

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW**Minutes****May 22, 2017**

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, May 22, 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, Mike Dorsey, Betsy Lyman and Penny Sanchez. Also present: Mark Johnson, Building Inspector; Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator; David Sutter, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

R. Hopper asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes from last meeting and had any corrections or additions.

Minutes:

V. Crisafulli made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

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

Minutes stand approved as submitted.

R. Hopper stated that May is National Historic Preservation Month and invited everyone to get out and see the wonderful things in Madison. R. Hopper stated he hoped everyone enjoyed the Garden Tour that happened the past weekend. V. Crisafulli shared an article from US News and World Report travel section which came out last week. V. Crisafulli added that the authors picked one charming small town to visit across every state in the country and Madison was picked for Indiana. V. Crisafulli continued by saying that this is wonderful and it even gets better. V. Crisafulli read the paragraph included in the article, “during the 1800s, Madison was part of Indiana's wealthiest county, and instead of investing in farming, businessmen invested in architecture. This left behind beautiful examples of Federal and Greek Revival styles, which can be seen downtown on Main Street. In fact, 133 of the blocks in downtown Madison are listed under the National Register of Historic Places, making it one of the largest National Historic Landmark districts in the country. The town is also known for its many antique stores and is connected to the Indiana Wine Trail”. V. Crisafulli stated other communities were called out for their natural beauty or for their horse racing but Madison is the only one that was singled out for the wonderful array of architecture.

N. Schell stated as part of Preservation Month the board has gone through past applications from 2016 and they have asked the next group to come and speak about their ongoing project. Graham and Carolyn Thieman are working on their house at 704 W. Second Street.

Graham Thieman presented that he and Carolyn had purchased the house in October 2014, unexpectedly. They decided after several months of evaluating the situation to start major repairs in the spring, March of 2015, BSA. First there was a water leak from the main and they had that repaired. The Thiemans then decided to install underground electrical to the house. After taking those projects on, G. Thieman determined the project was a little too big for them to handle. G. Thieman stated earlier he had said BSA and that stands for “before Sonny Ash”. S. Ash was convinced to come out of retirement to become the general contractor on this project in April 2015.

Page 2

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

G. Thieman stated the next phase of the project involved removal of the wallpaper from all the rooms. When the wallpaper was removed, it was discovered that all the walls were hand painted in various geometric designs. The Thiemans consulted with David Cart who stated he thought the ceilings were hand painted as well and he began to strip off some of the paint. D. Cart was able to find the original hand painted ceilings and each room had a different pattern.

G. Thieman showed photos of the dining room where the previous owner had installed an early American fireplace. During their renovations that fireplace was removed and restored to a 1870s fireplace. G. Thieman showed photos of the dining room as it looks now which is nearly completed. The ceiling and walls are painted. All the wood work is faux painted in two colors, walnut and oak. Push button lighting was installed in all the rooms downstairs.

G. Thieman showed photos of the entry way from Second St. including the prep work, drawings, and finished product. All the walls have the design throughout the hallway and the ceiling has its own graphic design. G. Thieman stated the interesting thing with the ceiling is that the compass circles created by the person who painted the original painting in 1870 were still there. G. Thieman stated that when they first saw the painting they thought it was fresco but it wasn't. Fresco refers to painting of murals and graphics in wet plaster. The other term is secco which is the term which is used for painting on dry plaster.

G. Thieman showed photos of the parlor which has not been finished. The photos showed where D. Cart has stripped paint off the walls and ceiling to reveal the original painting. G. Thieman also showed photos of the library which is currently being worked on. These photos included the primed doors which will be painted walnut and the $\frac{3}{4}$ finished painted walls. An additional photo of the ceiling revealed the different design and medallion. The medallion was originally painted green but since it looked like lilies along the tips of the medallion, they painted the tips white.

G. Thieman informed the board on future exterior projects. These projects included restoring and realigning the historic wrought iron fence and gate and the restoration of the original fountain in the front corner.

P. Newhouse thanked G. Thieman for his presentation and stated she loved the medallion with the green lilies. G. Thieman stated Terry Wullenweber is one of the most renowned plasterers in the Midwest or maybe even the whole United States and he has done all the plaster work in this house and he said these medallions are very unique and that Terry has never seen them before.

B. Lyman congratulated Graham and Carolyn Thieman on the fantastic work they have done on this house. B. Lyman stated this was a true model for the city and the care they are taking in this project is wonderful.

G. Thieman thanked the board for inviting him to give this presentation and offered to have the board come to the house for a tour. N. Schell stated that one of the reasons the board had asked the Thiemans to come tonight was because of the work they came before the board for last year. N. Schell stated they had done a lot of work on the roof and chimneys and flashings. R. Hopper asked G. Thieman if he would talk a little bit about that work.

G. Thieman stated originally the house had a slate roof which had gone through several repairs. The roof kept leaking and they went into the attic after a heavy rain and found five new leaks. S. Ash and G. Thieman decided the best course of action was to remove all the slate and install new sheeting with new copper gutters and flashings. G. Thieman stated when the slate was removed they found some wooden shakes and therefore this house originally had a shake roof.

R. Hopper thanked G. Thieman for coming to present on all the work he and Carolyn were doing on this house. S. Ash added that restoration is not a fast process and it takes a lot of determination and patience and both Carolyn and Graham have a lot of that and that is why you are seeing what you see today.

Page 3

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

N. Schell asked before G. Thieman sat down if Carolyn would come up to join him along with the Mayor the board has one additional slide they didn't know about. Mayor Welch stated "Carolyn and Graham, you have been had". Mayor Welch stated "we talk a lot about several reasons why people come to Madison and why they visit and end up living and working here but these two grew up in Madison and they chose to come back to Madison. You (Carolyn and Graham) have done so much for your area down there and continue to do so and we appreciate that". On behalf of all the citizens and of the board, Mayor Welch presented Graham and Carolyn Thieman with the 2017 Madison Historic District Preservation Award for the outstanding rehabilitation of 704 W. Second St.

V. Crisafulli asked N. Schell if she could pull that segment out of the video and include it on the website. N. Schell she would be happy to do that.

N. Schell stated the next thing on the agenda was a presentation on Hargan Matthews Parks. Nina Alcorn and Jennifer Clayton gave an updated on Hargan Matthews Park and showed the board the final rendering of the playground. The playground will have a soft surface, boat themed accessible playground, wheelchair swing, an accessible swing and an evolution swing which allows for an adult and toddler to sit on one swing facing each other. The park will be fenced in with a fence very similar to Bicentennial Park. The fence will have one entrance at the corner of West St. and Vaughn Dr. The city will be installing a gate off West St. to allow for maintenance equipment. The targeted completion date for the playground is late fall 2017. Phase two will include an art wall and that will be a collaborative effort.

V. Crisafulli stated this has been a model citizen led project and thanked them for the fantastic job they have done. R. Hopper thanked N. Alcorn and J. Clayton for presenting the update. B. Lyman expressed her appreciation of the river theme and stated it was very unique and fit into Madison very well.

New Applications:

1. Robert Eversole – C. of A. to demolish existing single family structure.

Location: **704 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

N. Schell asked if there was a representative here for the Mulberry St. project. V. Crisafulli stated that the appropriate procedure would be to put a motion on the floor to disapprove the project on the basis that there is not representative present at the meeting. D. Sutter stated that would be his recommendation since there is not a representative present.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

"I move to disapprove the project at 704 Mulberry St. on the bases that there is not representative present at the meeting".

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved

B. Lyman Approved

M. Dorsey Approved

P. Newhouse Approved

P. Sanchez Approved

Page 4

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

V. Crisafulli Approved

S. Ash Approved

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will NOT be issued.

2. Robert Eversole – C. of A. to demolish existing single family structure.

Location: **706 Mulberry St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move to disapprove the project at 706 Mulberry St. to demolish the existing single family structure on the bases that there is not representative present at the meeting”.

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

L. Ludington, president of Cornerstone Society and resident on Mulberry, interrupted the meeting and asked to speak. L. Ludington stated that he thought what the board was doing was fine but wanted to make them aware that by denying the application the board is automatically evoking the 12 month moratorium on demolition. D. Sutter stated in response to that L. Ludington is correct that denying the application would trigger that choice but it was still his recommendation based on the wording of the current ordinance to deny the application. B. Lyman asked for clarification that since this was considered a contributing structure it would be a 12 month moratorium on demolition. D. Sutter stated that was correct.

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 deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will NOT be issued.

3. William Jacobs – C. of A. to replace existing vinyl and aluminum siding with Norandex insulated siding.

Location: **126 West St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell asked W. Jacobs to sign the form on the podium which stated that the required signs were up for the 15 days prior to the meeting.

N. Schell presented the building was built circa 1910 and is a contributing gabled-ell style structure. N. Schell showed photos of home which showed that the northern part of the structure is currently aluminum and the southern portion, which matches the garage, is vinyl.

Page 5

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

William Jacobs was present and stated he would like to replace all of the siding with the proposed material. W. Jacobs stated he would like to replace everything to have only one type of siding on the house and to help deal with some insulation issues.

B. Lyman asked N. Schell if she had the sample. N. Schell stated it was in her office but her husband is grabbing it. V. Crisafulli asked if the Norandex siding fell under the category of smart siding that is allowable in the guidelines. N. Schell stated it was a plastic type of siding. S. Ash stated when he went by this house he noticed the southern portion which is currently vinyl is starting to warp and crack. S. Ash asked the applicant if they knew what they were getting into with going with another product which was similar.

W. Jacobs stated the existing siding was put on the house about 15 years ago and he believed that they have made some strides with this new material to help guard against that. M. Johnson passed around the sample of Norandex siding which was supplied by the applicant with his application.

P. Newhouse asked if the material was plastic or vinyl because the sample did not say. W. Jacobs stated he thought it was a type of vinyl. P. Newhouse stated the material looked like the material that was on their house when they purchased it. W. Jacobs stated this product was brand new and was put out last year for use. P. Newhouse stated the shape was very similar and their siding has not held up. P. Newhouse added that the style of the siding was not what the board liked to see in the historic district and does not look like typical lap siding. P. Newhouse stated she had issues with the vinyl and asked the applicant if he had considered Hardie Board or Smart siding.

W. Jacobs stated he did not think Hardie Board was a good product from information from people who are knowledgeable about the product. W. Jacobs stated he had read some information on the internet that stated there are some harmful things in Hardie Board such as silica which can cause lung problems. Crystalline silica dust in very small quantities over time can lead to disease of lungs as the dust becomes lodged and irritates the lung and reduces lung capacity. Children, asthmatics of any age, allergy sufferers and elderly all of who has reduced lung capacity can be affected in much less time. W. Jacobs informed the board that he has a child who has asthma. W. Jacobs stated that if he was to install Hardie Board siding on his house it would have to be cut and that will create dust. Hardie Board is also non-recyclable and vinyl is recyclable even though it says in the book that it is not. W. Jacobs stated he called the Waste District and they told him they would take the vinyl siding but Hardie Board needed to be taken to the dump.

P. Newhouse stated there are other options besides that, there is a Smart Siding or engineered wood siding. W. Jacobs stated that was still cement board. Members of the board stated it was not cement board. P. Newhouse asked if the applicant had looked into that option. W. Jacobs stated he had and it is about 10% more expensive than what he is proposing. W. Jacobs also stated that Smart Siding still needed to be painted and repainted every seven to ten years depending on weather. That would be an extra four or five thousand dollars every seven to ten years.

W. Jacobs pointed out several examples of pictures of houses that had vinyl siding which were located in the design guidelines. Those included the image on the cover, on the page about siding, and on page 20.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board.

W. Jacobs stated he thought that the proposed would be an improvement on his home since it is already 70% vinyl and the rest is aluminum. W. Jacobs stated from his home you could see 14 buildings. Of those buildings, three are commercial brick buildings, one is a brick home, one is a Hardie Board home, and the rest are vinyl.

P. Sanchez asked if the applicant was proposing to replace all the siding with the proposed material. W. Jacobs answered yes.

W. Jacobs stated there was currently a class action lawsuit against Hardie Board and it says the exterior fiber cement siding fails prematurely causing damage to underlying structures and other property due to moisture invasion that causes warping, flaking, product shrinking, cracking, and discoloration.

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

P. Newhouse stated the applicant should still look into alternatives such as the Smart Siding or engineered wood. We have determined and it is in our guidelines that it (vinyl) is not appropriate for the district.

W. Jacobs stated it is not prohibited. W. Jacobs quoted from the residential guidelines, “while the application of synthetic siding materials is discouraged, it is not prohibited”. On the bottom of that page there are instructions on how to install vinyl siding on your house so that you don’t cover historic windows.

S. Ash asked if the applicant was proposing to remove all the existing siding down to the wood. W. Jacobs answered yes. S. Ash asked what the applicant thought was under the existing. W. Jacobs stated there is wood under the existing siding but the house was under water in the flood and when he removed a small part of the wood siding it was deteriorated very badly.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the public.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Siding	56 - 58	---	<p>S. Ash – No it does not meet the residential guidelines on siding on page 56-58 calls for restoring the wood siding if possible and if not possible then you need to go with one of the approved list.</p> <p>W. Jacobs stated that vinyl was not prohibited. V. Crisafulli stated it is not appropriate as stated on page 56. W. Jacobs stated not appropriate but not prohibited which means it is something he could have. As this board and maybe this incarnation of the board but as the board is permitted many people do. V. Crisafulli stated that tonight you have heard why we feel like the integrity of the district is so important to the continued economy that we enjoy here. W. Jacobs stated he agreed with that and if he had unlimited funds that would be fine but he does not and this is what he can afford to do. W. Jacobs stated he would love to have the house back to the original wood siding and structure but he cannot afford do to that. V. Crisafulli stated there are steps to follow to claim economic hardship and the board has not seen those. W. Jacobs asked about that procedure. V. Crisafulli stated the board needed to see qualified estimates. W. Jacobs stated he knew how much money he had and it is a hardship for him but he understands it is the board’s choice.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I do not think this is an appropriate siding and I do not like the configuration of it either. It doesn’t look like lap siding. If the applicant would look into the engineered siding they might find it is not much more and it would be appropriate.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – I agree with the comments that S. Ash and P. Newhouse have made. It is not appropriate.</p>

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

That is how an original standing seam roofs were done. Another thing the applicant may think about is a flatlock roof. That is also a metal roof and when you have low pitches like this one has, you will be much less likely to have a leak with the flatlock roof. A good metal worker or roofing metal worker would know how to do a flatlock roof. That would be very appropriate for that pitch but the standing seam would be a nice addition.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board. R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the public.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53, 54	47	V. Crisafulli – Yes, I do believe that the standing seam roof will be an approved material on this property as stated in our guidelines on page 53. B. Lyman – I also agree and suggest that in the motion we allow for the flatlock roof as well as that is also an approved material. P. Sanchez – I agree with what has been said. S. Ash – I agree for the same reasons. M. Dorsey – I agree for the same reasons. P. Newhouse – I agree for the same reasons. R. Hopper – I agree for the same reasons.

V. Crisafulli made the following motion:

“I move to approve the application for the installation of standing seam metal roof or flatlock roof on the porch at 620 E. Second Street”.

Motion was seconded by S. Ash.

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.

- 5. Adam Thompson and Emily Wolf – C. of A. to install 29 gauge metal charcoal color roof on new garage.

Location: **824 W. Main St.**

Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

R. Hopper asked E. Wolf to sign the form on the podium which stated that the required signs were up for the 15 days prior to the meeting.

N. Schell presented the historic building on the property was built circa 1850 and is a contributing Italianate style structure. N. Schell stated that the garage was approved in September 2016 to have a standing seam metal roof. N. Schell showed an image of the brochure of the proposed charcoal colored 29-gauge roof which will match the color of the previously approved roof.

Emily Wolf was present. S. Ash asked if the applicant has looked into any other materials or if she could explain what the metal roof is going to be. E. Wolf stated they were approved for the standing seam but had Martin Stockdale get some estimates. The original classic ribbed roof is about \$5,000 less because of the material and labor. They want to get approval for the classic ribbed roof to save some money and E. Wolf stated the roof wouldn't be visible.

M. Johnson stated he was there for moral support and informed the board that the photos E. Wolf had was not the classic rib. A classic rib is barn metal and this picture is the new product that is out. It has the ribs in it but they are not very high and it is not 16 inches wide. E. Wolf presented photos to the board. The photos were of the garage on Presbyterian Street. B. Lyman asked if the roof would be screwed down. M. Johnson and E. Wolf stated it was. The product E. Wolf is asking for is the same material which was approved at the last meeting for the Baltimore Street project.

M. Dorsey asked if it came in wider panels. M. Johnson stated he didn't think so. P. Newhouse asked about the width. S. Ash stated it looked like it was about eight inches. V. Crisafulli asked M. Johnson and N. Schell to put together some information together for the board's next educational training session.

P. Newhouse asked about the visibility of the roof and if it was visible from the alley. M. Johnson stated the garage will be on the alley and once the garage is built you would be able to see it from Main Street. E. Wolf stated it would look a lot better than what was there currently. B. Lyman asked if there was a vacant lot next to this property. E. Wolf stated she owned all three properties and the building will located on all three properties with garages on each side of the property. B. Lyman stated so you could see about 1/3 of the garage from Main Street. E. Wolf answered yes.

B. Lyman asked if they had considered asphalt shingles. E. Wolf stated they had but they didn't want to replace it. The proposed roof had a 40-50 year warranty and they would like to not have to worry about leaks or wind damage. B. Lyman asked for clarification on the 40 year warranty including the rubber gaskets and spools. E. Wolf said yes that is what Benders told them and that was where they would be getting the product.

M. Dorsey asked M. Johnson about his experience with this product. M. Johnson stated he has not worked with this product but he has seen it up close on the east end of town.

B. Lyman stated they were reading the brochure provided and it said it has a 20 year paint warranty. E. Wolf stated she would have to check with Bender. B. Lyman stated her experience with the screwed down metal roofs is that they are only as good as the rubber seals around the screws. Once those give out, you will have a leak.

M. Johnson stated it is only as the installer puts it on. If the installer crimps it down, it will crack and leak but if the installer knows what they are doing and knows when to stop, the neoprene won't deteriorate. E. Wolf stated they had a very good contractor and asked M. Johnson if he agreed. M. Johnson agreed.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board. R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the public.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Roofs	53, 54	47	<p>P. Newhouse – It is a new material and it seems like it, based on what M. Johnson has stated. The one thing that bothers me a little bit is the width between the seams because we always like to approximate something that looks like the old historic standing seam. This looks like it is pretty narrow but the material is probably fine if it is installed right.</p> <p>M. Johnson stated it is certainly worth asking and she will, if you can get a wider panel because metal is priced per linear foot and if you are covering more area it will cost less. Perhaps, see if they can get a wider span on the ribs. P. Newhouse stated she would be happy with that.</p> <p>M. Dorsey – The material is obviously new and therefore isn't on the approved list but I think it would fit pretty closely to the standing seam. I would be willing to approve it.</p> <p>S. Ash – It is not on our approved list, standing seam, clay tiles, imitation slate, or even asphalt shingles. What I am worried about is that we are approving all these barn roof materials and pretty soon that will dominate our community. Until we can come up with an alternative I'm going to say I would not approve it.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – Like some of the others, I am conflicted on this. I think that this is an area that we don't know very much about and I think we need further education on the roof. I think that this is a structure that is not original and it is minimally visible from the street. It is a material we approved just last month and therefore I think there is a lot of gray area here. Since it is gray for me, I would probably vote to approve.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I am looking at our infill standards for new structures and it says new garages shall meet new construction guidelines on page 45 of the residential guidelines. On page 69 it says new buildings shall be compatible with adjacent buildings in terms of materials. Therefore I would be leaning since we haven't seen this applied before and it isn't on the approved list, I would lean more towards approving asphalt until we can make some kind of guideline standards that we can all know.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I agree with B. Lyman and with V. Crisafulli but I guess in fairness because of last month's meeting, I would lean toward approving with the applicant checking out the width option.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I agree with everyone's other comments. I would go ahead based upon the fact that you might be able to get a wider panel that I would approve this material.</p>

M. Dorsey made the following motion:

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

“I move to approve the application for 824 W. Main St. to install the 29 gauge metal charcoal colored roof on the new garage with the stipulation that the applicant attempt to get a wider panel”.

Motion was seconded by P. Newhouse.

Roll Call:

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

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. R. Hopper asked the applicant to inform N. Schell about if they could get a wider panel option.

6. Gerry and Leon Michl – C. of A. to build 22-ft x 14-ft picnic shelter on concrete pad.
Location: **203 Shamrock Ln.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

R. Hopper informed the board that the applicants have asked for an extension to check out some setback requirements.

B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move to extend the application for 203 Shamrock Ln. until next 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 until next month passed.

Page 12

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

7. City of Madison (Hargan-Matthews Park) – C. of A. to install playground
Location: **101 E. Vaughn Dr.** Zoned: Open Space (OS)

Application was withdrawn by City of Madison staff.

8. Jeff Vaughn (Todd and Melissa Miller) – C. of A. to construct a 36-ft x 70-ft three bay sided garage with metal roof
Location: **114-116 E. Fifth St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Application was withdrawn by applicant.

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 asked P. Woodburn to sign the form on the podium which stated that the required signs were up for the 15 days prior to the meeting.

N. Schell presented the building on the property was built circa 1900 and is a contributing front gable style structure. N. Schell showed images of various views of the exterior of the structure.

Peter Woodburn was present and represented Springdale Cemetery. P. Woodburn shared that the Springdale board has taken a lot of time to research, look, talk, and other activities and they have come up with what they hope will be a solution. When the cemetery was first organized in 1909 it was not the size of the property it is now. It was small blocks of houses, not a lot, but enough. If you go back through the records, you can see where Springdale Cemetery when they needed more land would acquire the land and demolish the house and then they had more space. Back then there was no such thing as historical landmarks or registered buildings. P. Woodburn continued by saying that the cemetery is beginning to need more space. That is one of the factors that are driving Springdale Cemetery Association to take the property down. The second factor is the liability; the Springdale Cemetery Association and the city have in maintaining this building as it is. P. Woodburn stated the board may ask why they don't fix it up. The Springdale Cemetery Association does not have the funds to pay for it. The Springdale Cemetery Association has had a number of people who have taken their time and energy to come down and look through the property. The Springdale Cemetery Association had a couple of open houses; several of you were down there and saw what it is like.

P. Woodburn continued by stating after due consideration, after talking to real estate agents, none of whom would take us on. The Springdale Cemetery Association talked to people up in Indianapolis, in the restoration world, and they were saying this isn't possible. What the Springdale Cemetery Association board has elected to do is to demolish the building. It is an eyesore and a public hazard. There are no structures in the cemetery to provide a context for the building to enhance or detract from its appearance. The house has been a subject of break-ins three times in 2015 and four times in 2016. There has been evidence of a perpetrator of one of the most recent break-ins could have been contemplating setting a fire because a five gallon container of gasoline was found at the building.

P. Woodburn stated currently, zoning restraints prohibit exterior remodeling or repairs. The Springdale Cemetery Association knows it is in the flood zone. If the house is moved, which the Springdale Cemetery Association cannot afford to do, it runs about \$35,000. That is to get the house up and then they don't know where to put it. They cannot get around the bridges. The Springdale Cemetery Association board is considering erecting a small building to serve as an office and to house the documents for research by visitors and board members. No other cemetery in Jefferson County has an onsite office and again the cost considerations are our issue.

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

P. Woodburn informed the board of the options Springdale has been given. Option one is to move which costs \$25-\$35 thousand which does not include any of the permits, moving utilities, replacing decorative trees, remove and replacing 120 tomb stones, remove and replace the wires from 13 utility poles, and construct a foundation at Pearl Park or like location.

Option two to restore the house to a usable condition costs \$25-\$35 thousand but the current zoning constraints prohibit exterior remodeling or repairs. Even if a zoning variance could be secured, showing the building to be rehabilitated, the Springdale Cemetery Association does not have funds to perform the work. Current operations and maintenance costs exceed interest income from the two trusts and the plot sales, requiring the board of directors annually to take money from one of the other funds.

P. Woodburn informed the board that Springdale had asked for proposals and received three. One was from Ohio Valley Excavating to demolish the house, salvage material, remove the foundation, and fill the basement with clean fill dirt. The cost was \$23,500 and if the cemetery wants to keep the material the cost would be \$25,700. The cost to dismantle the house and mark it so it could be reconstructed was \$32,000. The next proposal was to demolish the house, salvage material, remove the foundation, and fill the basement with clean fill dirt. The cost for that proposal was \$25,000 and if the cemetery wants to keep the material the cost would be \$30,000. The cost to dismantle the house and mark it so it could be reconstructed was \$35,000. The final proposal was from David Pond of Earth and Stone Restoration. Earth and Stone Restoration propose to demolish the house and remove at 600 W. Fifth St. located in Springdale. They will complete the following:

1. Provide proof of insurance and City of Madison's Contractor License
2. Remove and save ruminant broken headstones from the basement prior to starting the demolition of the property, headstone pieces are to be delivered to Robert Leach, sexton. There are 4x4's holding up the first story and they are sitting on broken tombstones.
3. Clean out all the trash from the building and remove it from the property. They will arrange to have a dumpster on site to handle all the trash and unusable items.
4. They will remove and salvage iron fence which includes two sections and five posts.
5. Remove the concrete pad and sidewalk in front of the property to allow for burial spaces
6. Demolish the house and clean up the side by removing and salvaging the stone foundation.
7. Deliver and compact the side with clean fill dirt. Finish the site with top soil.
8. Apply grass seed and apply straw. Springdale will be responsible for watering.
9. Retains possession of all salvageable materials for reuse in the restoration of other properties in Madison and Jefferson County.

P. Woodburn informed the board that he had taken D. Pond through the property and they noted that the ceilings are 2x4s which had nails in them, the windows are in casements and D. Pond plans to take them and reuse them, the floors are covered with asbestos tile and smaller wood floors below that, and therefore anything D. Pond can remove and save he will reuse or sell it.

P. Woodburn continued to read the proposed contract which has been executed, if Springdale does not get permission within ten business days this contract is void. The proposal states providing the Madison Board of Review gives permission to demolish the house on May 22nd, if the historic board declines to grant that this contract is void, we will arrange to prior to starting work to notify the organization...about utilities and gas. Earth and Stone will return in September to compact and reseed the soil. The professional fee is below \$10,000.

M. Johnson asked about the time frame to finish the job. P. Woodburn stated he would start tomorrow and have it done before September.

B. Lyman stated P. Woodburn made the statement that zoning prohibits them from doing any external remodeling but her understanding is that they could do repair. D. Sutter stated since it is zoned open space a building permit could not be issued and therefore any work that requires a building permit would not be allowed to be done. There are some things that would be allowed without a building permit. B. Lyman asked if that included if they wanted to paint the exterior. D. Sutter stated they would not need a building permit to paint.

Page 14

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

B. Lyman stated the board needed more clarification on what required a building permit. M. Johnson stated that anything on the inside, new plumbing, new electric, new HVAC would need a building permit but anything on the outside would not need a building permit.

V. Crisafulli stated she had section 11.41 of the new zoning code titled "Procedures and Requirements for a Building Permit" it says "periodic maintenance and repair projects necessary to maintain a structure for occupancy or its intended use such as reroofing, painting, replacement of interior or exterior surfaces or replacement of electrical or plumbing fixtures shall not require a building permit". L. Waller stated the key word there is fixture. A plumbing fixture is a toilet or a sink and an electrical fixture is a light fixture. B. Lyman stated for clarification that it wasn't the plumbing lines or electrical boxes. L. Waller stated that was correct.

V. Crisafulli asked what the former Mumbles property was zoned. D. Sutter stated that was zoned open space. V. Crisafulli asked if they were replacing electrical or plumbing. M. Johnson and N. Schell answered that they did not. M. Johnson stated they just tore out and did nothing that required a building permit.

B. Lyman stated P. Woodburn had said that the Springdale Cemetery Association wanted to build a small building for records. B. Lyman asked if that was allowed in that area. P. Woodburn stated the Springdale Cemetery Association is considering putting the office in the maintenance building which is already existing. D. Sutter stated that anything that required a building permit could not be constructed in this zoning classification. P. Woodburn asked about a house trailer. D. Sutter stated that would need a permit.

P. Woodburn stated the Springdale Cemetery Association board has people who are upset because they are moving the records out the current safe and moved to another location because they cannot access the records if there is no office. P. Woodburn stated they had been offered a place in Hanover, two buildings in town, and he had even offered his place. P. Woodburn stated they would be the only cemetery without an office but they are the largest.

M. Johnson asked how far up the hill Springdale Cemetery owned. P. Woodburn stated they owned about 80 to 90 feet. From the audience, John Muessel, stated they owned further than 80 or 90 feet. M. Johnson stated they could design an office to be located on the hill.

V. Crisafulli expressed her appreciation to P. Woodburn and the Springdale board for the amount of time and work and energy that has been going into thinking all of this through. V. Crisafulli stated that it is hard for the board that is there to protect this district to agree to demolish any building especially one like this.

P. Newhouse mentioned that on page 81 of the guidelines it does layout the criteria for the board to consider in case of a proposed demolition and this project certainly fits that in a way that it is pretty obvious. For one thing, there is no economic return of this and zoning prohibits new electrical or plumbing, and the deterioration is extreme. P. Newhouse stated that the thing that is important to her is that the removal would not be detrimental to the character of the historic district. P. Newhouse stated it was obvious to her that they should be allowed to receive a COA.

R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the board. R. Hopper asked for any comment or question from the public.

L. Ludington stated he thought there was a number of factors that need to be taken into account before the board take a vote on this. L. Ludington expressed his appreciation towards the fact that the Springdale Cemetery Association has adopted a much more thoughtful approach to possible solution opposed to so many people who just gone with the idea that all you can do is demolish a building. L. Ludington stated he wanted to point out that this is a contributing structure and the fact that it is in the cemetery is irrelevant because regardless of how the cemetery evolved this structure survived.

Page 15

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

There are a number of problems that have been mentioned with regards to the structure and the way it's been maintained or not maintained. L. Ludington stated he did visit the property and took a lot of pictures and it has been neglected and allowed to deteriorate for decades.

The fact of the matter is that since it is zoned open space it is a nonconforming use. It was built as a residence and been used as an office. Under the current Zoning Ordinance the existing use can be allowed to continue forever as long as they don't expand or enlarge upon the existing footprint.

L. Ludington state he questioned what has been said about the need for a building permit because his understanding from reading the new Zoning Ordinance it specifically states a number of exceptions and gives examples of types of things that do not require a building permit. L. Ludington stated he heard an account of what does require a building permit but that is not seen in the new Zoning Ordinance and therefore that is another issue. L. Ludington stated he did not see anything that prohibited any exterior repairs. It specifically states any repairs necessary to maintain the use do not require a building permit. There has been mention of the fact that an exterior restoration would be unfeasible but nobody is saying that the exterior has to be restored to its original condition. There is rehabilitation where what happens on the exterior doesn't necessarily affect what happens on the interior. L. Ludington stated he discussed with P. Woodburn the fact that there some interest in the Springdale Cemetery Association having some kind of public office facility there that alone is the reason to keep the structure. The open space zoning prohibits the construction of a new facility. But as long as that building remains the way it is with the original footprint, if they tore out the interior and remodeled it for a new use that would be perfectly acceptable. The new zoning ordinance makes it easier to do rehabilitation and restoration of historic structures unlike the old ordinance which basically required a building permit for almost anything.

L. Ludington continued by stating that regardless of what you think of this application he does appreciate the fact that Springdale Cemetery Association has shown some interest in a possible resolution if in fact the Historic District Board determines tonight that there...and I disagree with what somebody said about the loss of this particular contributing historic structure not having any effect on the character of the historic district because he would maintain that the loss of any contributing historic structure would be detrimental to the historic district. The only question is how much it is detrimental.

L. Ludington stated if in fact that the historic board in fact determines tonight that the loss of this particular contributing historic structure as identified in the NHL nomination in 2006 is justifiable, a final element would be, for future consideration would for every time a historic structure is lost there should be some consideration given to a minimal level of documentation of what the structure was so that once it is gone at least there is a record of what was there.

L. Ludington stated that is exactly what he does with his job with the State of Indiana. The state recognizes that historic structures may be destroyed in connection with their projects or road projects. Often a stipulation is made by the state Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology, is that if a structure is going to be sacrificed, lost, or destroyed at least it is required to do the minimal level of photo documentation so that there is some record of what that structure is for future generations.

P. Woodburn addressed L. Ludington and thanked him for his presentation.

R. Hopper asked for any additional comment or question from the public.

Camille Fife spoke that she has heard of the comments tonight and she wanted to echo L. Ludington's comments about the rigidity of the Zoning Ordinance and she hopes in the future there can be discussion about opening those out. C. Fife also stated that if it turns out that the board does vote to demolish she would like them to consider putting in a stipulation that the documentation be patterned after Historic American Building survey methodology. C. Fife stated she didn't think you would have to go as far as a level three but a level two would provide adequate and archival photographs, as well as sketches and required history of the building.

P. Newhouse asked P. Woodburn if the plan was to use the space for graves. P. Woodburn answered yes. P. Newhouse stated that she believed they needed that space for graves. P. Woodburn stated that there would be 147 lots available where the house is and the income from those lots is \$200,000. P. Woodburn stated they were getting low on lots right now.

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

B. Lyman asked for some clarification on the new and the old Zoning Ordinance whether or not the new ordinance is different and allows for more flexibility. D. Sutter stated the new ordinance allows for maintenance and repair; things like painting, roof, foundation repair, and restoring or repairing existing windows would not require a building permit. New electrical, new HVAC and new plumbing would not be allowed as it is currently zoned. V. Crisafulli asked if it would be possible for the cemetery to ask for a variance. D. Sutter stated yes it was possible.

P. Sanchez asked P. Woodburn if they had heating and air in the building. P. Woodburn answered no and stated there was none and that the ceiling was falling down.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	80, 81	71, 72	<p>M. Dorsey – There has been some good arguments from both sides but I would have to say that in light of the fact of all restrictions on what they can do with this and the deteriorated level of the building I think that it would meet the guidelines for justifying the demolition.</p> <p>P. Newhouse – I also agree with that for reasons I have previously stated. There is no economic return, the removal would not be detrimental to the character of the historic district and deterioration is extreme.</p> <p>S. Ash – I agree with the others. Looking at the residential guidelines for demolition on page 80-81, item three says “demolition may be appropriate if the denial of the demolition will result in a demonstrable economic hardship on the owner” and that is another reason that I would vote.</p> <p>V. Crisafulli – I do not agree for the following reasons: the guidelines say on the same page number four “demolition by neglect occurs when a building is allowed to deteriorate through lack of maintenance. It is a self-imposed hardship that will not be considered a mitigating circumstance when determining economic hardship”. That is a key reason I do not agree and I also agree with the comment from the audience earlier that any demolition of contributing building in this district hurts the entire district.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I agree with V. Crisafulli’s comments and I also believe it would be a detriment to lose this building and deterioration due to neglect is not a sufficient reason for demolition.</p> <p>P. Sanchez – I do think the application does meet the requirement of guidelines. They have worked hard to seek other alternatives. The economic impact on the board is great. The zoning and flood plain restricts it. I look at the surrounding buildings as a comparison of that one and that one obviously stands out but I feel that there are enough of the guidelines that are met that this application should be approved.</p> <p>R. Hopper – I tend to be on the fence but I agree on both sides. Any building that is contributing is a loss to the district but given all the facts that were presented and the fact that there is a person who would be willing to use the materials for other purposes I would agree that this meets the guidelines.</p>

Page 17

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

P. Newhouse made the following motion:

“I move to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the building at 600 W. Fifth Street with the stipulation that many of the elements of the building be salvaged and reused and that there should be documentation of the history, photos made, specifications, footprints and dimensions take place before that demolition take place”.

Motion was seconded by M. Dorsey.

Roll Call:

R. Hopper Approved
 B. Lyman Disapproved
 M. Dorsey Approved
 P. Newhouse Approved
 P. Sanchez Approved
 V. Crisafulli Disapproved
 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. N. Schell stated this project would need a demolition permit.

P. Woodburn thanked the board and as well as his board members who were in the audience.

Business - Old:

Business – New:

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Mike Dorsey	613 W Main St.	5/2/2017	42" Wood Fence
Brandi Macon	126 E Main St.	5/2/2017	3' x 5' MDO sign
Bill Barnes	108 E Third St	5/8/2017	6' Wood Fence: 1 gate
Gregory Stewart	514 Jefferson St.	5/16/2017	Barn metal to Shingle as previously installed
Dr. Ben Canida	901 E First St.	5/17/2017	2' x 8' Alumacorr Sign

Page 18

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

Historic District Board of Review: 2016 April COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Work Done According to COA?
Phagan, Jeff & Peggy	115 E. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace stairs in alley at East side of building. 	Not Completed
Weidman, Don	229 W. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brick in a window opening, facing Poplar Street. 	Yes, but needs painted
Bump, Tom & Karen	605 Jefferson St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repurpose one of two front doors, and recreate an original window Replace existing storm window, using Mon-Ray if affordable or getting quotes from other manufactures. 	Yes
Jackson, Joseph & Cathy	701 E. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolish one of two garages on site Rehabilitate the remaining garage with transferring garage door to West façade, changing vinyl siding to wood Removing to window openings on rear façade of home and changing vinyl siding to wood Remove and replace a metal storm door at West façade of home with full-screen, wood storm door Replacing shingle roof with metal, and reinstall chimney where one had been removed. 	Yes
Heitz, John & Lori/Red Pepperoni	842 W. Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand outdoor seating, to 20'x30', and to include wood deck and railing of either wood or wrought iron. 	Yes

N. Schell noted that she included an additional paper in the packets about contributing structures becoming noncontributing. There was a question about that one of the submitted worksheets and N. Schell wanted to provide that for the board information. Basically if all the historic material is lost a contributing structure could potentially go to noncontributing. B. Lyman asked who makes that evaluation. N. Schell stated she wasn't sure but typically that would happen during a resurvey of the district and the surveyor would make that determination. B. Lyman stated that years have marched on since the last survey was taken and now houses from the 1950s-60s would be considered contributing under the 50 year. N. Schell stated they would be considered historic. There is a potential that you could edit a National Register or National Landmark nomination to add a period of significance but those for our district would not be contributing because they do not fit within the period of significance.

G. Thieman stated that he was asked earlier about the roofing project and the copper flashing. G. Thieman informed the board that when he was working with the contractor he asked him if the copper flashing was the cheapest way to do the flashing and the contractor said yes because you could solder the copper and you cannot solder the other types of metal. You can weld stainless steel or aluminum.

No further business to be brought before the board.

P. Newhouse made the motion to adjourn - seconded by S. Ash.

Meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Page 19

Historic District Board of Review

May 22, 2017

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Ron Hopper, Chairman

Nicole M Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator

Louann Waller, Secretary