

**HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW**

Minutes

February 27, 2017

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, February 27, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Ron Hopper, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Valecia Crisafulli, Pam Newhouse, Sonny Ash, Betsy Lyman, Mike Dorsey, and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell; City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

**Minutes:**

V. Crisafulli stated there was one minor revision under new business, the word “elevate” should be changed to “alleviate”. P. Newhouse made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by B. Lyman.

**Roll Call:**

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

***Minutes stand approved as amended.***

R. Hopper gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. Once the application is announced the applicant or representative will come up the microphone to answer any questions. N. Schell would present the particulars on the project. The board would then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. R. Hopper added that at the end of each application the board would vote. N. Schell noted that on the podium is a gold form which each applicant needs to sign and date stating the signage was up for the required fifteen (15) days.

**New Applications:**

1. Rod & Robin Lanum – C. of A. to remove siding on south wall and replace with Hardie Board Siding. Separate gutters on north wall and install new metal downspout.

Location: **612 Walnut St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1845 contributing Italianate style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the current aluminum siding which the owner wants to take off and replace with Hardie Board siding, the current gutters which do not function correctly because of the difference between the siding and brick walls, and proposed siding for the south wall.

B. Lyman asked about the history of the house. Rod Lanum were present and stated he has only owned the property since November 2016. R. Lanum clarified that he did not want to remove the gutters but simply he wants to cut the gutter where the brick wall changes to the siding and add the downspout.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| Building Element     | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material  |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Gutters & Downspouts | 46                           | 44                          | B. Lyman – The guidelines do require they be either aluminum or half-round gutters and the applicant is going to use the aluminum downspout. The guidelines are the residential guidelines on page 46. |





Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

|           |    |    |  |
|-----------|----|----|--|
| Utilities | 78 | 69 | <p>B. Lyman – When people come before the board and it says either shrubs or fence it makes it a little bit difficult for me to know which one it is going to be and to approve a design. If you could as part of the agreement that we would make a part of the motion would be to work with N. Schell to make sure both the materials and height is such that when it is installed, we won't be waiting for shrubs to grow for ten years. We want to make sure the screening is appropriate and effective.</p> <p>John Staicer, President of Historic Madison, Inc. (HMI) was present and stated that was a part of the application and the application is for the placement of the units and HMI will not know the exact height or location of the screening until the units are actually installed. J. Staicer stated he had planned to work with N. Schell in regards to the screening.</p> |
|-----------|----|----|--|

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the project at 301 W. First Street, the Shrewsbury House to install new a/c units along the south façade of the building will be screened with either vegetation or wood and that the applicant has agreed to work with N. Schell once the units are installed so that they meet all the limits set by the Guidelines and if this happens then a COA should be approved.”

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved
- P. Newhouse    Approved
- P. Sanchez      Approved
- V. Crisafulli    Abstained
- S. Ash            Abstained

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

4. Fountain Holdings, LLC – C. of A. to replace wood louvre shutters on front façade. Replace deteriorated ½ round gutters with new 6-inch aluminum ogee style gutters. Remove non-original brick columns on porch and replace with period wood rail and 2-inch spindles.

Location: **607 Jefferson St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Page 5

## Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

N. Schell presented this building was built circa 1890 and is a contributing Queen Anne style. N. Schell showed photos of the current and proposed louvre shutters, current gutters, proposed gutters, current brick columns and railings, and proposed wood railing and spindles.

P. Newhouse stated this house was barely Queen Anne but the current shutters are obviously not original to the house because this style house probably did not have shutters. If the applicant did not want to put shutters back on this house, that would be appropriate. The current shutters are the wrong size because they extend above the lintel. These shutters are not operable but rather just decorative.

Bob Courtney, representative for Fountain Holdings, LLC was present and stated the shutters are attached to the brick. B. Courtney added that someone has done some demolition on the porch previously and the work being proposed would restore the porch to match the style of the home.

P. Newhouse stated this was a very stripped down, plain Queen Anne. B. Courtney stated he has learned a lot about the home since purchasing it and the Folk Victorian style and how that style came to Madison.

V. Crisafulli asked if the applicant intended to sell the house or rent it. B. Courtney stated he planned to sell the home.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| <b>Building Element</b>  | <b>Residential Guideline Page #</b> | <b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b> | <b>Proposed Material</b>   |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Gutters & Downspouts     | 46                                  | 44                                 | <p>P. Sanchez – On page 46 the K-style is approved as preferred.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – The style is approved but not preferred. The half-round style is preferred but I acknowledge that these are more difficult to install and they are more expensive. What the applicant is proposing is appropriate.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons because it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons but would like to see that half-round.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I would say the same thing and would like to see the half-round style.</p>  |
| Porch Columns & Railings | 51, 52                              | ---                                | <p>B. Lyman – These meet the guidelines and appreciate the applicant bring samples of what they are proposing.</p> <p>B. Courtney added he was leaning towards the decorative because there are plenty of examples of that type around town. B. Lyman asked if the applicant was going to use the posts as shown in the example. B. Courtney stated they would not need a center post because the corner posts are supporting the porch. B. Courtney added that only the center column would be removed. B. Lyman asked for clarification that a wood rail would run between the brick piers with turn spindles in-between. B. Courtney stated that was correct.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons as stated because it meets the guidelines on pages 57-58 in the residential guidelines.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree that it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons.</p> |

|          |    |     |  |
|----------|----|-----|--|
| Shutters | 55 | --- | <p>P. Sanchez – The proposed shutters do meet the guidelines on page 55 but was excited about P. Newhouse’s comment since they are not the correct size.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – If the applicant wants to put them back up that is okay but the house would be better without them.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree with the comments about the shutters, the photo illustrates that the shutters do not fit the window. They are different in terms of size.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli asked how the new ones would fit. B. Courtney stated they have two options, first to repair and paint the current shutters in place or remove them and replace them with brand new shutters. B. Courtney added he didn’t consider that the shutters were too big but he knew that in relation to the guidelines these shutters were adhered to the brick rather than window frame. If they chose to replace the shutters, they would right size them.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – This meets the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – I would agree but would like to see the applicant get the right height and width of the shutters. If you were to close the current shutters they wouldn’t even cover the window. It looks narrower than the window. To make it believable that the shutters are operable it needs to be wider and shorter.</p> <p>P. Newhouse added you could never make them look believable because they would have to extremely wide. These are purely decorative shutters.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree because the guidelines state “the addition of new shutter should be of wood and with dimensions that match the window opening”. If the applicant can do that then they meet the guidelines.</p> |
|----------|----|-----|--|

P. Newhouse made the motion.

Motion was seconded by V. Crisafulli.

B. Lyman asked if the motion was for the approval of shutters that match the window opening or the removal of them. P. Newhouse stated yes.

**Roll Call:**

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

**The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.**

Page 7

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

- 5. John & Sally Muessel – C. of A. to replace existing wood six (6) panel door with new four (4) panel solid wood door.

Location: **411 Broadway St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented this building was built circa 1870 and is a contributing Italianate style. N. Schell showed photos of the current 6 panel wood door and proposed 4 panel wood door. B. Lyman stated the board was always looking for solid wood door providers. B. Lyman asked if the applicant could share where they found the proposed door.

John Muessel present and stated they purchased the door from a company in Louisville. It is a milling place which has doors and categories full of doors. B. Lyman asked if they had different size doors and J. Muessel stated they had different sizes and styles. J. Muessel stated the proposed door had detailing which matched up closer with the detailing of the side lights.

P. Newhouse asked about the age of the current door. J. Muessel stated he thought it was added in the 1960s. P. Newhouse asked about the shape of the door. J. Muessel informed the board that the problem is that they had some work done in the interior of the home and during that time the bottom of the door was cut to allow it to operate. Since cutting the bottom, it has started to weather and split.

B. Lyman asked if the applicant would consider donating it to the Re-Store. J. Muessel agreed to donate the door.

M. Dorsey asked if the applicant could supply the name of the door manufacturer to N. Schell so the board would have a record of it. J. Muessel agreed.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| Building Element  | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material   |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Doors & Entrances | 39 - 42                      | 40 - 42                     | B. Lyman – It does meet the residential guidelines on pages 39-40. The door is a solid wood door.<br>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons and it will be a nice contributing feature to this house.<br>M. Dorsey – I agree it meets the guidelines and am glad to see the applicant go with a solid wood door.<br>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons.<br>P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons.<br>P. Sanchez – I agree for the same reasons.<br>R. Hopper – I agree. |

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA as applied for.”

Motion was seconded by V. Crisafulli.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved

Page 8

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

6. Al & Connie Huntington – C. of A. to build a two-story single family home with basement garage. Home will be compatible with historic properties in the neighborhood.

Location: **817 W. First St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell presented a circa 2017 new build. N. Schell presented that this building will be located on a vacant lot on West First Street just west of the townhomes on that street. N. Schell showed a colored image of the proposed building. N. Schell informed the board that the surrounding structures range from two-story to one-story structures on that block.

P. Newhouse asked about the square footage of the building. Al and Connie Huntington were present and A. Huntington responded that the square footage of the building was around 2500 sq. ft. on each floor. There is about 3700 sq. ft. total.

P. Newhouse stated the design was nice and would fit really well in the district. V. Crisafulli stated she appreciated the scale of the house on this block because it will work well. B. Lyman stated she appreciated the effort to put the garages low and out of sight. A. Huntington stated initially they had the garage on the front but after meeting with N. Schell they decided that wasn't the best place for it.

N. Schell presented additional images which showed proposed setbacks, south, east and north elevation views. A. Huntington stated the setback shows a 3-ft. setback which is the minimum. They may move the building back as far as a 7-ft. setback to be in line with the townhomes. P. Newhouse asked if the windows were aluminum clad. A. Huntington stated that was correct. P. Newhouse asked if there were three garage doors on the south elevation. A. Huntington stated that was correct. P. Sanchez asked where the access was to the back of the building to get to the garage. A. Huntington stated the driveway would come in behind the house from a private street.

S. Ash asked about the pitch of the roof on the main house. A. Huntington stated he did not know but could find out. S. Ash stated the pitch looked a lot steeper than the houses next to the lot. The houses right next to the applicants' is somewhere between a 4/12 and 6/12 pitch. This house looks like somewhere between an 8/12 and 10/12 pitch. S. Ash expressed concerns about the compatibility of roofline with the adjacent buildings. A. Huntington stated the adjacent buildings have a roofline which goes straight up and goes flat and they did not want a flat roof. A. Huntington stated they had driven around the district looking at the different types of roofs and they decided they liked the hipped roof the best. S. Ash stated all the other roofs were gabled on that street block and this would be the only hipped roof. S. Ash stated this makes the roofline not compatible. P. Newhouse stated the roofline was still compatible with the district because there are many homes with this roofline.

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

| Building Element | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material  |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Infill Buildings | 69-71                        | 64-66                       | <p>V. Crisafulli – On pages 69-71 of the residential guidelines it states “infill construction in the Madison’s residential areas should be compatible with adjacent buildings in scale, height , materials, orientation, shape, placement and rhythm and proportion of openings” and this home meets those criteria.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – This project is going to fit into the neighborhood very nicely and it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>S. Ash – The design is nice but in the residential guidelines on item five it states “new buildings should be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of roof form” and this project does not meet this criterion.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I wanted to complement the applicant on all the materials which are listed; brick, stone, aluminum, ogee gutters, wood columns, shingles, aluminum clad windows, wood entry door, and the garages behind and below the house. All of these meet the guidelines. I agree with S. Ash on the roof configuration and would like to see a different roof configuration so that it would be more compatible with adjacent houses.</p> |

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness based on the residential guidelines for new infill construction.”

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman        Not Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez      Approved

V. Crisafulli    Approved

S. Ash            Not Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

R. Hopper stated the applicants COA has been approved and they would get a physical copy once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project. N. Schell reminded the applicant that they would need a building permit from the Building Inspector.

Page 10

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

A. Huntington stated he wanted to clarify that the work currently being done at the property is not work being started but since this property is right on fringe of the floodway, the elevation had to be raised to meet FEMA regulations.

7. - 11. Madison Main Street Program - Mulberry Façade Improvement Program

N. Schell stated since this project is part of the Mulberry Façade Improvement Project she was going to let the applicant and their representative talk about each project. N. Schell informed the board that all the structures within this Madison Main Street project are contributing Italianate built between 1850 and 1900. Andrew Forrester will introduce the project and then each separate section will have its own slide.

V. Crisafulli stated she needed to recuse herself from the discussion and vote because she is a member of the Main Street Board and part of the America's Best Communities team. P. Newhouse stated she needed to recuse herself from the discussion and vote because she is a member of the Main Street Design Committee.

Andrew Forrester from the City of Madison shared some background about the Mulberry Façade Improvement Project. This is a unique application because this is one group. This came because this project is result of collaboration between the City of Madison, Madison Main Street Program, Office of Community and Rural Affairs, and America's Best Communities team. As many people know, the America's Best Communities team has worked on a number of projects, the big and most visible one is Hatcher Hill and the trail and Mulberry Street has been a main focus. Part of this project is to revitalize Mulberry Street and reimagine Mulberry Street. A. Forrester continued by stated there was two public meetings where they received feedback from the public about what was important to area residents and property owners on Mulberry Street and they have taken ideas from that. One opportunity that came up was to work on a façade program and there was a lot of interest in that. The group then applied for \$10,000 matching grant from Indiana Office of Community and Rural Affairs and that was approved. That grant was matched with \$10,000 from America's Best Communities dollars, money from the Madison Main Street Program and from each property owner who is a part of this project. This is just the first phase and the hope is to complete a phase two and phase three to continue to do work on Mulberry Street. A. Forrester thanked Kim Nyberg and Link Ludington for their hard work on this project.

Link Ludington, co-chair of the Mulberry Enhancement Project and member of the Madison Main Street Design Committee, summarized the work for all five Madison Main Street projects which are subject to Board approval. The location of the project is the 300 Block of Mulberry Street and while at the meeting the specific work discussed is limited to the facades of each building, this project is a comprehensive project. The nature of the work that is going to be done includes to the removal of inappropriate modern materials such as plywood coverings, an existing awning, doors and window coverings, and a downspout. The replacement treatments include rehabilitating and restoring what is underneath the plywood where it exists, where existing historic elements do not exist the work will be to repair those elements and the replacement of existing materials with similar materials. A new awning will also be placed on the 321 building will be identical to the awning shown in the guidelines. The proposed light fixtures are comparable to those presented in the guidelines.

Kim Nyberg, co-chair of the Mulberry Enhancement Project, stated this is a fantastic project and they are so thrilled that the property owners on this street want to be involved. Mulberry Street is one of the gems in Madison's commercial district.

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

- 7. Madison Main Street (Francis R. & Joan W. Short) – C. of A. to remove sign frame, light fixtures, remains of old storm window tracks, and plywood coverings on door and window openings. Repair surviving storefront bulkheads and transoms or replace to match original. Install new or salvaged shop doors to replace missing original doors. Install new “gooseneck” metal light fixtures.

Location: **311-315 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

K. Nyberg presented that the storefront has been covered for many years and that plywood covering will be removed. During the investigation done from the inside, it was determined that the raised panels on the bulkheads were still there under the coverings. On the 313 building there is a projecting sign which will be removed. The old storm windows on the second and third floor will be removed. The storefronts have beautiful cast iron detailing. K. Nyberg showed images of the current buildings and a couple drawings of the proposed changes. Since the buildings have apartments on the second and third floors, there are two doors which will have to stay at this time but they will make them visually disappear. There will also be a change in the exterior lighting. It currently has coach lights on the second floor and those will be changed to a more appropriate commercial lighting type such as a gooseneck light.

B. Lyman asked about the architectural detail of the far left building. She noted that on the second floor in the center there appeared to be a door. L. Ludington answered that was correct and informed the board there was a balcony on the building at one time. K. Nyberg stated that particular opening is currently covered and they want to remove those coverings. The door in that building is still attached but sealed off and is inoperable.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| Building Element  | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material   |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Doors & Entrances | 39 - 42                      | 40 - 42                     | <p>P. Sanchez – On page 40-42 it lists the use of new or salvaged wood and that is what the application is proposing.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – Yes it meets the guidelines for doors and entrances on pages 40-42.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>B. Lyman asked about the materials of the doors as the application stated wood or wood composite. L. Ludington stated the preference is to use wood but would like the approval to include wood composite if they were to go that way. B. Lyman stated the guidelines stated the appropriate material is wood and asked if wood composite is approvable material. N. Schell stated that material is not talked about in the guidelines. K. Nyberg clarified that the doors would be wood not wood composite.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree it meets the guidelines.</p> |
| Lighting          | 47                           | 45                          | <p>B. Lyman – The guidelines specify for dark metal gooseneck lights.</p> <p>S. Ash asked if the lights would be painted or anodized. K. Nyberg stated the sample she pulled to show the property owner was a dark anodized light.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree this application meets the guidelines.</p> <p>M. Dorsey - I agree it meets the guidelines on page 45 of the guidelines.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree.</p>   |

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

|             |     |         |  |
|-------------|-----|---------|--|
| Signs       | 59  | 48 - 51 | M. Dorsey – Since it is not original the removal of it meets the guidelines as outlined on pages 48-51.<br>P. Sanchez – I agree.<br>S. Ash – I agree.<br>B. Lyman – I agree.   |
| Storefronts | --- | 52 - 55 | S. Ash – As stated on pages 52-55 of the guidelines that “storefronts are defining elements of the commercial and historic character” of the building and the applicant has proved the original elements are still there.<br>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reason and because the proposed materials of wood, iron, and glass are all approved materials.<br>R. Hopper – I agree for the same reasons. |

M. Dorsey made the motion.

Motion was seconded by R. Hopper.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- B. Lyman      Approved
- M. Dorsey     Approved
- P. Newhouse   Abstained
- P. Sanchez     Approved
- V. Crisafulli   Abstained
- S. Ash          Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

- 8. Madison Main Street (Lisa Lumpford & Sharon Burchett) – C. of A. to remove plywood coverings of door and window openings.

Location: **316 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

K. Nyberg presented that the only work to be done on this building was to remove the plywood covering from the door and the transom. P. Sanchez asked if the work included the transom where the a/c unit is located. K. Nyberg stated the a/c unit would probably stay. L. Ludington stated they would like to get it approved for both because they are looking for an alternative a/c unit.

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

| Building Element  | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material  |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Doors & Entrances | 39 - 42                      | 40 - 42                     | P. Sanchez – It is always removing plywood is a good thing and supported by the guidelines on pages 40-42.<br>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.<br>S. Ash – I agree.<br>B. Lyman – I agree.<br>R. Hopper – I agree.  |
| Windows*          | 60 - 63                      | 56 - 59                     | B. Lyman - The materials stated in the application are for wood or wood-metal clad. That is in agreement with the commercial guidelines on pages 56-59.<br>N. Schell noted that this application was to remove the plywood coverings from the windows not to replace any windows. K. Nyberg stated the only replacement would be if the glass needs to be put back into the transom. N. Schell stated that fell under maintenance and repair and does not need approval. L. Ludington stated they would like approval because if the transom sash has been removed where the a/c unit is they would like to replace that. L. Ludington stated since there is a lot of uncertainty in these projects that should anything arise as they are removing materials they would consult with N. Schell. |

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the project at 316 Mulberry Street be approved for a COA and they are requesting to remove the plywood coverings of the doors and window openings of the storefront and therefore should be approved”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

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

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

Page 14

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

9. Madison Main Street (Gary L & Bonnie L Hopper) – C. of A. to remove existing door. Install new shed-type canvas awning and suitable new or salvaged door.

Location: **321 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

R. Hopper stated he needed to recuse himself from the discussion and vote because he is related to the applicant.

K. Nyberg stated the owners have taken good care of the exterior of the building. The changes will include a new flat sign for the barber shop, the installation of a new canvas awning with a three to three-half foot drop. The awning will be the appropriate size with a return. The door that is on the barber shop right now is colonial style door and not a commercial door. A drawing and image of a sample of the proposed door was included on the PowerPoint.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| <b>Building Element</b> | <b>Residential Guideline Page #</b> | <b>Commercial Guideline Page #</b> | <b>Proposed Material</b>  |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Awnings                 | 35                                  | 34, 35                             | P. Sanchez – It meets the guidelines on pages 34-35 because the shed type canvas awning is appropriate.<br>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.<br>S. Ash – I agree.<br>B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons. |
| Doors & Entrances       | 39 - 42                             | 40 - 42                            | B. Lyman – I agree it meets the guidelines because the proposed material is wood and supported by the commercial guidelines on pages 40-42.   |

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA to remove the existing door and install a shed type awning and new or salvaged door at 321 Mulberry Street as proposed”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

**Roll Call:**

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

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

10. Madison Main Street (Waltz Property LLC – Contract Rowlett) – C. of A. to remove existing upper downspout and install new round downspouts.

Location: **322 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

K. Nyberg presented that the project is to remove the existing downspout and install a new larger downspout. There are problems with the drainage from the top-left corner of the building as pictured. S. Ash asked if the collection box at the top would be changed. K. Nyberg stated probably not but they would consult with the contractor about that. L. Ludington stated the project was to only change the upper downspout.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| Building Element     | Residential Guideline Page # | Commercial Guideline Page # | Proposed Material  |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Gutters & Downspouts | 46                           | 44                          | P. Sanchez - I agree it meets the guidelines because they are proposing to install new round downspout in place of the upper ones and those are discussed on page 44 of the guidelines.<br>M. Dorsey – Yes it meets the guidelines.<br>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.<br>B. Lyman – I agree because both the materials and style meet the guidelines.<br>R. Hopper – I agree also. |

P. Sanchez made the following motion:

“I move to approve the COA for the project at 322 Mulberry Street to remove the existing upper downspout and to install new round downspouts”.

Motion was seconded by B. Lyman.

**Roll Call:**

- R. Hopper      Approved
- B. Lyman        Approved
- M. Dorsey      Approved
- P. Newhouse    Abstained
- P. Sanchez      Approved
- V. Crisafulli    Abstained
- S. Ash            Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

11. Madison Main Street (Dead Letter Office LLC) – C. of A. to remove 20<sup>th</sup> century sheet metal awning, modern “colonial” door, woodwork, and covering of transom. Repair 324 transom or replace to match original. Install new or salvaged door to match 326 existing door. Install new shed-type canvas awning.

Location: **324-326 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

Page 16

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

**Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet**

| <b>Building Element</b> | <b>Residential<br/>Guideline<br/>Page #</b> | <b>Commercial<br/>Guideline<br/>Page #</b> | <b>Proposed<br/>Material</b>   |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Awnings                 | 35  | 34, 35                                     | B. Lyman – Both the shed style and canvas material meet the guidelines on pages 34-35, therefore I agree they meet the guidelines<br>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.<br>M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons.<br>P. Sanchez – I agree.<br>R. Hopper – I agree.                            |
| Doors & Entrances       | 39 - 42                                     | 40 - 42                                    | P. Sanchez – On pages 40-42 of the guidelines it is recommended the use of wood or salvaged wood for the doors and that is what they are asking for and therefore meets the guidelines.<br>M. Dorsey – Yes I agree same reasons.<br>B. Lyman – I agree.<br>S. Ash – I agree.<br>R. Hopper – I agree. |
| Storefronts             | ---   | 52 - 55                                    | M. Dorsey – It meets the storefront guidelines defined elements in the commercial guidelines on pages 52-55.<br>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.<br>B. Lyman – I agree.<br>P. Sanchez – I agree.<br>R. Hopper – I agree.   |

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the project at 324-326 Mulberry Street for a COA to remove 20<sup>th</sup> century sheet metal awning, modern “colonial” door, woodwork, and covering of transom; to repair the transom at 324 or replace it to match the original; to install new or salvaged door to match the existing door at 326 and to install a new shed-type canvas awning all meet the guidelines and materials and therefore the COA should be approved”.

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

**Roll Call:**

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

Page 17

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will be issued.***

R. Hopper stated the applicants COAs have been approved and they would get physical copies once it is generated and signed but they could go ahead with their project.

K. Nyberg expressed appreciation to the Madison Main Street Design Committee and stated this has been a dream for some time. K. Nyberg informed the board this was group one of the property owners and they would be back. D. Sutter expressed his appreciation for the applicant's willingness to go through these applications one at a time. It was D. Sutter's recommendation to separate each individual property owner for the legal notice and therefore the meeting.

**Business - New:**

1. To consider an amendment to the HDBR Rules of Procedure.

N. Schell stated the two amendments to be discussed were provided to the board members and a few for the audience. N. Schell stated both would appear on the screen.

The first amendment for consideration is an amendment to be added after the words "and at the time of application", as the new fourth sentence in the paragraph on P. 3 titled: "Certificate of Appropriateness – General". The following words should be added: "complete applications are due to staff at least 10 days before the filing deadline for a departmental review. After the departmental review is complete, applicants may be requested to supply additional information. This additional information and all associated fees are due by the filing deadline."

N. Schell stated this amendment comes from a conversation between herself, L. Waller, M. Johnson and Mayor Welch to have this additional deadline. This will allow for review by department staff before the filing deadline. R. Hopper stated this was a good idea. B. Lyman asked if it was 10 days or 10 working days. N. Schell clarified it was 10 days.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move to approve this amendment as presented".

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey seconded.

**Roll Call:**

|               |          |
|---------------|----------|
| R. Hopper     | Approved |
| B. Lyman      | Approved |
| M. Dorsey     | Approved |
| P. Newhouse   | Approved |
| P. Sanchez    | Approved |
| V. Crisafulli | Approved |
| S. Ash        | Approved |

***The motion to approve the amendment passed.***

Page 18

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

The second amendment for consideration is an amendment to remove words “This authorization is limited to applications for COAs for signs which meet the sign specifications and for Mon-Ray Storm Windows, Series #500 (approved by the HDBR, April 25, 2011). As of November 26, 2012, the Board has authorized the staff to grant Fast-Track Certificate of Appropriateness for new or replaced fences within the primary area which meet the descriptions in the Residential Design Review Guidelines on Pages 73 and 74. Proposed fences within the primary area which do not meet the guidelines must have Board approval, using the normal procedure.” The amendment to be added after the words “full board review”, as the new second sentence in the paragraph on P. 4 titled: “Fast-Track Certificate of Appropriateness”. The following words will be added: “this authorization is limited to projects marked with an ‘X’ in the column labeled as ‘Staff Review/Approval’ in the document titled ‘Madison Approval Guidelines’”. Proposed projects which do not meet the guidelines must have Board approval, using the normal procedure.”

P. Sanchez asked for clarification that what is current will be replaced with what is proposed. N. Schell stated that was correct. V. Crisafulli stated she did not understand what the change meant. N. Schell stated the ‘Madison Approval Guidelines’ is a document that was sent out to the board several times for review and it is a document which lists out staff approval, no approval needed, and full board approval in a table with an X under each section. This shows which projects need which type of approval. Within this document there was an expansion of staff approvals to many different projects. V. Crisafulli stated she understood the explanation not but the wording proposed does not state that explanation. B. Lyman clarified by stating that there is a document which has an explanation of what is approved and not and there is a chart with that. B. Lyman continued by stating what was proposed is just further explanation to refer people to that chart. B. Lyman believes that the confusion comes because this wordage is taken out of context because it doesn’t have the chart with it. N. Schell stated the chart is a 6-7 page document. B. Lyman stated that N. Schell has asked the board to look at that chart and agree to what additional projects could be fast-tracked and this wordage is added to the description which supports it. N. Schell stated that was correct.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the amendment to the rules of procedure as listed on the screen and given to the board be approved”.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

**Roll Call:**

R. Hopper      Approved

B. Lyman        Approved

M. Dorsey      Approved

P. Newhouse    Approved

P. Sanchez     Approved

***The motion to approve the amendment passed.***

N. Schell stated she would provide that document to the board again and put it on the website. N. Schell stated if anyone would like a hard copy or would like her to send that document to them to contract her.

Page 19

Historic District Board of Review

February 27, 2017

**Business - Old:**

1. Storm Windows

R. Hopper stated a few meetings ago the board had a representative from Glass Unlimited come and give a presentation on a storm window. That representative had asked the board to consider approving those.

N. Schell stated she had done some research on what other communities use as their definition of storm windows and she had sent that B. Lyman who is heading this research. Displayed on the PowerPoint is the wording used by New Harmony, Indiana. N. Schell offered to supply the other definitions if requested. The New Harmony wording is: "Storm windows should fit window openings exactly, without the use of spacers. They should be painted, anodized, clad, or otherwise coated in a color to match the windows or trim. They should be compatible with the window pattern, and the meeting rails should match the existing window. They should be installed on the blind stops so that window frame and trim are not covered. Interior storm windows are also effective". B. Lyman stated this was a suggestion that L. Ludington had brought up to the board instead of the board approving specific models or types. This would give the board and staff a guideline to follow rather than focused on specific brands.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move to approve this wording on storm windows for our guidelines".

L. Ludington stated this definition does not meet all the considerations because this definition does not talk about the width of the frame or the profile. There is a wide variety of specifications and configuration of storm windows and maybe providing examples in guidelines of which are acceptable and which not would work. L. Ludington also stated that not all windows have blind stops and therefore the installation of storm windows on the blind stop may not be possible.

B. Lyman asked L. Ludington that the wording which talks about the storm window should fit the window openings exactly, does that not address the idea of how much is visible. L. Ludington stated the issue may be with the word "should". One of the considerations discussed previously is that the frames of select brands are of minimal width so they do not hid that much of what they are mounted on.

V. Crisafulli stated she did not want to get stuck on procedural issues and wondered if amending the wording to include "the frames should cover minimal amount and if appropriate be installed on the blind stops".

Camille Fife stated she agreed with L. Ludington on the difference between "should" and "shall" or "should" and "must" in this wording. These differences might be hard for someone who is trying to administer this as a fast-track. C. Fife suggested the board table this until next meeting so that all the "shoulds" could become "musts" and the narrowness of the frame is defined.

V. Crisafulli withdrew the motion.

***This discussion will be tabled until next meeting.***

Page 20

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

2. 2017 Goals Update

B. Lyman presented an update on the 2017 goals.

1) Create a user-friendly online COA Application

B. Lyman stated N. Schell sent out question asking how many other communities are using an online COA to the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions forum and there were only a couple who responded. If the board could accomplish this goal then they could be a national model. N. Schell has found some software through the city's website which is allowing her to create a form.

2) Provide Applicants Best Practices Support

B. Lyman stated with the board's approval of the additional deadline this goal has been accomplished because that gives the preservation planner more time with the applications.

3) Improve Review Board meetings to better serve the public

B. Lyman announced she is in the process of developing a feedback form. This form will be given to the applicants to talk about if the process is good, if they were aware of the historic district, the value of the historic district and improving the process. This will be under the board's review for next meeting.

4) Improve Communication Channels between HDBR and Mayor, City and County Council, Other City Boards, Staff, Public, etc.

5) Develop a list of resources for Guideline Approved Building Materials

B. Lyman announced that on Thursday March 2<sup>nd</sup>, M. Dorsey, L. Waller, and she would meet with Glass Unlimited to review the guidelines and to see if they could come up with a list of vendors which match the guidelines. This will allow people to find it easier to find materials. Melissa from Glass Unlimited is very open to this and this is a good development.

6) Encourage the Public to ask questions and Tap into Our Talent - Technical Support Committee

7) Join a Solution-based Effort to Train People Qualified to Work on Historic Properties

8) Build Pride and Involvement in Madison's Historic District

B. Lyman stated several of the local organizations are thinking about supporting a program called the Alley Program. Last year we (funded by Indiana Humanities Council and Cornerstone Society and supported by City of Madison, Madison Main Street, Jefferson Co. Historical Society and Historic Madison Inc.) put on a workshop and tour of shotgun houses. This year we are thinking of going through the alleys and looking at our great urban barns.

9) Non-compliance

Goal #1: To develop a fair, graduated, effective means to enforce compliance with Historic District Ordinances

B. Lyman stated V. Crisafulli has agreed to serve with her and meet with D. Sutter to talk about some steps the board might take on what to do about non-compliance.

Page 21

**Historic District Board of Review**

**February 27, 2017**

Goal #2: A monthly review of the status of past COAs

N. Schell has started this by looking at the past year's COAs for February 2016. N. Schell presented that she planned on giving a staff report at each meeting to inform the board and the public of any fast-tracks done within the current month and then as time allows reviewing the COAs from the same month last year.

**Business – Staff Report:**

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

| Applicant       | Address                       | Date of Approval | Material                   |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| City of Madison | Between 601 & 701 E Vaughn Dr | 2/14/2017        | Fence: Metal               |
| Rob Culver      | 1028 Park Ave.                | 2/24/2017        | Fence: wood and chain link |
| Dollar Store    | 408 Jefferson St.             | 2/7/2017         | Sign: Plastic on Façade    |

V. Crisafulli stated the Dollar Store had come before the board previously with a plan to expand the building with a new design. V. Crisafulli asked about that plan. R. Hopper stated that has not happened and he had checked with the manager and the manager stated adjacent property owner would not sell them the right-of-way which they needed to expand.

Historic District Board of Review: 2016 February COA Review

| Applicant               | Address           | What Was Approved                                | Work Done According to COA? |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Graham Thieman          | 704 W. Second St. | Faux Slate Shingles<br>Copper Flashings          | Yes                         |
| Kevin and Margo Watkins | 804 E. First St.  | South 2 Fiberglass French doors<br>No sidelights | Yes                         |

No further business to be brought before the board.

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

**BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Hopper, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Louann Waller, Secretary