

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

September 26, 2016

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, September 25, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Pam Newhouse, Ann Roller, Valecia Crisafulli, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey, and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

R. Hopper noted that a report from the Indiana Dept. of Natural Resources has been received. This is for Madison's CLG which is Certified Local Government. Report stated that we were substantially compliant with regulations, had a few recommendations. R. Hopper requested that the report be posted on-line (City's website). V. Crisafulli stated if we are not currently members of the National Alliance of Preservation Commission, thought for the money to join that organization it would afford us a great array of training opportunities, resources, and there is a national conference every other year that the group puts on that helps commissions learn more about their rolls and provides training for commission members. Even if we never get to the conference, it would be good for newsletters, resources, and information that she thought would help the members and staff. This would be joining as a group so all would have access to the resources.

V. Crisafulli offered to research information and report back at the October meeting.

Minutes:

There were no additions or corrections to minutes of the previous meeting. P. Newhouse made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by M. Dorsey – roll call – all ayes.

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.

C. of A. Board Member Worksheet:

R. Hopper reminded everyone of the audit sheet which was presented to board members and guests at the last HDBR meeting. He explained this provides the board members with a checklist and it was agreed upon at the August meeting to adopt the Audit sheet tonight. P. Sanchez asked if the checklist is just to keep the members on track. That is correct per R. Hopper. B. Lyman welcomed suggestions or amendments to the form. V. Crisafulli asked D. Sutter that sometimes when doing grant reviews, those review sheets become part of public record in case anyone files an information request, would this be applicable to these sheets. Yes, per D. Sutter – would become part of the record of this administrative board. He added that the sheet is a tool, it is not changing anything, it is based from Ordinance; form will help to focus, reference the Guideline numbers so when a board member is making a decision it may be easier or more useful to compare and being able to check if requests meets Guidelines. He repeated that the sheet should be included as part of the records.

P. Newhouse made the motion to adopt the worksheet – seconded by V. Crisafulli – roll call – all ayes.

Use of C. of A. Board Member Worksheet approved.

(Use to begin at the next HDBR meeting)

New Applications:

1. Adam Thompson and Emily Wolf – C. of A. for a new 50-ft. x 40-ft. garage.
Location: **824-826 W. Main St.** Zoned: Specialty District (SD)
Parcel I.D. 39 08 34 443 107 000 007

Mr. Thompson present and explained that there were two (2) buildings; utilizing PowerPoint pictures he pointed out a two-story building on the right that had an upstairs which was in very rough shape as was the building that it was attached to that was on 826 W. Main Street that is in the left of the picture on the bottom; noted pictures of the back of the buildings from the alley view; view from Main Street.

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

P. Newhouse asked Mr. Thompson if they own 824 & 826 – one lot. Mr. Thompson noted that the lots have been combined.

Continuing to look at the PowerPoint pictures, noted pictures of the proposed new structure. Mr. Thompson said that was an imagine to give the board an idea of what their new building would look like – with a few changes – no overhang, two man doors, two walk-in doors, and three windows, pointed out the side that would face their house; for the alley side it will be similar to the bottom picture which, again, without the overhang; picture up top gives the idea with a one man door and a couple of windows on one side with another walk-in door to the left with another window so there will be three windows total and two walk-in doors (south side).

In response to V. Crisafulli's question, Mr. Thompson said the proposed use of the building is for him to put his vehicles in; he has three or four cars himself and with a van and another truck it's hard to keep them all on the road and one has already been sideswiped and damaged.

R. Hopper asked for confirmation that there will be three garage openings. Yes, per Mr. Thompson, three 10 x 10 garage doors. R. Hopper also asked if they will be carriage type style. Mr. Thompson answered yes and further stated they like that style a lot, that is what they chose, so the picture which already has them on there gives an idea of what his will look like.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson about the proposed materials. Mr. Thompson said the materials they want to use look real similar to the pictures; want to go with standing seam (roof), metal for sides – be a complete metal building is what he wanted to do originally and thought would like to but knows from experience there are issues with that so he would be willing to look for other alternatives for the siding and the roof just as long as he can get the building done by winter.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson if he would consider Hardie board or Smart Siding. Mr. Thompson said the Smart Siding would be the only one he would actually consider; the T-111 or any type of wood that would have a lot of maintenance every few years painting it, he definitely would not want to go that route, but he would be able to venture into some other ideas as long as he can get the building rolling. Said perhaps he could get back with this board at a later date to discuss.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson about the windows and doors – are they vinyl. Mr. Thompson stated they have chosen aluminum clad windows; steel door with blinds inside the glass; aluminum garage doors. L. Waller noted that Mr. Thompson had chosen 1/1 windows.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson if he had an actual plan that he is going to follow. Added that sometimes it is difficult for the board, when shown pictures of something, not really sure what he is building unless they see an actual plan. In pointing to a PowerPoint picture, Mr. Thompson said his building would be with metal and standing seam, identical to what the building would look like especially the bottom picture from the alley side with those garage doors, no pergolas on top but it would be identical to the bottom building. B. Lyman then asked if it will be carriage doors and aluminum clad windows, and thought he said in his application there will be two windows and one door. Mr. Thompson said there will actually be three windows from the street side which faces the back of their home and there will be two walk-in doors. Further, B. Lyman said she was a little confused about the size of the building, it sounds like a really big building – 40 x 50. Mr. Thompson responded by saying it is a fairly large structure but guessed when you have a bunch of vehicles, one car eats up a lot of room so he wants to make sure he has enough space to where he wouldn't have to have anything else parked on the street other than what he drives to work and then maybe another truck. With their parking spot by the road they only have two spots. He said with his projects he has a few cars they don't drive every day that he wants to make sure they are away especially for winter and that way they are not getting

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

damaged. Looking at the PowerPoint screen, B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson if one of those buildings is that dimension. Mr. Thompson said those on the bottom he would guess to be 30 x 40, the top one on the left is a 30 x 40. B. Lyman said to Mr. Thompson so he is proposing 10-ft. more both ways so there will be more space between the doors. There will be a little more space between the doors but they will be spaced out evenly just like the bottom building. B. Lyman told Mr. Thompson that one of the things this board has to consider in their design strategies is that the buildings look compatible with other buildings in the neighborhood and it seemed like he would have the biggest garage in the neighborhood. Mr. Thompson answered that there are a couple of other ones here and there that are fairly large but thought right around his block his would be the largest – thought the one behind them in the alley is fairly large but it is very old as well. B. Lyman then asked Mr. Thompson if he felt like it needs to be that large. Mr. Thompson said he really does, yes, because it will be a building that he will have probably for the rest of his life. Now if it was an issue with size on cutting it down some, he would be willing...at this point he just needs a building by winter to be able to put at least a few cars in. Thought a 30 x 40 would be the absolute smallest he could go and maybe even the same width of what they had. He explained that the original buildings were actually 55-ft. wide but it was up against another structure in the alley so they cut out a few feet there. Then as far as the width of it, he wouldn't want to give any there, but maybe the depth of it he would be willing to make that not as deep. B. Lyman asked Mr. Thompson if he would be willing to go 30. He would be willing to go 30, per Mr. Thompson. Further, B. Lyman asked for confirmation from Mr. Thompson that he wants the length 50. Yes, per Mr. Thompson, would still want the length to be the entire width of their property with 3-ft. on each side of course. B. Lyman asked M. Johnson if there are any issues with setbacks or anything on the lot or height due to the power lines going over. He answered that those would be discussed when they come in for the building permit; usually the candidates white line showing staying within parameters; this is identified on the building permit application.

V. Crisafulli asked for clarification from Mr. Thompson that he would be willing to put Smart siding on the building. Mr. Thompson told her he would be willing to look at other options as far as materials used. And, that she (B. Lyman) had brought up the issue about the building size so he would be willing to go down to 30 on that but he would still like the width of it to be the same. Then for materials he would look at other options that they could use that would be more suitable for it.

V. Crisafulli stated she was willing to vote for this if he (Mr. Thompson) is willing to follow the materials in the Guidelines. And, she thought it goes without saying, only because we have a number of these tonight, that part of the problem with this application was the fact that the work got started without coming here first and that has presented quite a problem. Yes, per Mr. Thompson. Further, V. Crisafulli stated that she thought they had seen this weekend what an attraction the historic district is for the whole region and thought this board sees it as their role to make sure this continues to be a great draw for people. V. Crisafulli further told Mr. Thompson that she thought the materials he is going to use are important and then in terms of checking back with this board, would want to see pictures and make sure it is in compliance. Mr. Thompson said he could most definitely do that and knew that Mr. Johnson will be with them a lot at the get-go with the footer, the block and everything so he guessed what he was really looking for, since they have waited so long this year, to be able to start the work and then when it gets close to choosing materials if he could meet with some of this board somehow and go over that so that way can get started with the footer and actual foundation. V. Crisafulli told Mr. Thompson with regard to the depth, and understood where he was going with the scale and size, but if have the width and he said the structures he demolished were even wider (Mr. Thompson noted they were 55-ft. wide), from an visual standpoint, the depth isn't an issue and thought it could make...certainly a garage is more utilitarian when you have some space in front of your vehicles when you pull them in. Mr. Thompson told her that he didn't know if she had noticed how far the old buildings set on the alley, they would have to come much farther back and that is why

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

they have already accounted for that in their yard. V. Crisafulli said she really didn't see the size as an issue, thought materials is the issue here.

R. Hopper said to Mr. Thompson that to clarify he thought what the board would like to help to help him with is that the board would review the application and put in there that he will put the aluminum clad windows and Smart siding so that he doesn't have to come back before the board for those materials. Mr. Thompson noted that way he could get started with the foundation. They have a lot of stuff that has been sitting out there for so long that needs to be cleaned up and that way before he gets any materials, he would be more than willing to meet with whoever he needs to, all of the board members to let them know the materials or even go over it with them. D. Sutter explained to Mr. Thompson if this board voted to approve a C of A tonight the materials would be in that so Mr. Thompson would know what to do. Mr. Thompson commented that he is familiar with the Smart siding and does like that, just totally against T-111 or a wood type siding. B. Lyman said she agreed, it is more maintenance.

B. Lyman suggested to Mr. Thompson, said not a necessary thing, but suggested that a lot of people seem to like the SmartSide with the wood grain but actually a more historically appropriate one is the smooth one because then it looks more like wood. Mr. Thompson said that is something he had not thought about. Asked for clarification about the flat. Yes, per B. Lyman and then told him that Bender's offers that.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

"I move that the project at 824, 826 W. Main Street be approved for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following stipulations:

- The building to be constructed will be 40 x 50 ft.
- It will have a standing seam metal roof
- It will have LP Smart Siding (hopefully smooth sided which Mr. Thompson agreed to)
- Three Carriage style garage doors on the north side
- Three windows on the south side which will be wood/aluminum clad
- Two steel doors on the south side

If these requirements are met, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be given.

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse – roll call – all ayes.

Motion approved in accordance with motion and vote.

2. James and Allison Hall – C. of A. for replacement of the following windows: East façade – one (1) lower level and two (2) second level; South façade – nine (9) that will include five (5) on the lower level and four (4) on the second level; west façade – two (2) second level.

Location: **309 Elm St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

L. Waller noted that the applicants did not have their meeting signs posted for this meeting, Mr. Hall did come into the (PC) office to get signage for the October meeting; Mr. Hall has requested that tonight's application be extended.

M. Dorsey make the motion to extend application – seconded by B. Lyman – roll call – all ayes.

Application extended to October meeting.

3. Summer Marshall – C. of A. to replace all 15 windows with wood/aluminum clad windows; and for demolition of accessory building.

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

Location: **201 Plum St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Ms. Marshall present. Ms. Marshall advised that she has changed her application as will not be demolishing the building. She explained when she was here last had talked about putting aluminum on the garage and then had recommended the other siding so they have decided to go with that. B. Lyman asked the applicant if the plan is still to raise the roof. Yes, per Ms. Marshall, this will be for additional storage. B. Lyman also asked Ms. Marshall if she knew if she was going to change the roofing. Ms. Marshall said she thought there is metal on it now so they would probably, she was guessing, go with shingles to match the house. Continuing, B. Lyman told Ms. Marshall it would be nice for them to use half-round gutters. Also, B. Lyman asked Mr. Marshall if they plan to change out the doors or anything. Ms. Marshall said that the one garage door, the entry on the side, will be metal; guessed would do some sort of carriage like door on the front because that is what they have on their home garage and the appearance looks a lot nicer. As far as the windows, she said there are only two windows on the side and she was assuming they would replace those as well when the times comes – just haven't gotten that far yet but will probably be the same as the house – wood/aluminum clad – that's what they propose to put in the house.

B. Lyman told Ms. Marshall like she had mentioned to the last applicant, the smooth side siding, if can get that, it's really...Ms. Marshall answered that she thought they were going to do what matches the house which is actually the woodgrain. B. Lyman explained to Ms. Marshall that a lot of people don't realize there is an option and that the smooth side actually looks more historic. Ms. Marshall said they would definitely look at it.

B. Lyman said she just wanted to note, on the worksheet what they are trying to start is to get someone to help to certify that the windows, obviously these are damaged, but we are going to try to get someone who has experience with wood windows to help us certify how deteriorated they are and if they can be renovated. Asked L. Waller if that is to start next month. L. Waller confirmed this.

R. Hopper advised that the board would separate the Certificates – one for the windows and one for the garage. It was noted that the HDBR gave approval for metal siding on the garage at the July, 2016 meeting.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that the Madison Board of Review approve an amended Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 201 Plum Street to replace the existing metal siding on the garage with Hardie board siding which is an acceptable replacement material.”

Motion seconded by V. Crisafulli

B. Lyman said she wanted to mention that Ms. Marshall talked about other materials like the carriage doors and things like that, maybe that could be part of the application so could get that on record. M. Dorsey asked if perhaps that was covered last month. No, per B. Lyman. Ms. Marshall said she didn't know specifically what the door will look like and didn't know exactly what the windows will look like but would be along the lines of a decorative finish. B. Lyman then asked if it would be appropriate just to say a "carriage" style door, would that cover it for Ms. Marshall? Yes, per Ms. Marshall.

M. Dorsey said he was adding the carriage style doors to his motion - V. Crisafulli retained her second to the motion - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

R. Hopper asked for a motion for the windows.

M. Dorsey said the following motion:

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 201 Plum Street to replace approximately 15 existing windows with aluminum clad supported by the Residential Guidelines on Pages 60 and 61 indicating aluminum frame windows are acceptable windows when existing wood windows are not reasonably repairable. Motion seconded by P. Newhouse - roll call - all ayes.

Window replacement approved in accordance with motion and vote.

4. Springdale Cemetery – C. of A. for demolition of single family dwelling structure.
 Location: **600 W. Fifth St.** Zoned: Open Space (OS)

Springdale Cemetery representative and president of Springdale Cemetery Association, Peter Woodburn, present and noted that he was very fortunate to have most of the board of directors accompany him in case there are additional questions that he can't cover as he has been the president for three (3) months.

Mr. Woodburn said in having to have served on one of the original boards back in the old City Hall and having worked with the Historic Review board it is absolutely a delight to see it so professional.

Mr. Woodburn stated that the house that is in question is the Sexton house, the _____ house, it was built as close as they can tell after 1860. The property is in dire need of either demolition or being torn down, one or the other. It is almost unsalvageable; Mark Johnson has been down to the property and has looked at it; Steven Ash who is involved with the cemetery has also looked at it, and he and his father have sort of been the caretaker for the building. He went on to say that they just cannot afford to replace it and they can't afford to renovate it. But what they would like to do is to take it down which will give them additional area of new plots to sell. They do need the revenue, they do need to start kicking up the cemetery, getting people more involved with it. Said that is what they would like to do; would like permission to tear it down. He noted it is in the floodplain.

B. Lyman said to Mr. Woodburn that the application said they were interested in replacing the house with an office. Mr. Woodburn answered that they are very interested in replacing it with an office, they don't have any clue at this time where the office will be, they don't have the funds to pay for it at this point, it's going to become one of their strategic objectives that they want to move the cemetery association forward to such a point that they can do things that a normal cemetery could do. Further said, they have made provisions, Karen Phillips one of their board members, has made the very gracious offer of storing their documents, a safe and any other records. Ms. Phillips said the location is in an office building at the intersection of SR 56 and 62 (top of Hanover Hill next to insurance office). Ms. Phillips said she is willing to offer the space at no charge temporarily. Mr. Woodburn noted what they don't want to do is to close off the availability of anything, want to make sure those who need to do research have access to it, want to make sure it is in a safe and secure building, want to make sure if something would happen catastrophic they can get the safe out of it.

Ann Roller asked for confirmation from Mr. Woodburn if all they were asking for tonight is demolition. Demolition only per Mr. Woodburn.

V. Crisafulli said she had a question asking for clarification because it was mentioned that this building is in a floodplain which means under current zoning or the way it is classified, they could not get a permit to renovate this or rehab it, is that correct? D. Sutter explained that it is currently zoned Open Space and under that zoning classification it would be ineligible for a building permit for significant renovations. There are certain things/repairs that could be made but they could not...V. Crisafulli asked D. Sutter if anything significant could not be done - new wiring, new plumbing? D. Sutter told her that was correct. Mr. Woodburn asked V. Crisafulli if

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

she had been in the building. She answered that she had not, have driven by it. Mr. Woodburn offered to take V. Crisafulli to the property. He stated that he hasn't been in it either, has just looked at it from the outside, taken photographs, and talked about it a lot, it is disastrous. P. Newhouse said she has been in it - it's at the end of its life, it is a historic structure but they have a lifespan, it has not been taken care for years and didn't know what it would take to bring that building back, it is dangerous, it's not salvageable she didn't believe.

Ann Roller questioned if it's in the floodplain can they build something there. No, per L. Waller. A. Roller said to Mr. Woodburn they couldn't put an office there. Not there, no, per Mr. Woodburn. Mr. Woodburn said they would certainly be back to talk to this board when they get to that point.

B. Lyman asked M. Johnson to help her understand if we say they had a fairy Godmother who gave them money to renovate this for an office, what could be done without getting a building permit. M. Johnson answered that he would go another way with what's required - maintenance and repair, the basement area and stuff that like is maintenance and repair. If they open the walls and needs to be rewired, not up to code, that requires a building permit. Plumbing requires a building permit and HVAC requires a building permit. So survival in the winter months might be an _____. He said that he would also like to put his two-cents in - the option of moving the building, he had a gentleman who moves building...who said to move it from where it is right now just to the bridge is \$15,000.00 (the bridge where you enter the cemetery); raising it higher to go across the bridge is not an option for the simple fact of instability of the building; then you come on down through Fifth St., that's the only way to get out of it, you would have to relocate and take down power lines and everything else. Repair the foundation - can do that. But that is the only thing he could find in the Unsafe Building code, it's not leaning, the foundation just needs to be repaired. M. Johnson added that he knew money is an issue but with a little bit of money could do it a little bit at a time - gut it, start from scratch by redoing everything; could do it if it didn't need a building permit, but they need a building permit, can't issue one. It's a double edged sword here that everyone is faced with.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

V. Crisafulli said she would make a motion but wanted to make a statement before doing so because she thought it is known how she feels about the historic district and this is by far Madison's most important economic asset. Said she could not in good conscience vote to demolish a structure like this. But said she also understood the catch 22 conundrum they are in because we can't say they can't demolish, but also can't rehab it because won't give a building permit, that's really not far. Added that she struggled with trying to put together a motion that would give them an out. Also, she said if there is any discussion after this motion she was open to amending it too to make it more palatable to everybody.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a single family dwelling structure at 600 W. Fifth St. according to the application submitted on August 30, 2016 and discussed on September 26, 2016 under the conditions outlined below:

The Residential Design Review Guidelines, pg. 80, present three qualifications informing the board's decision on demolition

1. Not making a contribution to the historic character of the district.
2. Evidence that the applicant has explored other possibilities for the building including moth balling or moving the building. (V. Crisafulli told M. Johnson she was not aware of any research he had done on that until this point.)
3. Demonstrable economic hardship on the owner. The Guidelines state that demolition by neglect is not a mitigating circumstance when determining economic hardship.

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

The application does not, in my opinion, meet any of these three criteria. However, given that the structure is zoned as nonconforming use and in a floodplain open area and that the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that the survival of nonconforming uses should not be encouraged and that the applicant would not be able to obtain a building permit to rehab the building, I move that the applicant be given a three month period to explore the potential for donating the property to a recipient willing to move the building. If that proves not to be feasible then the applicant would come back before the Board to receive a C. of A, which if granted, would require the building to be carefully dismantled with materials to be donated for reuse following all EPA requirements so materials may be retained."

Mr. Woodburn told V. Crisafulli that he was comfortable with her motion. Said he was not speaking for his board, hard to from where he was sitting. He asked two of the attending board members, Karen Phillips, Don McKay, and Steve Leach, contract employee of the cemetery, if they had any questions or comments. No response.

Audience member, Steve Leach, said on moving the structure, the bridge isn't the main obstacle. The headstones that line the road would be a monumental task to move, would have to move them from both sides of the roads, getting with family members - didn't know how that could be done but wanted to add this for moving the structure. He also said that it is so wide that it would cost thousands of dollars to move those. But to move that many stones and get them back properly would be a huge task, there are some large stones.

B. Lyman said she has moved a house herself and has seen other people move them; sometimes additions are taken off and roofs are taken off so clearances can be made and accommodations, so it takes the right kind of person. Mr. Leach explained that on the front of the structure there are no additions. It's a solid structure. M. Johnson said the size of the house is 36 x 60. Mr. Leach went on to say that the additions would be on the back. Right, where the kitchen is per B. Lyman. Mr. Leach also said to get family members to approve headstones being moved he just didn't know because they own the lot they are sitting on, didn't know how they would do that.

Ann Roller asked Mr. Woodburn if he minded waiting three months and coming back. Mr. Woodburn answered that he didn't think it would be an issue. Again, he was speaking without full board approval but thought three months is adequate time, liked the structure of the amendment, thought in light of what this board is for thought it is a good step. And, if they can't live with it another three months, they can probably start moving stuff out because they know they aren't going to stay there. V. Crisafulli told Mr. Woodburn knowing his skills with marketing she was sure he can get the word out about the availability of this structure.

Addressing V. Crisafulli, D. Sutter asked her if it would be the December or January meeting. Just so all know what is wanted. V. Crisafulli answered that December gets crazy so asked if January works. Mr. Woodburn said that was fine.

Mr. Leach distributed a map and explained that forefathers developed this, mapped this out with the office not being there, with the intent they tore 12 houses down to map, so the office is right "here" - they had already mapped it out as lot numbers. This house was left for the caretakers. B. Lyman asked Mr. Leach if he knew the last time it was occupied. Mr. Leach said they have been down there since 1999 so it was before then. In 1999 they painted the house and put a new roof on it but the damage had already been done. And they took four 40 yard dumpsters of stuff out of there then.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

R. Hopper noted there was a motion on the tabled, asked for a second. Motion seconded by B. Lyman - roll call - all ayes.

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote. Applicant to return to the January, 2017 meeting.

5. Equestrian Group – C. of A. for three (3) cloth awnings – placement of one awning over each of the three (3) second floor windows; concealed LED up lighting to front façade of structure.

Location: **113 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

R. Hopper noted that applicant has requested for their applicant to be extended.

V. Crisafulli made the motion to extend application - seconded by M. Dorsey - roll call - all ayes.

Application extended.

6. Jim Stark – C. of A. for construction of an accessory building.

Location: **1015 N. East St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

Mr. Stark explained that this is intended to be a portable shed with Smart siding. Stated if he had known that the smooth option were available he would have gone with that; white steel roof; only a people door on one end - solid wood door with three panes of glass in the upper portion; strictly for storing household items; will be on skids and fairly easy to move. P. Newhouse asked Mr. Stark if it is located at the back of his property. Yes, yes per Mr. Stark, away from the street but near to 421. P. Newhouse said she knew that it sits back quite a ways.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 1015 N. East St. if constructed according to the plans submitted on Sept. 2, 2016 is within the Madison Residential Design Guidelines for new construction pages 64 - 71. New outbuildings should be built at the rear of a dwelling or set back on side elevation. The wood siding and door to be used are compatible with other structures in the district as is the proposed steel roof. Therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Motion seconded by P. Sanchez - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

7. Steve Buchanan – C. of A. to enclose a portion of east façade porch. Enclosure is so as to accommodate a downstairs bathroom. Infill will be with wood to match existing wood siding.

Location: **601 E. Main St.**

Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

Mr. Buchanan said the part he will be enclosing is where there is screen. Will take out the screen and enclose it with lap wood siding; close off going to the house; there is a door on the inside that you can access that is to be a bathroom.

B. Lyman told Mr. Buchanan this is a really nice house. She asked him if he had lived in it a long time. Mr. Buchanan answered that no he has not, just recently bought it.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

Ann Roller made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historical Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on September 7 and discussed on September 26 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for porches, pages 49, 50. Original porches should not be removed. Porches on the

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

rear and sides of dwellings may be enclosed when not visible from the street. Enclosing the porch with wood, pages 56 and 58, is appropriate for the historic district. The Guidelines are being met. Therefore, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted."

Motion seconded by V. Crisafulli - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

8. Jefferson County Democratic Central Committee – C. of A. to remove existing wood siding from north façade (front of structure) to be replaced with Hardie Siding.

Location: **406 E. Main St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Democratic Central Committee member, John Hutchinson, said that just the part of the wood siding is deteriorated around the doors; there is a little repair that needs to be done on the door frame; want to replace with Hardie board. Noted that it can be seen where existing is deteriorated in the top picture on the right. He said they are just trying to make it look better.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Hutchinson if he happened to know what the building used to be. He answered that when he was a small child it was a chick hatchery. And before that he understood it was a feed store - Samples Feed Store. B. Lyman said it looked like the openings were for some kind of carriage doors. Mr. Hutchinson said that eventually they probably took the incubators out and moved them out north on 421 where Henry Schafer lived. Claude Beaver built a building out there and moved his hatchery out there later on. B. Lyman also said that she had walked around the building and could see on the east and south facades that it looked like the whole building at one time was all one structure. Yes, it was all one structure, was cut up per Mr. Hutchinson. In looking at PowerPoint pictures Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that their portion of the structure goes only as far as the utility boxes, the rest of that belongs to the Red Cross. Of interest he said he has referred to the little opening on the bottom as the door to nowhere until he went through the Red Cross building he didn't know that you could get to the back of that. P. Newhouse asked Mr. Hutchinson how long it has been the Democratic Party headquarters. He said he was gone for a period of time teaching and coaching in other areas and he came back in the 1970's and it was there and that siding has been there consistent, so it has been there 50 years.

B. Lyman told Mr. Hutchinson that she really understood what he is trying to do and in terms of deteriorating, but guessed she always looks at opportunities like this if there is anything that could raise the look of the front of the building to make it a little bit more historic. And, she was doing some online investigation and they actually have things that can be built that look like carriage doors that have a pedestrian door in them so it gives the look like it's actually a door but it's a door within a door. Mr. Hutchinson told B. Lyman that he understood what she was saying but the only reason they are able to do this at all is because the Carpenters Union is going to provide free labor to them. B. Lyman said well maybe they would consider an upgrade of the structure. Mr. Hutchinson said then they get into the problem of whether they can afford it or not. B. Lyman said she understood. Just put that out there because to honor its heritage of what it was before and what this board is all about. Mr. Hutchinson said it didn't look that way when it was a chick hatchery. B. Lyman asked Mr. Hutchinson if he knew what the doors were when it was a chick hatchery. He said no, it's been too long ago. B. Lyman asked P. Sanchez if she remembered. P. Sanchez said she didn't remember that door, no, didn't remember what it was like. A. Roller asked Mr. Hutchinson if he was saying to fill in the whole thing. Confirmed. B. Lyman noted that there can be a door within a door where they want to put the siding. Mr. Hutchinson repeated that that goes beyond their financial capabilities. A. Roller suggested for the discussed area to be painted all one color, just paint it all dark (match the existing front door). B. Lyman told Mr. Hutchinson it's all about unifying the color. R. Hopper noted that the door would stay the same.

P. Sanchez made the following motion:

Page 11
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 406 E. Main St. to replace rooting wood siding around the north facing front door with Hardie board a material deemed appropriate. The applicant will be doing maintenance, repairing trim, and repainting the door consistent with the current appearance. Normal maintenance consisting of tuck pointing brick and painting the back door requires no approval by this board. The application was submitted September 7 and discussed September 26."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

9. Steve Buchanan – C. of A. for installation of wood/aluminum clad windows to front and sides of structure.

Location: **220 W. Second St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

L. Waller told Mr. Buchanan that windows have been a long time coming, thanked him, and knew the neighbors thank him. A. Roller added that she thought the neighbors would be thrilled.

R. Hopper asked the board members if any of them needed any further explanation other than what could be seen on the screen.

B. Lyman asked Mr. Buchanan if they will be 2 over 2. Mr. Buchanan said that all three houses look similar, he started out to put that in there, the other windows are all plain, no grills in any of them, so that is what he will probably put back to make it match the other two existing houses. B. Lyman said she thought that would be appropriate. Mr. Buchanan said he thought that (grills) would look nice but it wouldn't match. B. Lyman also asked Mr. Buchanan if the sills and frames are still there or would he have to remove all those. He explained that some of them are rotted on the side of the house, rotted completely out, but the window will slide right back in, the window sash and everything is already gone, will slide right in and will wrap. B. Lyman said they are always interested in keeping as much original material as possible or at least replacing it with something that is similar in design so it keeps those architectural details intact.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a C. of A. for the proposed project at 220 W. Second St. as submitted on September 7, 2016 and discussed September 26, 2016 to install wood/aluminum clad windows on the south and east face of the house. This is compatible with the Residential Guidelines, windows, pages 62 - 63. Since no existing windows are there to be evaluated for deterioration, this is approved and wood/aluminum clad windows are appropriate." So I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved."

Motion seconded by M. Dorsey - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

10. William L. Demaree – C. of A. for installation of a flush panel steel overhead door to south facade of garage.

Location: **117 W. Third St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

R. Hopper asked Mr. Demaree if there was anything he wanted to say about his application. Mr. Demaree responded by saying that he was just open for questions. A. Roller told Mr. Demaree that he had done a very nice job repairing the brick, it looks really nice. P. Newhouse told Mr. Demaree that it was a carriage house she assumed a long time ago. Mr. Demaree

Page 12
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

confirmed. B. Lyman said she had walked down the alley and looked at what would be the north side and looks like it has some of the original doors and windows in it and lentils, it is really a beautiful building.

No further questions or comments from the board members. No questions or comments from the audience.

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for property at 117 W. Third St. to install a flush panel steel garage door to the south facade of the garage supported by the Residential Guidelines for doors, page 30 - 32 stating that missing doors should be replaced with examples that replicate the original or similar doors."

Motion seconded by P. Sanchez - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

11. Victor Thevenow Jr. – C. of A. to remove black glass panels from south elevation (front façade) of building in order to expose existing brick.

Location: **207 E. Main St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

R. Hopper noted a PowerPoint picture of the front of the building. Mr. Thevenow told the board members didn't know if any of them have walked by the building, there are some of them (glass panels) that are coming lose, the bottom left by the door has cracked, very front bottom has already been replaced at one time that is delaminating now (section on the left); glass is what they are interested in taking off right now and then replacing the wood also. Said he wants to take it back to the original brick. V. Crisafulli asked the applicant if he knew what the brick looks like, the condition of the brick under there. Mr. Thevenow answered that he did not, not without taking a glass panel off and that's going to break. V. Crisafulli advised Mr. Thevenow that there was a period of time when commercial buildings were upgraded in the 20's and 30's with this black glass, the Carrera glass, and that look was really very popular at that time and very common in traditional historic districts like this. Said she would personally hate to see that glass removed, particularly when we don't know what's underneath, it could be so much more expensive for him to redo what's underneath. Mr. Thevenow said that there is water damage behind it now and thought over time he is going to lose the glass to winter freezing and thawing, if she had been by could see where some of it has already moved. He added that the next door lady removed, didn't know what she removed on that side, but it's causing a gap issue there on the left side that is allowing weather to come in too, so it's just a matter of time. V. Crisafulli told Mr. Thevenow it would be really hard for her to approve this without knowing a plan for what's underneath and seeing underneath, felt like he might really regret it. Further told Mr. Thevenow she wouldn't recommend removing this glass, would repair and maintain this look because it's a very traditional and historic look for buildings of this age and the character of the downtowns at that time. B. Lyman said to Mr. Thevenow let's just say he removes the glass and it looks like the next door neighbors, what would he do then? He answered that the next door neighbors has mortar on it that can be removed. B. Lyman then asked Mr. Thevenow if that would be his step to remove. He said his step is to remove to the brick, take it to the brick. Also, B. Lyman asked Mr. Thevenow if he would sandblast. No, per Mr. Thevenow, not sandblasting, can't do that, will be a tedious job to do it. Mr. Thevenow noted that he knew what he is getting in to, depending on what it's on it, if they just glued the glass panels to the brick it's not going to be that big of a deal to take that back. If it's mortared over like that, yea, it's going to take some more work, he understood that. He thought the building would look tremendous bringing it back to the brick structure that it was. P. Newhouse said she agreed and would like to see it go back to the brick and if he is willing to do the work to make the brick look good, that would be agreeable to her. Mr. Thevenow said that maintaining the glass panels he thought over time will see them break, didn't know how to get them to the point where they are not going to break with the freeze and thaw of winter.

Page 13
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 016

B. Lyman commented when she was looking at it she noticed what looked like steel poles inside the glass windows and with seeing other buildings around town with poles like that, that are much more decorative of course, asked Mr. Thevenow if there was any possibility those were exterior at one time and that all of this was built around it. Mr. Thevenow said he was not sure.

V. Crisafulli told Mr. Thevenow this is a beautiful building. Mr. Thevenow said they are actually painting the upper part of it right now. B. Lyman told Mr. Thevenow that just out of curiosity was his intention for retail below. He answered, yes, retail below, he had the shop below, closed it down, going to lease or rent it out to another retail shop.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

V. said she had a motion and just so Mr. Thevenow would know, thought she already stated her reason before for making the motion in this way just because she can't find this justified by the Guidelines.

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for removing the black glass panels from the front facade of the property at 207 E. Main St. according to the application submitted on September 7, 2016 and discussed on September 26, 2016. The Commercial Design Review Guidelines on page 55 states that storefronts rebuilt or remodeled in the 30's and 40's - 1930's and 1940's - such as those featuring Carrera glass a popular treatment applied to commercial architecture during that period should be preserved and maintained in any future building rehabilitations. For this reason the C of A should be denied and the applicant be encouraged to maintain the existing facade and recognize its value and significance to the historic commercial district."

Motion seconded by B. Lyman -

Roll call -

M. Dorsey	Said he thought with the conditions of the glass he would have to disapprove
P. Newhouse	Disapprove
A. Roller	Approve
P. Sanchez	Disapprove
R. Hopper	Disapprove
B. Lyman	Approve
V. Crisafulli	Approve

R. Hopper asked for the final count. D. Sutter announced that the motion failed and thought for cleanliness of the record would say if someone that disagreed with the motion would make a motion to approved, thought that would make a clear record if someone chose to do so.

He further explained - a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness; this motion failed, the motion to deny it failed; as opposed just to having things be deemed approved, for someone that voted against Valecia's motion would like to make an affirmative motion for his project, thought that would make a cleaner record if someone chose to do that.

P. Newhouse made the motion to approve a C of A for this project to remove the black glass and to restore the brick to its original condition - seconded by M. Dorsey - roll call -

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

R. Hopper explained that the original motion to keep it on failed so to clean it up and make it more understandable for the record, Pam did the second motion giving applicant permission to

Page 14
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

take it off and that was approved. R. Hopper said the reason he voted against it was because he was not sure the black glass was put on in the 40's, didn't know if knew the time it was put on.

Application approved.

12. Larry and Lee Ann Angell – C. of A. for removal of rear façade flat roof and rubber membrane and replace with a 6 ½ - 12 pitch roof; installation of asphalt shingles to entire roof.

Location: **807 W. Third St.**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

Mr. & Mrs. Angell present. Mr. Angell pointed to the PowerPoint picture showing the rear of their home and explained that for the last 20 years they have lived there they have had issues with the kitchen part of their roof which is flat, a flat rubber roof. And then they have a back porch which also has rubber. He said they are looking into changing the pitch on just the kitchen itself and leave the porch the way it is. He further explained they want to tear off the shingles and put new shingles on. Mrs. Angell said they have actually had this problem for years; originally rolled roofing on that; went to rubber roofing being told that it would be better; replaced the ceiling in the kitchen twice; they just see no other alternative than to change the pitch; from the front of the house can't see it all, the only way that you see the change in the pitch is from the alley way, not from the front at all. A. Roller noted that even then it will be hard to see. A. Roller asked the applicants if they plan to shingle the porch or just leave it rolled. Mrs. Angell said they plan to leave the porch as it sits right now.

B. Lyman commented that she loves shotgun houses. She asked the applicants if they happened to know the history of it. Mrs. Angell answered that they don't know much about the house.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 807 W. Third if constructed according to the plan submitted on September 6, 2016 is compatible with the character of the historic district. Specifically the replacement of the shingled roof with new 25-yr. asphalt shingles constitutes routine maintenance, replacement of the nonhistoric flat membrane roof in the rear of the house with a gabled shingled one conforms to page 53 of the Madison Residential Review Guidelines which states that this type of roof is commonly found on similar shotgun style houses of this era. In addition there is no visibility on this part of the roof located at the rear of the structure from Third St. and minimal visibility from the alley. A Certificate of Appropriateness should therefore be granted."

Motion seconded by B. Lyman - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

13. Karen Modisett – C. of A. for construction of an accessory building.

Location: **745 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

In looking at a PowerPoint picture on the screen, R. Hopper asked Ms. Modisett if that is a picture of the building she wants put up. Ms. Modisett said the building she wants is actually the small picture in the corner which is a carport minus cupola (because she was told the last time she asked that she couldn't have one). She said this picture is to give the style of the building. She explained that she spent \$1,000.00 trying to please this board but the architect she hired apparently didn't understand what she was saying, he didn't understand that she wanted a carriage house, he gave her a garage. So \$1,000.00 later she decided to go on the internet, so what this is - it's going to have a space above, just going to be a little higher to allow for storage above; in theory she doesn't build things, not even crafty; so what they see there, that building is a little

Page 15
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

higher, can see the height; the building she is going to have compared to the original plan is going to have what she believes is called a knee wall which will allow for some additional storage above; will actually be a carport facing the alley on the south; her lot is extremely small, 25-ft. wide, so the structure can only be 19-ft. so that doesn't quite allow for two cars but she has never had a garage. She said she needs a place to put her stuff. So, that is it, that little picture on the left is what she is trying to build.

Ms. Modisett said as she turned in her plan she was made aware that a business in Madison now makes seamed metal roofing which is what that building actually has, can't see it, but the top building has that. She noted that she would do standing seam because she thinks it is attractive; would make the bottom of it cement board, however, she had been to Benders at one point and does know what they are talking about. Her brother told her about the smooth and not smooth so she realizes it has to be smooth. Further, she said there will be no windows except for the very top on each end of what would be the loft, they will look old, otherwise why build a carriage house, she could build a garage, but she is not doing that; trying to make it look like a carriage house. Further stated that she didn't make it complete, didn't make it a total building because she was trying not to spend more than she originally paid for her house.

Ann Roller said she wanted to make sure she had it right - going to have smooth Smart siding, standing seam metal roof, and wood/aluminum clad windows. Yes, per Ms. Modisett. Ms. Modisett said they (windows) probably won't be like the half-moon (in picture) because she thought that is a little over the top. But will be something appropriate for the space, perhaps rectangle, and thought would want them to open but not 100% sure. B. Lyman suggested to Ms. Modisett that she might to take a look at the structure and model it after something that would match that. Ms. Modisett stated that the end of her house has a decorative vent (perhaps match the vents); will have gutters and probably Leaf Guard.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

Ann Roller made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on September 7 and discussed on September 26 is within the Madison Residential Review Guidelines for new construction, pages 69 - 71. New garages or accessory structures should be built at the rear of a dwelling or set well back on side elevations. The materials of smooth Smart siding, pages 56 -58, standing seam metal roof, pages 53 & 54, and wood/aluminum clad windows, page 60-63, are all appropriate for the historic district. The Guidelines are being met. Therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted. Motion seconded by V. Crisafulli - roll call - all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

14. Historic Madison, Inc. – C. of A. for a handicap accessible ramp.
 Location: **118 W. Third St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

HMI Director, John Stacier, stated they have been renovating the museum portion of the Dr. Hutchings, they have called it the Dr. Hutchings annex for years, and now they are calling it the museum. This is where Hutchings artifacts and photos of things that can't be put into the Dr. Hutchings office, are not appropriate for display in there, can be installed and hopefully will be part of the candlelight tour of homes at Christmas time. He noted that they are kind of up against a little bit of a deadline. He added that they had come before this board about ten years ago with a similar application which was approved and they just never got around to putting in the handicap accessible ramp at that time. They figured after ten years they had better come back to make sure this is appropriate at this point in time.

Page 16
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2016

Mr. Stacier explained it will be a wood ramp similar to the ramp at the Shrewsberry house and then will landscape around it to try to block some of it; eventually will have a fence going around the entire property, have a bit of historic iron fence to put across the front, not sure what they will do around the alley side on the back; all you will see from the front will be the shrubbery that will be installed to kind of screen the ramp.

B. Lyman told Mr. Stacier she was sure this will be perfectly appropriate and will be done in the greatest of sensitivity. She thanked Mr. Stacier for jumping through the hoops like everybody else - he is setting a good example. Mr. Stacier said he would be back in the future because they have some other things that will be happening. V. Crisafulli said she would echo Betsy's statements and thanked Mr. Stacier and HMI for their good stewardship.

No further questions or comments from the board. No questions or comments from the audience.

P. Sanchez made the following motion:

"I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the application submitted on September 7 and discussed in September 26 for property at 118 W. Third St. is within the Guidelines on page 61 for new construction ramps. The 6-ft. opening will be made in circa 1971 brick wall that separates the related museum properties. A ramp made of wood will use the same design already approved at museum properties located at 301 W. First St. and 408 W. Third St. The ramp will be sandwiched between the brick wall and the building thus have minimal visibility. As materials and design are within Guidelines a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted."

Motion seconded by P. Newhouse - roll call - all ayes.

V. Crisafulli asked to wait just a moment and stated for full disclosure she sits on the HMI Board of Directors; asked D. Sutter if she should reclude herself from this vote or abstain. D. Sutter advised based on the way the vote went it wouldn't matter probably, but yes, thought to abstain was probably a good idea given her interest in the organization. He thanked V. Crisafulli for bringing that up and thought the record should reflect even though it was not a deciding vote being cast.

For the record - V. Crisafulli abstention from voting.

Application approved in accordance with motion and vote.

Business - New or Old:

V. Crisafulli distributed a copy of the 100-Day Plan for Mulberry Street that is part of the ABC project; pleased to announce that Mulberry Street received a grant from *Okra* from the state to do facade improvements.

No further business to be brought before the board.

M. Dorsey made the motion to adjourn - seconded by P. Newhouse.

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

 Ron Hopper, Chairman

 Louann Waller, Secretary

