

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 28, 2011

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, March 28, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. in City Hall. Dirk Cheatham, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Paul Davis, Mike Pittman, Ann Roller, John DeLuca, Ginger Jorgensen, and Ron Hopper. Also present were: Mike Hoffman, Building Inspector; Darrell Auxier, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary.

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting.

P. Davis made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by J. DeLuca – all ayes.

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.

New Applications:

1. **EGC Construction on behalf of property owner: John Morgan** – (This is an amended application from previous HDBR approval on November 10, 2010.) *C. of A.* for a two-story three car garage – Pella wood windows; custom made garage doors of metal with 100% facing of cypress; custom made single entry doors of wood; exterior lights to be black wrought iron or copper (carriage style); and a metal standing seam roof.
Location: **403 W. First Street** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Mr. Morgan's architect, Mike Anderson with EGC Construction, presented this application. Mr. Anderson confirmed this is an amendment to a previously (HDBR) submitted plan design. Mr. Anderson explained that Mr. Morgan called him about 1 ½ months ago wishing to have additional storage to the three-car garage – stated he want some more storage in three-car garage, so if he put a little “bump” on the side of it and if so how would he get stuff upstairs and all that, so that resulted in a minor redesign which is just simply adding the “bump” onto the side of the building and also there was a hoist way on the exterior that they kind of considered with John – John was very pleased with it but said that's great, let's think about how it is situated on the site, so in talking about it on the site, it could have some latitude right now, slide it away from Broadway closer towards the storage area right now, so that's sort of the line of thinking right now is that it may not be where it is positioned precisely in the site plan but wants some latitude to move it. So, Mr. Anderson said that's one thought – however, a few weeks ago Kelley, Mr. Morgan's daughter, called Mr. Anderson and said she was alarmed where they had the building positioned that it would still obstruct their view of the river – so – they went back to the design board and did a complete throwing all the cards up in the air and letting them fall and scrambled them up and came back with another idea so he is here to present another idea here which the board does not have right now. (Mr. Anderson distributed the new design to the board members.) Mr. Anderson explained it is still a three-car garage, is positioned basically behind their existing carriage house, materials aren't going to change – still going to have the standing seam metal roof, cypress, veneer doors, copper downspouts, gutters and all – but, it's a more compact profile, slightly smaller in square footage, moving even farther away from Broadway and allows for an unconventional design for the three-car garage configuration. Mr. Anderson noted it still maintains the hoist way basically facing the side entry so Mr. Morgan can take larger things, piano and whatnot up and down onto the second floor. He noted aside from that it allows for the ... from the site plan there is a triangle view which is the further most point showing they have a site line direct view to the river and it avoids any of the structure from any existing structures. Mr. Anderson said he is just here to throw this out to the board for their review.

In regards to the west side, J. DeLuca asked Mr. Anderson what the setback will be from the property line – or is this Mr. Morgan's property as well. Mr. Anderson answered that that whole strip is Morgan property. J. DeLuca noted they have a minimum setback of 3-ft. “over here” which is good but unlike the very nice layout the board saw when they gave previous approval, there was about 30-40 ft. of hard surface directly showing out to Broadway Street now so this

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
March 28, 2011

part will be new driveway surface? Yes, per Mr. Anderson – that would be pavers or something like that. J. DeLuca said he didn't know if that falls within our concern but it concerned him that we would have just a parking lot look there instead of a very nice ... Mr. Anderson said there is another strip adjacent to that between the rose hedges and the driveway so that strip right there would be finely manicured. J. DeLuca asked if they could soften it up a little bit with landscaping. Mr. Anderson answered there will be all kinds of landscaping – will be more of a horticulture garden (pointed to the area).

D. Cheatham asked Mr. Anderson how much frontage there will be on the east elevation side to the street. Mr. Anderson answered there will be 54' 9 1/2" to the outside edge of the concrete – pointed out a dimension that is 54-ft.

J. DeLuca said this is a well made out, high-end, good quality project – probably the best package he has seen.

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

R. Hopper made the following motion: moved that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for the new construction of a 2-story, 3 car garage at 403 W. First Street, if constructed according to the plans submitted on March 28, 2011, is compatible with the character of the historic district and the architectural details are generally in harmony with the character of the adjoining properties and the district, as referenced in the Madison Residential Review Guidelines, pg. 69, and City Ordinance, section 10: Development Standards, item D: Visual Compatibility Factors; area 1: height, area 2: proportion of building's façade, area 3: proportion of openings within the facility, area 7: relationship of materials and textures, and area 8: roof shape. This proposal includes the recommended items as listed in City Ordinance, section 8, item 1: Structure Plan, item 2: Site Plan, and item 3: Photographs.

Motion seconded by J. DeLuca – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as applied in accordance with motion.

2. **Ken and Linda Pettit** – *C. of A.* for a two-car garage with metal standing seam roof (to match house), Hardi Board siding (batten style); wood/aluminum clad windows and doors (Andersen 400 Series); metal garage doors; and cupola constructed of Hardi Board and copper.

Location: **119 East Street**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Application presented by applicant's contractor, Matt Hicks by informing the board members that basically this will be just a two-car garage, office space up above, and everything mentioned in reading of the application – Hardi siding, metal roof to match the existing (house) addition which is probably about eight years old, also matching the door and window types that are on the new addition in the back.

D. Cheatham asked Mr. Hicks if there will be any elimination of any part of the house. No, per Mr. Hicks – this is just a new garage but trying to match what is existing as well as they can. Mr. Hicks advised that all the products the owners are interested in using are what is now there.

J. DeLuca asked Mr. Hicks if this will be built on the lower elevation. Mr. Hicks answered it will be the higher where the older carriage house type structure was. P. Davis helped by explaining it will be where the old stone retaining wall is. Mr. Hicks explained that the stone walls that are there will be taken out and then footing will be poured in that same spot.

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
March 28, 2011

Application presented by door contractor, Roger Welch. Mr. Welch said that basically he is going to build a six panel door to complement the existing opening. D. Cheatham asked Mr. Welch if this isn't pretty much what is there. Mr. Welch told D. Cheatham he was right on – right on the money. Mr. Welch further stated they have been kind of talking, maybe/possibly a four panel which would ... but doesn't know for sure but that would be complimentary to the linear side lights on each side of the existing door now – have two panels at the base of each side to the existing side lights now, but keeping with that ... the way he was told it is a Federal opening and that's probably debatable. Mr. Welch said as far as a Federal opening there should be a panel door, now you can go in all directions as to what style of a door but that's pretty much of a basic plain masonry opening, so he is just here to see if he can build a six panel or a four panel complimentary... a door that will compliment the outer parameter of that door.

G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Welch if that is a 36-in. door – that is what he has on the drawing – that is pretty standard. Mr. Welch answered that he has not measured that door yet. G. Jorgensen said that is what she was wondering – that's why she was wondering – that's a standard size – that's why she was wondering if that door was standard. Mr. Welch said he can't answer that, but a lot of your older doors, front doors ...see, that's variable too – this is just something to go with, to start with. Also Mr. Welch said he would say from just looking at it, it probably is a 3068 1 3/4" standard, early – probably no more than 20 or 15 years old, maybe 30 or 40 – very basic. But, a Federal opening was usually a panel door whether it be four panel, six panel, nine panel going all the way up to the northeast. J. DeLuca asked what is typical for around here. G. Jorgensen answered there is no standard, that's the thing – that's why she was wondering – he used a standard and that was why she was wondering because they are not standard.

J. DeLuca said he thought they should be more concerned with the actual design of the door because whatever it is, it is. G. Jorgensen agreed – that was why she was wondering if the size of the opening would be changed. Mr. Welch said the existing jam opening is what it will be. J. DeLuca also asked Mr. Welch what type of wood it will be made of.

Mr. Welch answered that it will probably either be ... it's going to be painted so it will be cypress or mahogany or white oak. G. Jorgensen said as far as she sees either the four or six panel would be appropriate for the style of the house. D. Cheatham said that probably a four would be appropriate. G. Jorgensen added, probably so – that is more common for here. Mr. Welch said he would let Carey (property owner) decide if that is alright with the board.

J. DeLuca wondered about the hardware – does the board care about what the doorknob looks like. Mr. Welch stated he did not know what Mr. Strouse will put on there but was sure it will be something that is going to compliment – will probably be either a deadbolt with a round knob passage set with a deadbolt or probably a lever thumb with a deadbolt.

In regards to the windows, J. DeLuca asked Mr. Welch if he was doing any work with the windows. Mr. Welch said he believed he would talk with Mr. Strouse when he comes in. J. DeLuca said it was their understanding that Mr. Strouse is reglazing and refinishing the windows, the existing windows, rather than replacing them. R. Hopper noted that some work has been done. Mr. Welch stated that he would help Mr. Strouse refine that. A. Roller noted the windows don't match right now. Right, per Mr. Welch. And, Mr. Welch said if you want to become politically correct that whole façade, that whole front structure – it was really three double doors and windows above that so... and there were two different periods of construction there and so where do you start and where do you stop? G. Jorgensen said there is the 1830 part and ... Mr. Welch said he thought, haven't talked to the homeowner in person, he would think since there is a panel door and lights around that panel door then you don't want to look at that beautiful front with six over six on the top and two over two on the base – and, it would take nothing to take the existing sash out, use the existing sash downstairs (two sash make a window) and take the middle muntin out and take true divided six over six downstairs and compliment that, clean that up very easy, very quick.

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
March 28, 2011

G. Jorgensen said just a little bit of the history she got – the older part of the house was the back part in the 1830's and the mid part was about in the 1850's, 1854 or something like that. Mr. Welch said he hasn't gotten that pinpointed but was not ashamed to say that a good friend of his kind of... but he is well aware of economics no matter what kind and age we're in and you had to take all of that into consideration – when you look at a lot of these structures downtown because time and economics had a big role – but his good friend, Link Ludington, enlightened him on those so gave him the credit on that – and, Link is quite...he knows his stuff so there is where he was getting enlighten on that but he would have come to that, but his job was just the door. G. Jorgensen said the reason she was bringing that up was because the two window styles are different and she also spoke to Link and he said that at one time it was a commercial building and that's why...and the lower part was more open, there were doors on the bottom, but the reason why they are two over two as they are now, which they were replaced as Link said in the 1870's or maybe the 80's even that's why and that was the style they used then because the panes had gotten larger at that time – so that's why they don't match but those are early windows – we don't want to lose the windows but as Mr. Welch can reconfigure them... Mr. Welch said they could be reconfigured. G. Jorgensen agreed. J. DeLuca asked about windows being replaced. G. Jorgensen commented those are the ones on the west side...which if they had gotten into this conversation then, it would have gone a lot more smoothly she thought because she didn't have a problem with replacing the ten year old windows with wood because that is replacing like with like – to her that is replacing – replacing those old windows with new windows is not like with like. Mr. Welch said you see what could have happened is they might have used...there it was critical to use the proper woods in the right places that would withstand the weather but the proper woods cost dollars bills.

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

R. Hopper made the following motion: that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 703 W. Main Street is constructed according to the plans submitted on December 29, 2010, is compatible with the character of the historic district, for the reason that it complies with the Madison Design Review Guidelines, pg. 41, which states that a 4 or 6 panel door would be appropriate for a Federal Style dwelling.

Motion seconded by J. DeLuca – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as applied and in accordance with motion.

Mr. Welch said that Link (Ludington) enlighten him on this, the word Federal... G. Jorgensen said he (Link) is correct – it has a lot of characteristics from the Federal period but it is considered Greek Revival. There was confirmation that the 4 or 6 panel door would be appropriate. D. Cheatham thanked Mr. Welch for the history lesson. Mr. Welch responded by saying that he learned from the Main carpenter that walked the Mediterranean.

Business – Old or New:

G. Jorgensen announced that the Indiana State Historic Preservation conference is going to be held April 6 – 8 – website is www.in.gov/dnr/historic if anyone is interested in finding information on the conference.

Discussion regarding the interview process of the three Historic Preservationist candidates and questions in which board members would like to ask candidates. R. Hopper noted that he thought all three candidates should be asked the same questions. The board expressed the desire to form a committee to meet prior to April 4 to compile questions. D. Auxier advised the board

Page 6
Historic District Board Meeting

members to keep in mind that the committee has to comply with the Open Door Law unless they will be coming under Executive Session for a permissible purpose – give 48 hours notice to the media and post the notice 48 hours before. Ultimately the subcommittee decided to meet in City Hall Friday, April at 10:00 a.m. L. Waller to prepare legal notice. D. Auxier advised the notice does not have to be published in the paper, just needs to be provided to the press and posted.

D. Cheatham brought up about storm windows – noted this was discussed at the last HDBR meeting (special meeting) decided they are going to be a conspicuous change. D. Auxier noted that he thought they are a change in appearance certainly – didn't see anything in the Ordinance that exempts storm windows from...though the practice has been from his understanding, doesn't know this for a fact because he hasn't represented this board that long, but his understanding was that in the past storm windows were approved by the Building Inspector without coming before the board. D. Cheatham said the few cases that he knew of, that's been the case – knows the last HDBR meeting... D. Auxier said, yes, it was brought up at the at last meeting and thought that technically unless the board chooses to delegate the authority to the staff to approve storm windows that it should come before the board. D. Cheatham said that basically his statement was to the audience and to the public that he thought it should come before the board – most likely the applications are probably going to be approved, but thought it was something that should come before the board. M. Hoffman said that is an item he hasn't addressed since he has been here for four years and the applicant's that come before the board with window changes or remodeling the house or whatever, storm windows were just passed over. D. Cheatham said he didn't think it would be a hard sell to the board but was sure in certain cases there might be something that the board might need to address. **Storm windows shall be brought before the HDBR.**

One other thing D. Cheatham said he wanted to mention is that he passed it over with Louann three or four weeks ago as far as the time of the start of the meetings – if anybody and everybody would be willing to move it up to 5:30 p.m. – would that be a conflict with work issues or is there opinion – like to keep it at 6:30? M. Pittman commented that he thought as long as the public can get here by 5:30, thought that was fine – had no issue with it. G. Jorgensen expressed concern for those who work and might want to attend. D. Cheatham said he knew that a lot of people are caught in between maybe getting off work, go home to get something to eat, or don't get anything to eat and then go home at 7:30 or 8:00 or whatever. D. Cheatham asked the audience if they had any comments about this – for or against – no response.

R. Hopper made the motion to change the HDBR meetings from 6:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. on the fourth Monday of each month starting in the month of April – seconded by P. Davis – all ayes. **The HDBR will meet at 5:30 p.m. the fourth Monday of the month.**

Audience member, Rich Murray, asked that this change be made on the board in the front hall and on the City website.

No further business to be brought before the board.

G. Jorgensen made the motion to adjourn – seconded by P. Davis.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Louann Waller, Secretary