M. Dorsey stated the Board did approve it on an earlier application this evening. M. Johnson said on this one, they had done everything. M. Dorsey asked if it had vinyl windows in it. M. Johnson stated that it does now but it did not originally. B. Lyman asked if M. Johnson if he gave them a Stop Work Order, too. M. Johnson said yes. An image was shown of the stop work order posted on the house. M. Dorsey asked if they stopped. M. Johnson said that day they did and said he waited until 5:30 for them to leave. R. Hopper asked if they took out a door and a window. M. Johnson said yes.

R. Hopper stated that as the chair of the Board he would recommend, if it was alright with the Board Attorney, that an Executive Session be held to talk about these two properties to see what action the Board may wish to

Page 8
 Historic District Board of Review
 June 27, 2016

take. He stated that he thought they were in violation of the Stop Work Order at least. He asked if the Planning Office would come up with some dates and find a date that is best for the Board and the attorney to meet. D. Sutter stated that discussing the initiation of litigation whether or not that is the decision the Board comes to, that discussing that is allowable to have an Executive Session over and that would be his recommendation to do.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other New Business. T. Broadnax said she wanted to mention the email that the Board should have received regarding meeting with the Planning staff. She added that each new review cycle is set as the second Tuesday of each month and that will begin July 12th and will start with Ann and Valecia. R. Hopper asked if this was to visit the sites of the applicants. T. Broadnax said yes. B. Lyman said that she had it down as Ann Roller and Mike Dorsey for the July 12th cycle. Both Ann and Mike said that they weren't available on that date. B. Lyman suggested that the memo she had should be forwarded to the Board members again. T. Broadnax said that Jess Butler had made some changes to the schedule before she left. B. Lyman asked that the revised schedule be sent to the Board. T. Broadnax said that Jess had assigned a senior Board member with a newer one. R. Hopper said it was similar to the situation if a Board member couldn't make it to a Board meeting and if there was a date on the schedule when they weren't available, then we could switch it around and schedule it through Tamara. P. Newhouse asked who would email it. Tamara said she would and to let her know if a date on the schedule didn't work and she would make a change.

In other New Business, B. Lyman showed pictures of a new architectural sheet metal machine that Aaron Perry has at his Exterior Pro Roofing business. She, Jess Butler, and Pam Newhouse visited his shop and saw a demonstration of the equipment. She stated that this would allow them to make custom metal pieces for historic homes including standing seam metal roofs. R. Hopper said that this would be something we could let applicants know about. P. Newhouse said it is the only machine locally, and that the closest one to Madison is in Louisville.

P. Newhouse reported that last Thursday, she, Betsy Lyman, Jess Butler attended a conference in Richmond, Indiana called Quality of Place and it was very interesting. She stated that one session in particular put forward ideas on how to stimulate restoration of historic homes through technical advice and low interest loans that is currently being done by an organization in Cleveland, Ohio and it's made a tremendous difference. She added that we were all very excited and took a lot of notes and we'd like to tell more about as we learn more and have the presenter come back and talk to us.

R. Hopper asked if there was any other New Business. Hearing none, he said he would entertain a motion to adjourn. M. Dorsey moved to adjourn. R. Hopper asked for a voice vote. All were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 pm.

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Tamara Broadnax, Preservation Support Staff*

Louann Waller, Secretary

*T. Broadnax and B. Lyman prepared the minutes. A final review of the draft was done by T. Broadnax.