

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

September 26, 2011

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held their regular meeting on Monday, September 26, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Dirk Cheatham, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Paul Davis, Mike Pittman, Ann Roller, Ginger Jorgensen, and Ron Hopper. Also present were: Darrell Auxier, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary. Absent was board member John DeLuca.

G. Jorgensen requested a wording change on page 5, last paragraph “G. Jorgensen noted it was so unusual for a historic board to not rule for vinyl windows” – it was supposed to be to rule for vinyl windows. No further changes requested. P. Davis made the motion to approve the minutes with the wording change – seconded by R. Hopper – all ayes.

Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed with the aforementioned wording change.

New Applications:

1. Rod Sidley Architects for owners Bill and Terri Canida –

C. of A. to demolish limestone clad office addition, restore existing brick, add contexture detail; replace existing vinyl windows; remove limestone at front porch and replace with columns and handrail.

Location: **512 Broadway Street**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

C. Fife advised that Rod Sidley unfortunately had an error in sending out the meeting notice – wrong building address was on the notice – C. Fife requested on their behalf an extension of this application until next month.

R. Hopper made the motion to extend this application – seconded by M. Pittman – all ayes.

Application extended.

(D. Auxier advised C. Fife to obtain a written extension from Mr. Sidley.)

2. Patty Jackson, City of Madison Owner Occupied Rehab Program SIRPC, for Elizabeth Young –

C. of A. to install new windows, doors, storm doors.

Location: **706 Presbyterian Avenue**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Property history, description and application outlined by C. Fife; noncontributing building; secondary area. C. Fife commented this application might not have had to come before the board but appreciate that Patty was willing to do that.

C. Fife explained that the windows and some of the other parts of the building, in her opinion, are more than 80% deteriorated and in reference to what is being discussed is 151.20 (a)(1)(c), is zoned Historic District Residential.

C. Fife said the work plan is to replace vinyl windows and for an insulated fiberglass door. She outlined this is a very modest structure, vinyl clad, one-story, and with extreme deterioration in almost all of the openings.

Ms. Jackson told the board members that she represents the Southeastern Indiana Regional Planning Commission and they are doing this project for the City of Madison and it is to assist low to moderate income residents within the city of Madison and they have been very fortunate to receive a \$300,000.00 grant from Indiana Housing and then an additional smaller grant of around \$21,000.00 from USDA Housing Preservation Grant Program.

Mrs. Jackson said as the board can see from the pictures of 706 Presbyterian, there is a lot of work that needs to be done to this home and they are requesting vinyl windows because the lady

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

is elderly, she would not be able to take care of the upkeep of wood windows, and it is so rotten and deteriorated that they've actually debated whether or not they can really do anything. She noted that the bids came in at over \$40,000.00 to do the work they propose to do, so their primary goal right now is to get the shell secured, she has a problem with snakes in her window sills nesting and she also has an extreme problem with fleas inside the house right now; there is a lot of rotting in the floor joists in the crawl space and they will be spending around \$4,000.00 replacing and repairing those. They are hoping to do the windows, the roof, repair some siding, and put new doors on and from there, there probably won't be a lot extra – will focus on the exterior and then do the interior.

Mrs. Jackson explained with this program they are not allowed to specify a certain brand without giving an equivalent because it is a State and Federal program that the funding is coming from, so she had gone to Lowe's and gotten a brochure on...have to do things that promote energy efficiency and products that are Energy Star rated so the board members will see that a lot with her work write ups, it has to be Energy Star rated, wood window or vinyl window, or Energy Star rated door, anything like that. Mrs. Jackson said she had looked at full view glass doors without a sash in the middle and then has looked at the one with the sash in the middle because she is dealing with some people who are elderly that can't take the glass panel out of the door and put the screen in, whereas this one rolls down from the top. Mrs. Jackson said she has been asking the residents which they would prefer and they told her, some of them - Ms. Young didn't specify which she would prefer so Mrs. Jackson would probably ask for the one with the sash in the center so it would be easier for her to roll that down and get some circulation through the house; Ms. Young does not have central air but Mrs. Jackson is also looking at putting in a furnace and central air in the home. Mrs. Jackson said she doesn't have any pictures of windows but it is specified to match the size and style of the existing, but as can be seen from the photo it's kind of a hodge podge variety.

M. Pittman said he noticed there was a significant amount of damage to the foundation and that seems to be a priority – you can put in vinyl windows and you can put doors on but if the foundation is not there, it's like putting a band-aid on it. Mrs. Jackson agreed and said she thought it would be about \$4,000.00 for all the work they will be doing in the crawlspace and foundation work. M. Pittman added that it appeared there is insect damage to the timbers. Mrs. Jackson said they were also going to treat it but actually might just be replacing everything underneath. Also, Mrs. Jackson said that Paul (Davis) is their home inspector for the projects, have worked with him in the past, has been great to work with. Mrs. Jackson said she has had a long talk with Ms. Young about fleas in the house – Ms. Young is not living in the home right now because there is no heat because what was there is no longer working – Ms. Young would like to move back and was a little upset with Mrs. Jackson when told this is a lot more than anticipated and it could be they may not be able to do anything.

M. Pittman asked what is the total cost for the home. Mrs. Jackson answered they are looking at about \$21,000.00 – have \$14,000.00 with the funds from the Rehab Program but then they are applying...USDA has a 504 grant program for persons over the age of 62, they have to be very low income, and they can qualify for up to \$7,500.00 additional grant, they have applied for those funds and hoping to get them and then they will be able to make a bigger impact on the house. Mrs. Jackson noted she has been told they have funding available from this program right now but it's just a matter of getting through all the paperwork and everything for it – will not award a contract until they know if they are getting those funds or not. M. Pittman said he guessed from his perspective, and this is just him speaking, he would like to make sure that the structural issues are dealt with prior to the storm door and windows – unless you get a solid floor... Mrs. Jackson said the windows are a priority too – have enough funds to do the foundation work and work in the crawlspace, the windows, the furnace, roof, and gutters.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

P. Davis reiterated that Mrs. Jackson had said the total estimates were over \$40,000.00 so that's almost building a whole new house. Mrs. Jackson said she had only one contractor put in a bid on this house.

Mrs. Jackson told the board members that she has instructed Ms. Young to get rid of the cat she is taking care of for her daughter – this is the cause of the flea problem.

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

R. Hopper made the following motion: “I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 706 Presbyterian Avenue does not require approval for this change as evidenced by City Ordinance 151.20, Section (A), (1) (c), however, if constructed according to the plans submitted on 9/7/11, is compatible with the character of the historic district and the architectural details are generally in harmony with the adjoining properties.” Motion seconded by G. Jorgensen – all ayes (P. Davis abstained).

Application approved in accordance with motion and board vote.

3. Patty Jackson, City of Madison Owner Occupied Rehab Program SIRPC, for James and Paulette Rice –

C. of A. to install storm windows or replace windows, replace entry door, tuck pointing, and other repair and maintenance

Location: **821 W. Third Street**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

Property history and description; application outlined by C. Fife.

C. Fife said the things that Patty (Jackson) has worked with this owner on that concern this board are door replacement, the roof – the roof would be a replacement in kind, shingle to shingle so sometimes that can be considered maintenance and would not be something this board would be looking at – the windows, knows Mrs. Jackson has received a bid. Mrs. Jackson said that unfortunately she did not receive any bids on this property so they are having to rebid it, but the way the other bids came in... would just be primarily looking at storm windows and not doing replacement. C. Fife asked/commented to Mrr. Jackson that would be Mon-Ray storm windows. Mrs. Jackson answered they would be Mon-Ray or equivalent. C. Fife noted this board has already approved Mon-Ray as a type of storm window to go forward with. Also, C. Fife said she thought under those circumstances the only issue there would have been is that the front windows and the windows visible at the side of the porch are historic windows so would have concerns about that – she and Mrs. Jackson have talked a lot about that and Mrs. Jackson agreed that the Mon-Ray storms on those windows would be an adequate substitute, and on the back windows and those that are not visible from the street, of course that would be different and she (Mrs. Jackson) could do whatever her budget would allow. But, the door is something that might need to be talked a little bit more about. C. Fife showed a close up picture – an interior shot of the frame of the door – can see the upper part of it and if they can see on the left, again, an interior shot of this door (this is the door off of the porch they were looking at earlier) it is maybe not the first door on this building but certainly an early door, a full wood door with an upper light and it appears to be in reasonably good shape; now what is a problem is the frame surrounding it, looks like it needs some repair, certainly needs some scraping and painting, and fixing – that might be of concern. Mrs. Jackson stated that the homeowner was pretty insistent on a new door and she told him that she would present it to this board and see how the board felt. Mrs. Jackson noted she did look at the door and feels like it is in pretty good shape but the frame around it has deteriorated...thought there was a gap around the door and stuff like that but the homeowner

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

may not be very happy with her...she went and looked at it and unless there was an area that she didn't see, thought the door seemed to be fairly solid and thought it just needed repair.

Mrs. Jackson said on this application they would more than likely just be looking at the storm windows instead of replacement and then whatever the board wants to consider on the door – what she proposed was to put in an insulated fiberglass door with similar look but will leave that up to the board.

In regards to the roof, Mrs. Jackson said they are replacing the asphalt shingled roof with an asphalt shingled roof but they are required by the State to do a 30-year warranty shingle which takes it from a nondimensional to a three-dimensional shingle so that is somewhat of a conspicuous change there. C. Fife noted that is similar in material and pretty much standard. G. Jorgensen said that actually the 30-yr resembles shingles more than ...C. Fife added that this house also has some metal roof. Mrs. Jackson said it has part metal roof which they will reseal and repaint.

M. Pittman explained that their front door is not the original door on their house but it also was a wonderful source _____ until they had a good carpenter in to look at it and he actually took it and redid it – the weather stripping, worked on the jam and actually set it up so that it does look nice – it can be done – in fact, sure the issue with the homeowner is that the wind blows through, nobody likes the wind blowing through and it probably doesn't close that well because you can see that the frame is deteriorating – replace that frame and with weather stripping that could solve the issue for them. A. Roller asked if there is a storm door over it. Mrs. Jackson answered that there is a storm door on it – thinks the storm door you can't see is metal and the one on the front is wood – not sure about this one. M. Pittman said he would like the owner to keep the wood door. D. Cheatham added this would be cheaper.

D. Cheatham said what the board has is basically the Mon-Ray storm windows or equivalent to those that are in view from the street – the other storm windows will be basically up to Mrs. Jackson's discretion, repair door frame, replace shingled roof, and repair/paint standing seam metal roof.

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

R. Hopper made the following motion: "I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 821 West Third Street, if constructed according to the plans submitted on 9/7/11, specifically the repair of existing metal and asphalt roofs with the same materials, is compatible with the character of the historic district and adjoining properties. However, the replacement of the existing wood door with a fiberglass substitute is not appropriate according to the Residential Guidelines, p. 42, and City Ordinance 151.30, and should be repaired not replaced." Motion seconded by M. Pittman – all ayes (P. Davis abstained).

Application approved in accordance with motion and board vote.

4. Patty Jackson, City of Madison Owner Occupied Rehab Program SIRPC , Velma Brown

C. of A. for storms and/or window replacement, install new storm door at rear, install ramp on east side of home and a removable grab bar by front entry.

Location: **1017 W. Main Street**

Zoned: Medium Density Residential (R-8)

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

Property history and description; application outlined by C. Fife. Patty Jackson stated they did receive bids for this property and the wood is what they would like to go with for the ramp, it was a little bit cheaper; the storm windows, they would also be asking for (can't afford to change out

End of Tape 1 – Side A

metal grab bar that you can see can be unfastened from the wall – may have to adjust the mail box a little bit in order to put the bar where it needs to be but thought doing a ramp will make a huge difference for Ms. Brown and she won't have nearly the issues because the steps on the side entry are very unstable, unlevel, and not easy ingress or egress for Ms. Brown. A. Roller asked Mrs. Jackson what about a wrought iron fence – her mother had one of those put in instead of a grab bar. Mrs. Jackson answered that honestly she didn't know...A. Roller said it seemed like that would be better for Ms. Brown than to have...Mrs. Jackson said when you go to this house the door is right in the pathway of the walkway and knows she had discussed this with Mr. Hoffman and they couldn't do...it's a possibility they could do something like that – don't know how secure they would be able to get that fastened to the concrete and then thinks they are creating a trip hazard for the public that is walking on the sidewalk because Ms. Brown opens her door and steps out and she is on that sidewalk, there is no space in between. M. Pittman told Mrs. Jackson she might want to talk to Madison Iron Works. Mrs. Jackson said ok – that is a good idea.

M. Pittman asked Mrs. Jackson if she knew that the gutter is falling off on the side. Mrs. Jackson advised they are replacing that – they are doing gutters, roof, and the ramp.

M. Pittman asked Mrs. Jackson if the house already has storm windows on it – looked like it has some. Mrs. Jackson said there are on some windows but not on all of them. M. Pittman then asked if they are replacing all the storm windows. Mrs. Jackson said they would put storm windows on all of them – doesn't think many of the windows have storm windows – thinks maybe the one on the front and the one of the west side, but those on the east and south sides...

D. Cheatham outlined that basically what they have is installing storm windows where needed, install new storm door (rear), install ramp on east side of home, and grab bar at front entry. Mrs. Jackson asked if they needed approval for the storm door. C. Fife answered, yes. Mrs. Jackson then said on this one she would like to request...noted they would be installing a storm door on the front and the side. C. Fife asked D. Auxier if it was okay for Mrs. Jackson to add that to the application. Yes, per D. Auxier. Mrs. Jackson said the doors would be full view but needed to check with Ms. Brown because she may prefer not to have the roll down/full view. C. Fife requested that the doors be added to the motion.

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

R. Hopper made the following motion: "I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 1017 W. Main Street, if constructed according to the plans submitted on 9/7/11 be approved as follows: replacing the existing asphalt roof in-kind with asphalt shingles, the ADA compliant ramp on the east side of the home meets the requirements of the Residential Design Guidelines, p. 65, Section 2, and City Ordinance 151.30. The two side windows, six over six on the East side should be repaired and painted, with storm windows added, and the other windows be replaced with wood windows. The full view storm door is consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines, p. 42, and City Ordinance 151.30." Motion seconded by M. Pittman – all ayes (P. Davis abstained).

Application approved in accordance with motion and board vote.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

G. Jorgensen asked Mrs. Jackson if they plan to camouflage the ramp with vegetation. No, per Mrs. Jackson, they don't have a budget for landscaping. Additionally, Mrs. Jackson said the size of the ramp is dictated by ADA – has to be done to their standards. C. Fife said she thought in looking at it, where it will be located, it will be there and obvious but it won't scream at you, will be...

5. Patty Jackson, City of Madison Owner Occupied Rehab Program SIRPC, for Clinton Linville.

C. of A. for storm windows or new windows, replace storm door, brick tuck pointing and other maintenance and repair.

Location: **905 W. Second Street** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Property history and description; application outlined by C. Fife. Mrs. Jackson stated they have received bids and in discussing with Mr. Linville he would prefer just to do storm windows so that is what their goal will be. C. Fife stated/asked Mrs. Jackson if those will be Mon-Ray or equivalent. Yes, per Mrs. Jackson. C. Fife said the front window is probably a little bit sensitive.

In regards to the tuck pointing, Mrs. Jackson said she had put in the guidelines for the tuck pointing to follow what is recommended in the Guidelines – held a prebid conference a couple of weeks ago and gave a copy of the Guidelines to the contractors.

M. Pittman told Mrs. Jackson if the contractors get started on the tuck pointing or anything to do with historic restoration and end up with issues, or problems, or lack of knowledge on what to do, certainly Cornerstone is a great resource – encourage them before they jump into the work and figure out they don't know what they're doing, want to make sure they understand you don't just use ready mix and shove it in between the bricks – that's where the tuck pointing is so critical – real important that they understand – it's really an art.

R. Hopper asked since this is a duplex, would they be doing the whole roof or just the one side. Mrs. Jackson said it will do just the one side – actually is a metal roof on the other side – then thought maybe she should have asked for a metal roof because she didn't know how the shingles and metal roof will tie into each other and not have problems. C. Fife said there is a way to do that. Mrs. Jackson said they also will be painting the exterior.

D. Cheatham outlined the application – storm windows or new windows, which the new windows are the only difference in the application.

R. Hopper made the following motion: “I move that the Madison Historic Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project for 905 W. 2nd Street, if constructed according to the plans submitted on 9/7/11 is compatible with the character of the historic district and the adjoining properties, and be approved as follows: replace the existing shingle roof with a new shingle roof, the full view storm door will be appropriate with the type of door recommended in the Residential Design Guidelines, p. 42 and City Ordinance 151.30, the front windows need to be repaired and painted and add storm windows as referenced in the Residential Design Guidelines, p. 60, 61, section 1 and 3, and City Ordinance 151.30. The side and rear windows are not visible from the street and there is no alley behind the house, therefore do not fall under jurisdiction of the City Ordinance” – motion seconded by G. Jorgensen – all ayes.

Application approved in accordance with motion and board vote.

C. Fife informed the board members of one other project which Mrs. Jackson is working on - 512 West Street and they will be doing painting, roof in-kind replacement, and repair, but all of the work they are doing is repair and maintenance – all in-kind, no change in materials so C. Fife

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

told Mrs. Jackson that would not be something that would be necessary to come before the board – must be careful to replicate everything well. But, because it is such a prominent building, C. Fife said she kind of had the feeling that when work started the board members might be curious as to what was going on.

Extended Application:

- 6. Main Source Bank** – C. of A. to replace front doors.
 Location: **213 E. Main Street** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

C. Fife stated she received a request for this application to be extended to this month but the people have not chosen to ask for a second extension, so, they are working on it as of the last time she spoke with them but think they will choose to reapply when they are ready.

New Business:

- A. C. Fife reported during the month of September she did the following:
 B. Usual meetings with lots of property owners
 C. Have visited several times property at 413 Poplar Street and others – have a list of properties that are in the process of being restored or worked on and sometimes the progress is very slow so she has been trying to work with the owners to do the best she can to encourage them – most of the owners are like all of us because they are in such a place where funds are extremely limited.
 D. Special meeting on 9/12/11 for discussion of the Ordinance – minutes will be provided to the board members before the next meeting.
 E. In the process of writing a grant. As everyone knows, we have received our CLG, just waiting for the rubber stamp of the feds but have been encouraged to go ahead and we are writing a grant which will be for two things - #1 a brochure, which has been talked about before – and, #2 preservation plans for properties in our community which either are abandoned or are expected to be abandoned. We have an agreement in verbal form at this point only with Ball State and with King’s Daughters’ Hospital to go forward and see if we can’t obtain funds to _____. She thanked our hospital friends for being so open to a new idea.
 F. We have a new more user friendly procedure – the Fast Track application for signs and storm windows. So far she has delivered Fast Track applications to two of our four in-town sign folks with ideas and instructions of how to use the applications – thinks this will help to get more participation in the procedure – has two more to mail because she was not able to get to them.
 G. Have new property signs (showed the board members the new sign) – printed here, fee was approved, ready to go so in October applicants will be able to use the signs rather than sending out certified letters for meeting notice.
 H. Reminded everyone about the workshop on 9/29/11 – it has been moved, was originally scheduled at the library – Jonathan Anderson is a lawyer who has worked with some very interesting projects – workshop will be at the Visitor’s Center.
 I. Next month will be our time to award the second Preservation Hero’s reward – have some applicants from last go around that have been reviewed by our committee – will try to get a news release out this week – nominations are open so if there are additional projects, keep in mind they have to have come before the HDBR, they have to have been a project that rehabilitated and brought in to use something that had begun in rough shape, like to see projects that show innovation – that show sweat equity and creativity in their work.
- D. Auxier asked C. Fife if **Main Source** withdrew their application or just simply now ask that it be removed. C. Fife said they just didn’t ask that it be removed. D. Auxier said he thought under those circumstances it would be appropriate for the board to deny the application – if they are not going to approve it, they need to deny it because it is deemed approved if it is not denied. They may still come back and reapply – this would be denied only because of a technicality.

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
September 26, 2011

C. Fife said today she had talked with folks at the bank and they working it but they have a problem...this is a multilayer situation and getting the proper quotes and information to the right people has taken longer. C. Fife reiterated **this denial is a technicality – not a true denial – they can come back at any time.**

R. Hopper made the following motion: “I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review find as a fact that the proposed project at 213 E. Main Street be denied based on their request to resubmit their application” – seconded by M. Pittman.

Application denial in accordance with motion and board vote.

Additional New Business:

M. Pittman there are two potential situations – one at 411 W. Main – appears to be new windows on the alley side and the other is 309 W. Main, alley side, windows are covered with wood.

C. Fife reported that new windows have been installed at 521 Walnut. C. Fife will follow up on all three.

C. Fife will schedule a special HDBR meeting for sometime in October (to continue review of the Historic Ordinance).

No further business to be brought before the board.

R. Hopper made the motion to adjourn – seconded by M. Pittman.

Meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Louann Waller, Secretary

D. Cheatham, Chairman