

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 27, 2017

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, March 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: Nicole Schell; City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

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.

Minutes:

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 published.

New Applications:

- Owen McCall – C. of A. to replace “K” style 6-inch Aluminum gutter and 3-inch downspout with 6-inch half round copper or galvanized gutters and a 4-inch round downspout and leaf guards.
Location: **220 Walnut St.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1840 contributing Federal style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the current missing aluminum K-style gutter on the front façade of the building. Bill Peckinpaugh from Kentuckiana Contractors showed the board two samples of the half round gutters. Owen McCall was presented and stated he would like to go with the copper gutters. M. Dorsey asked what gage of copper were the gutters. B. Peckinpaugh stated he thought it was 26 gage. B. Lyman asked if the seams had to be soldered. B. Peckinpaugh stated it would not because it was not going to be very long and there is a connecting piece which is designed to go in-between the gutter pieces. B. Lyman asked about the bracket type. B. Peckinpaugh since the gutter was on the front of the house the gutter would be installed using a bracket that goes underneath the gutter. The bracket would be decorative. These would match the brackets which were used on the building on East Second Street.

V. Crisafulli complimented the applicant on his choice in the gutters and thanked them for using the half-round. O. McCall stated there was a large K-style gutter on this house and it had blown off in a wind storm. O. McCall asked if the K-style was allowed. Several board members answered yes. V. Crisafulli and P. Newhouse clarified that the half-round was preferred in the guidelines and especially on a house of this caliber.

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

S. Ash stated that copper gutters are in demand for people to take off and stated he hoped the applicant could secure these gutters. S. Ash stated he has experience with people taking off copper gutters within a week of installation. O. McCall stated he wanted to move the downspout to the front and asked B. Peckinpaugh if they could include a number of fasteners. B. Peckinpaugh stated that if the downspout was properly installed in the brick, the fasteners are pretty hard to remove. B. Peckinpaugh clarified that the fasteners would be installed in the mortar joints.

P. Sanchez asked for clarification that the downspout was going to be moved from the side wall to the front wall. B. Peckinpaugh stated there was a subsurface drain at the corner of the front of the house and therefore it made more sense to run the downspout with less bends.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Proposed Material
Gutters & Downspouts	46	44	P. Sanchez – In the guidelines on page 46 specifically number 4 it states the most appropriate design is a half-round and therefore I agree it meets the guidelines. P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reason and appreciate the material being used. V. Crisafulli – I defiantly agree for the same reasons. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. B. Lyman – I agree for the same reasons and would like to thank you for taking the extra step to complete this project. M. Dorsey – I agree. R. Hopper – I agree and would like to thank the applicant for coming before the board.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 220 Walnut Street to install the half-round copper gutters and downspout as proposed”.

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 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.

Page 3

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

2. Krystal Hays – C. of A. to restore building to 1957 appearance by removing fireplace, front walls, and front door. Repair original section of dining room and return it to an open air pavilion.

Location: **115 E Vaughn Dr.**

Zoned: Open Space (OS)

N. Schell presented the building was a circa 1950 non-contributing modern movement style structure. N. Schell showed photos of the current building as well as an image which showed the 1957 structure. N. Schell stated the sign on the bottom photo was not the sign in 1957 but rather the sign which the applicant has been approved to install.

Krystal Hays was present and stated she wanted the building to look exactly as it appears in the bottom photo. K. Hays stated this business would be open seasonally and would sell ice cream. L. Waller stated that this project does not require a building permit since they will not be constructing anything.

V. Crisafulli asked if the left portion of the building as shown in the 1957 photo was how that portion looked today. K. Hays stated yes and stated the only thing that would be changed was the windows. Joe Newby spoke to clarify. J. Newby stated the lower window track was going to be removed by Glass Unlimited and taken to their shop to be restored.

V. Crisafulli asked about the sign on the historic photo. N. Schell stated the sign on the lower historic photo was not the historic sign but rather the sign which has been approved by the office to be installed in place of the existing sign. J. Newby stated they wanted to replicate the window sign and remembered it saying "Madison Regatta, first weekend of July". P. Sanchez stated that back then Regatta was in September.

P. Newhouse stated this was a great project and thanked the applicants for taking on the project. B. Lyman stated it was her understanding that the applicants wanted to remove the fireplace. K. Hays stated yes. J. Newby stated they would like to option to keep the fireplace if it is structurally sound. J. Newby pointed out the section of the building that was added on to the original portion. J. Newby continued by stated the plan was to remove the addition and if possible keep the fireplace as a freestanding fireplace. J. Newby stated they would like to leave the fireplace only if it was structurally sound which is to be determined. There is evidence of stress cracks on the fireplace and therefore would like the option to either keep the fireplace or remove it.

P. Newhouse asked about the timeframe of the project. K. Hays stated they hoped to have it open for Derby Day. J. Newby stated it would probably be the weekend after Derby Day and the weekend before River Roots.

V. Crisafulli asked where the parking would be located. J. Newby stated the current fence would be removed and concrete posts would be installed to protect the building as required by the insurance company. Parking would be located in front of those concrete posts.

S. Ash asked if the business would have the same name. K. Hays stated the name would be ChillBilly Treats since Burger Chef is a trademark name.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Proposed Material
Restoration			<p>M. Dorsey – This project does meet the guidelines for restoration.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli asked for clarification on the work being done with the fireplace. N. Schell explained that the on the current photo the area with the vertical paneling will be removed. The option they want is to keep the fireplace if it is structurally sound or to remove everything in that section. J. Newby stated the fireplace if structurally sound would be a freestanding fireplace. K. Hays stated the fireplace would not be active.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree and appreciate the applicants for taking this building back to the original look.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree and it will be a nice addition on the waterfront.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree and would like to thank the applicant for coming before the board.</p>

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

“I move that we approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to restore the building to the 1957 by removing the fireplace, front walls, and front door. Repair the original section of dining room and return it to an open air pavilion with the option of either demolishing or keeping the fireplace if it is structurally sound at 115 E. Vaughn Drive”.

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

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.

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.

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

Extended Applications:

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

N. Schell stated the applicant came into the office and has asked for a one month extension. This extension is to allow them to advertise for the relocation of this structure. B. Lyman stated that N. Schell had recommended in the notes provided to the board that the board extend the application but ask the applicant to fill out a new form with associated fees. N. Schell stated she had recommended that because of how long this process has been going on and that the applicant is aware that the board may consider asking them to fill out a new application and pay associated fees. V. Crisafulli asked if there was anything in the guidelines that dictates that after a certain time period or in the board's procedures that you have to refile. D. Sutter stated he was not aware of anything. V. Crisafulli states she would rather not impose this at this point without there being something in the board's procedures that lets people know about it. P. Newhouse stated she agreed. D. Sutter stated typically if the applicant has been diligent in working with the office, he didn't think the board should make them reapply. V. Crisafulli stated the board didn't want to extend something indefinitely but the board would have to change their procedures before they could ask for something like this. R. Hopper agreed.

V. Crisafulli made the motion to extend the application for another month.

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

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 extend the application one month passed.

2. John DeLuca – C. of A. to install a 24-ft. x 14-ft. single car garage with Hardie Board siding and shingle roof with a 10-ft x 14-ft covered patio in front of garage.
Location: **507 W. Main St.** Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

N. Schell presented this was the John Boyd House which was built between 1834 and 1842. It is a contributing Federal style structure. N. Schell showed the drawings of the proposed garage and covered patio.

B. Peckinpaugh stated the setbacks on this garage were three feet on one side and four foot on the other side. B. Peckinpaugh stated there would be decorative posts on the front in the patio area. This garage will not be visible from the street but is defiantly visible from the alley. M. Dorsey asked about the setback off the alley. B. Peckinpaugh stated it would be 20 feet off the center of the alley. V. Crisafulli asked how this setback would compare with adjacent buildings. B. Peckinpaugh stated the garage would basically line up with the adjacent buildings.

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

S. Ash asked about if the garage would sit behind the existing privacy fence. B. Peckinpaugh explained that the current fence along the back of the property would be removed. A new fence will be added after the garage was built. B. Lyman asked about the material of the garage door. B. Peckinpaugh answered it would be metal. B. Lyman asked about the material of the man door. B. Peckinpaugh stated the plan was to use a metal door but if they could find a salvaged door they would consider using that. B. Lyman asked if the garage would have gutters. B. Peckinpaugh stated there would be 5-inch residential K-style gutters. B. Lyman asked if there was to be any windows in the garage. B. Peckinpaugh answered no.

Certificate of Appropriateness Board Member Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Proposed Material
In-fill Garages and Outbuildings	69 45		<p>M. Dorsey – On page 45 of the residential guidelines for garages and outbuildings, as detailed here, it meets the guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree and would like to note that the board asks applicants to use the smooth side of the Hardie Board as it gives a more appropriate appearance.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree but would like to see the applicant find a wood man door and asked if the applicant could design the garage door to match a carriage style door.</p> <p>B. Peckinpaugh stated the garage door would have panels and there is discussion about adding decorative carriage door hinges and handles. John DeLuca was present and stated there was no way to see the man door from the alley as it will be located on the north side of the garage.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I agree for the same reasons and agree on the appearance of the garage door.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I agree.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree and looks like this garage will meet the new construction guidelines on page 69.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree.</p>

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

“I move we approve this application and give J. DeLuca a COA for this project.”

Motion was seconded by P. Sanchez.

Roll Call:

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

Page 7

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

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.

Business - New:

B. Lyman presented the three criteria considered by the board for demolitions since the board would hear a demolition request at their next meeting. The demolition criteria:

1. The Board shall determine whether the building is in such a state of deterioration and disrepair or so structurally unstable as to make preservation, restoration, or rehabilitation impracticable.
2. The Board shall determine whether the removal of such a building would be detrimental to the character of the historic district, balancing the interest of the public in preserving the integrity of the district with the interest of the owner of the building in the use and utilization of the property.
3. The Board shall take into account possible alternatives to demolition, and should apprise the owner of the building of such alternatives.

B. Lyman stated that in the case of the Springdale Cemetery structure several of those things have been discussed at a meeting. N. Schell agreed with that statement. V. Crisafulli thanked B. Lyman and N. Schell for bringing this discussion up to the board. V. Crisafulli stated it was her understanding that these criteria were not either or but rather all three must be taken into consideration. N. Schell stated that was correct. B. Lyman asked while all three must be considered, if one is not met would that give enough reason to deny the application. D. Sutter stated all three would have to be met. D. Sutter explained that the current location of the Springdale Cemetery is zoned Open Space and therefore they cannot obtain a building permit. V. Crisafulli asked if there could be an exception made upon request. D. Sutter stated he would have to check into that option but there is also an issue with state building codes.

L. Waller noted that the building at Springdale Cemetery is also located in the Special Flood Hazard Zone. V. Crisafulli asked if there could be an exception to both. D. Sutter stated he would look into the options but there are some issues outside this board but he wants to make sure the board doesn't put this applicant in a position where they cannot do anything with the structure.

P. Sanchez asked if there was another building behind this building being discussed which is like a pole barn building. B. Lyman stated that was correct. They use it for storage. P. Sanchez asked if that structure was part of this application. B. Lyman stated no, the application is only to demolish the house. V. Crisafulli asked out the pole barn building got a permit. D. Sutter stated he would check into that for the board.

B. Lyman stated the applicant could do ordinary maintenance on this structure. D. Sutter stated that was correct and that the applicant could do anything that does not require a building permit. B. Lyman asked what type of work required a building permit. D. Sutter stated he would get with M. Johnson to create a list of what type of work required a building permit. P. Sanchez asked N. Schell to email this information on demolition to the board. N. Schell stated she would do that after the meeting.

B. Lyman also presented the rest of the ordinance which covers demolition. This portion is to be followed if the board denies a COA for demolition or these were steps which are to be followed after the board approves the COA. N. Schell stated these steps will be followed only if the board denies a COA for a demolition. B. Lyman asked if this was when the applicant would show that they could not receive economic return on the building. D. Sutter stated this provision starts if the board denies the application. If the board approves the demolition then the process never gets to this point. V. Crisafulli stated they would have to follow all of these points not just part of it. D. Sutter stated that was correct.

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

Link Ludington, president of the Cornerstone Society, spoke about the fact that the application for the restaurant which the board heard about earlier is also located in Open Space zoning. This board approved an extensive remodel of that structure despite its zoning and he asked why that project does not require a building permit. D. Sutter stated that none of the work requested required a building permit. He noted that the applicant had worked with M. Johnson prior to coming before the board to make sure none of the work they were planning to complete required a building permit. L. Ludington asked if the structure was also located in zone X of the flood zone. L. Waller stated she believed this structure was located in zone AE of the flood zone. L. Ludington asked if the requirements of the building permit are based on the recently passed zoning ordinance. L. Waller stated that was correct. L. Ludington stated the zoning ordinance states that it allows any work which is to extend the life of the building.

M. Dorsey presented that a couple of weeks ago B. Lyman, L. Waller, and himself met with Glass Unlimited. The members and staff took a look at several storm windows Glass Unlimited carries and talked with Melissa about the historic district guidelines. M. Dorsey stated they had requested additional information on the storm windows they saw and the office is waiting for that information from Glass Unlimited but he thought many of the options they carry would fit in nicely with the expanded pre-approved storm windows. B. Lyman thanked those who made time for that meeting and added she thought it was very instructive because they were able to discuss the guidelines with Glass Unlimited. Glass Unlimited is planning to look through their vendors to see if they can provide more options for people who are trying to meet the board's guidelines.

Business - Old:

1. Storm Windows

N. Schell stated displayed on the PowerPoint is the wording which has come from previous discussion at the last meeting as well as some email exchanges between the board members. The wording is: "Storm windows shall fit window openings exactly, including round arched windows, 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 so that it does not damage or obscure trim. Storm window frames must be narrow width to avoid obscuring the primary window unnecessarily. Interior storm windows are also effective".

B. Lyman made the following motion:

"I move to approve the wording on storm windows to help staff make determination of other brands of windows will be accepted".

M. Dorsey seconded the motion.

V. Crisafulli stated one of the points of discussion at the last meeting was the use of the word "should". V. Crisafulli proposed the board amend this wording so that every instance the word "should" is used, it be changed to the word "shall". This change would keep it from being just a recommendation.

L. Ludington asked if the board was trying to make compliant storm windows a staff approvable item without a COA. R. Hopper stated that was correct. L. Ludington asked the board to consider doing the same thing with compliant gutters and downspouts.

B. Lyman asked if shall is stronger than should. V. Crisafulli answered that was correct. D. Sutter stated legally that was also correct.

B. Lyman amended her motion to the following:

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

“I move to approve the wording on storm windows to help staff make determination of other brands of windows will be accepted with the change of the word ‘should’ to ‘shall’”.

M. Dorsey seconded the amended motion.

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 storm window wording passed.

R. Hopper asked N. Schell to prepare a definition for gutters and downspouts so that the board may consider approving those. N. Schell stated she would do that for the next meeting.

N. Schell stated she wanted to give a quick update on the 2017 Goals specifically on number 9: Non-compliance. N. Schell stated a couple of weeks ago B. Lyman, V. Crisafulli, D. Sutter, and herself met to talk about some steps the board might take on what to do about non-compliance. The meeting went pretty well and they are continuing to work on completing that goal.

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Chillbilly Treats	115 E. Vaughn Dr.	3/6/2017	Sign
Deja Wood	404 Broadway St.	3/16/2017	Sign: Wood/Paint
Brian Marshall	201 Plum St.	3/21/2017	Fence: Wood
Andy Lynch	302 Elm St	3/21/2017	Fence: Wood w/ 2 gates

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

March 27, 2017

Historic District Board of Review: 2016 March COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved
Fountain Holdings, LLC	424 E. 4 th St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove enclosure of carport • Replace exterior storm windows • Replace chain link to iron • Vinyl windows/vinyl shutters
Curtis M. Jacobs	718 Fillmore St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enclose existing carport • Replace screen with windows porch • Extend porch to garage
Scott Lynch	103 E. Vaughn Dr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New metal seamed roof • Hardie board siding • 2 aluminum Windows front • Louvered shutters • Concrete or decking floor • Stacked stone fireplace
Bill Peckenpaugh	207-215 W. 1 st St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace 24 wood windows • Repair front door • Tuckpoint lower NW corner
Bill Peckenpaugh	907 W. Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace 4 wood windows • New front steps with iron rails • New shingle roof • Repair chimneys • Replace side wood door
Earthen Stone (Julie Brown)	118 W. 5 th St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New floor joists • New stone foundation • Replace wood siding • Replicate/remove scroll work • Standing seam or shingle roof • Replace/add windows (5 added)

N. Schell stated the office is working to contact a couple of these applicants which were found to be in non-compliance with what was approved. N. Schell stated she would give an updated report at the next meeting.

V. Crisafulli stated she wanted to ask who from the board was planning on attending the state preservation conference which is April 25-28th. R. Hopper and B. Lyman stated they were attending. V. Crisafulli stated those who were attending should talk about combining transportation. R. Hopper agreed and stated he thought Camille Fife was also attending. V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell if she was attending. N. Schell stated that she was.

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Newhouse made the motion to adjourn - seconded by B. Lyman.

Meeting adjourned at 6:24 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