# HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

**Minutes October 23, 2023**

**The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, October 23, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Mike Pittman presided over the meeting with the following members present: Owen McCall, Carol Ann Rogers, Michael Zink, and Sandy Palmer. Also present was Nicole M Schell – Director of Planning.**

M. Pittman gave an overview of what to expect for those who have never been to a Historic District Board of Review meeting. Once the application is announced the applicant or representative will come up to the microphone to answer any questions. N. Schell will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. M. Pittman added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

**9/25/2023 Minutes:**

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting for September 25, 2023and had any corrections or additions.

S. Palmer moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by O. McCall.

**Roll Call:**

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

S. Palmer Approved

M. Zink Approved

***Minutes stand approved.***

**Applications:**

1. Steve Buchanan – C. of A. to build top floor addition on north side of structure.

Location: **407 E. Vaughn Dr.** Zoned: **Open Space (OS)**

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. There was no representative present at the meeting. Application was deemed incomplete and will be on the next agenda for discussion.

1. Shina Murdock – C. of A. to build new garage at the rear of the structure.

Location: **120 Jefferson St.** Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Shina Murdock and Ryan Rogers were present.

S. Murdock noted that the stone along the garage doors facing the alley would be similar to one located on First Street. S. Palmer asked for clarification on the project. R. Rogers stated it would appear as a garage from the alley but would have some open space on the sides and rear. It will also have storage towards the house. M. Pittman asked for clarification on the garage door materials. R. Rogers confirmed they would be fiberglass doors with a wood finish. S. Murdock noted that the doors would likely be solid without glass.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.
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**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 24.0 New Construction – Outbuildings | 101-102 | *M. Zink* –Looking at Madison Historic District design guidelines, 24 new construction outbuildings, pages 101 102. The design of new garages and other accessory buildings should be compatible with dwellings in the historic district. New outbuildings should respect and blend with the architectural style and scale of the associated dwelling. I believe that this is. The site new garages and accessory buildings appropriately on the lot. Locate detached new garages and outbuildings to the rear of a dwelling or set back from the side elevations. Attached garages and accessory buildings should be set back from the front façade of the primary dwelling at least one-third of the total depth of the dwelling. The outbuilding should maintain a proportional mass, size, and height to ensure it is not taller or wider than the principal building on the lot. It appears that it does, and it is one story. The materials that are used for the new garage outbuilding should reflect the historical development of the property. The materials used on the exterior facade of the garage and outbuildings were often different and less costly than the main dwelling. And actually, this looks pretty nice or appears pretty nice. The eaves and roof ridges of the new outbuilding should not be higher than those of the existing primary building, which it is. not higher than the primary building. So based on these findings and facts, I believe that it goes with the guidelines that we have.  *M. Pittman* – I agree for the same reasons.  *O. McCall –* I agree for the same reasons.  *C. Rogers* – I agree.  *S. Palmer* – I agree for the same reasons. |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. M. Zink made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a certificate of appropriateness to Shina Murdock at 120 Jefferson Street, Madison, Indiana. Subject, however, to the conditions specified in the findings of fact previously. To wit.”

Seconded by C. Rogers.

**Roll Call:**

S. Palmer Approved

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

M. Zink Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.***
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1. Greg & Shirley Howard – C. of A. to extend the front porch by 4’.

Location: **843 W. Third St.** Zoned: **Residential Medium Density (R-8)**

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Greg & Shirley Howard were present.

S. Howard noted that the porch would extend almost to the edge of the existing sidewalk from the driveway, and they would move the sidewalk to stretch from the porch directly to the city sidewalk. S. Palmer asked for clarification on the porch roof. S. Howard stated that it would match the existing design to cover a larger area and would be using the existing posts.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 14.0 Porches | 68-70 | *O. McCall* – Porches 14.0 on pages 68 through 70 of the guidelines 14.5. The enclosure or other alteration of original or historic front porches is not appropriate in the historic district. The enclosure of porches at the rear, or other areas not seen from the public view, is appropriate if the enclosure is designed and constructed in a manner that preserves the historic features of the porch. This is not relevant since it is a new building. 14.9 Use architectural details and ornamentation that are compatible with the style, period, and detailing of the porch and structure. Such features as new metal columns or wrought iron posts, over-scaled columns, metal or plastic balustrades are not appropriate. Since this is really just the same porch, just extended four feet, it's a trivial change. So, I don't really see how this could possibly be in violation of the guidelines in anyway and should be approved.  *M. Pittman* – I agree.  *M. Zink* *–* I agree for the same reasons.  *C. Rogers* – I agree.  *S. Palmer* – I agree for the same reasons. |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a certificate of appropriateness to Greg and Shirley Howard for the proposed four-foot extension of their front porch, located at 843 West Third Street.”

Seconded by M. Zink.

**Roll Call:**

S. Palmer Approved

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

M. Zink Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.***
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1. John & Cynthia Campbell – C. of A. to build a 10’6” x 10’6” addition with a 13’6” x 13”6’ rooftop deck on the rear of home.

Location: **111 E. First St.**  Zoned: **Central Business District (CBD)**

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. John Campbell was present. Robert Dean appeared during the meeting to assist the applicant with questions.

R. Dean noted that the addition would actually measure 13’6” x 10’6” under the 13’6” x 13’6” rooftop deck. S. Palmer asked about the siding material. N. Schell noted the existing home is brick. R. Dean stated the proposed material was called Sushi Bon which is a Japanese product that repels insect invasion and is very low maintenance.

M. Pittman asked for public comment and noted none.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 26.0 New Construction – Additions  27.0 New Construction - Decks | 106-108  109 | *S. Palmer* – new construction additions, which 106-108 Where possible, locate new additions at the rear so that they have a minimal impact on the façade and other primary elevation of the affected building or adjacent properties. The overall proportions of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in height, scale, size, and massing so as not to overpower it visually. A new addition should never be taller or wider than the original structure unless required by code or a non-aesthetic functional requirement. Observe the principle of “additive massing” where the original structure remains dominant and the additions are adjoining and smaller masses. Based on the drawings, you are following that guideline. The design elements of a new addition should be compatible with the existing building in terms of materials, style, color, roof forms, massing proportion and spacing of doors and windows. I’m not quite sure about the doors and windows, but I think that this is in compliance. Additions should be constructed so that they can be removed from the original building in the future without irreversible damage to significant features. This is adding on the existing structure so that you would be able to do so. I think you said they were going to be aluminum wood clad windows. (M. Zink confirmed that the application included wood or aluminum clad wood windows.) So that’s in compliance. Rooflines of new additions should be similar in form and pitch which they are. Foundations should be similar and compatible with existing foundations. And it looked to me with that material would be so. Locate decks only on the rear and should be attached to the historic building so that they may be removed. This can be. And the flashing details to reduce the eliminate moisture. I didn't see that specified in there, but I'm assuming you'll be flashing it so that you’re going to eliminate moisture in your new addition. I think it's in conformance.  *M. Zink* – I agree.  *M. Pittman* – I agree.  *O. McCall –* I agree.  *C. Rogers* – I agree. |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. N. Schell noted that this application will need a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals for setbacks and recommended including that in the motion.
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M. Pittman asked if there was a plan for the addition if the variance is denied. R. Rogers explained that they would turn the staircase instead of having a straight staircase without a landing.

S. Palmer made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a certificate of appropriateness to John Campbell at 111 East First Street for the a 10’ 6” x 10’ 6” addition with a deck, that is10’ 6” x 13’ 6”, contingent upon the approval from the zoning board of the setback or a change in the staircase if zoning approval is not given.”

Seconded by M. Zink.

**Roll Call:**

S. Palmer Approved

M. Pittman Approved

O. McCall Approved

C. Rogers Approved

M. Zink Approved

***The motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved. A Certificate will be issued for the entire project.***

**Old/New Business:**

No old or new business.

**Staff Report:**

October 2023 Fast-Track Applications

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant | Address | COA |
| Kim Kidwell | 9/25/2023 | Install 4’x4’ wood sign at right angle on front of building |
| Cynthia Johnson | 9/28/2023 | Replace deteriorated stone steps & walkway to door with concrete (keep retaining walls) |
| Kim Nyberg | 9/29/2023 | Install 4’x4’ wood sign at right angle on front of building |
| Chris & Gina Lynn | 10/06/2023 | Install 3’ x 89’ metal fence along front & rear side yard (6’ in rear west side) |
| Roger Welch | 10/05/2023 | Replace existing deteriorated wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows of same shape, design, size, & configuration |
| Lisa Farris | 10/18/2023 | Replace existing deteriorated metal storm door with full light storm door. |
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October 2022 COA Review

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant | Address | COA | Completion Status |
| Ryan Rogers | 403 W. Second | New construction o fa porch roof & concrete pad as well as the modification of a lower level window on the East elevation to a doorway on the rear of the home | Yes |
| Tami Hagemeir | 701 W. First | Install shipping containers on the northeast & west corners of the property with a greater than 10’ setback from property lines | In Violation of COA |
| Margo Olson | 100 E. Second | Install 60”x96” aluminum sign on front of building | Yes |
| Jae & Holly Wood | 108 E. Main | Install flat metal sign on front of building & vinyl sign on front door/window | Yes |
| Ron Bladen | 110 W. Main | Replace existing deteriorated wood windows with aluminum clad wood windows of same size, shape, & design | Yes |
| Sarah Renfro | 118 Ferry | Replace front wood staircase (straight) with wood staircase with middle landing | Yes |

C. Rogers made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by S. Pamler.

Meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

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

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Mike Pittman, Vice-Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Nicole M Schell

Director of Planning