# HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

**Minutes January 27, 2025**

**The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, January 27, 2025 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Mike Pittman presided over the meeting with the following members present: Happy Smith, Ken McWilliams, William Jewell, and Jed Skillman. Also present was Brenna Haley – Historic Preservationist.**

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. B. Haley 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.

**12/16/2024 Minutes:**

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on December 16, 2024,and had any corrections or additions.

K. McWilliams moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by W. Jewell.

**Roll Call:**

H. Smith Approved

M. Pittman Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

W. Jewell Approved

J. Skillman Approved

***Minutes stand approved.***

M. Pittman announced the annual DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology photo contest has started. The deadline for submissions is April 4th, and the contest is open to all ages and skill levels. All structures in photo entries must be at least 50 years old and taken in Indiana. The structures do not have to be restored. Photos of exclusively natural elements will not be accepted, and photos must have been taken in the last two years. Photographers can enter up to three images.

Before beginning the application hearings, the board needed to elect a chairperson. K. McWilliams nominated M. Pittman as chairman. H. Smith seconded.

M. Pittman Approved

H. Smith Approved

W. Jewell Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Skillman Approved

***The nomination to appoint M. Pittman as Chairman was approved.***

M. Pittman then opened the nominations up for Vice Chair. H. Smith nominated W. Jewell as vice chairperson. J. Skillman seconded.

M. Pittman Approved

H. Smith Approved

W. Jewell Approved
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K. McWilliams Approved

J. Skillman Approved

***The nomination to appoint W. Jewell as Vice Chairman was approved.***

**Applications:**

1. Claude and Wanda Rottet – C. of A. to enclose back porch.

Location: 820 Fillmore Aly. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Claude Rottet was present.

C. Rottet explained that he only wants to glass in the rear porch to make it a year-round room. He would not be changing the footprint at all and would only be putting glass on the outside. He plans to insulate the bottom of the porch.

J. Skillman asked if he intends to put a fireplace or woodstove out there. C. Rottet said he does not plan to.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 14.0 PORCHES | p. 68-70 | *Madison Historic District Design Guidelines* 14.0 PORCHES p. 68-70  14.1 Retain and preserve historic porches, entrances, and doorways including related features such as railings, posts or columns, ceilings, steps, lattice, flooring, piers, ornamental trim, and other character defining elements.  14.2 Maintain historic porch features and components. Follow design guidelines for wood or masonry materials as relevant.  14.3 Repair, rather than replace, historic porch and entrance elements, wherever feasible. Use repair techniques which preserve historic material, including patching, epoxy repair, reinforcing, or splicing-in of new wood in place of deteriorated sections. Replacement elements should match the original in size, shape, pattern, color, and texture.  14.4 Replace in-kind using appropriate materials. Woods that are naturally rot-resistant or treated will provide the greatest durability for exposed elements such as railings, steps, flooring, and floor framing. The use of pressure-treated wood is appropriate when painted within six months. The use of alternate materials that duplicate the appearance, texture and architectural detail may be considered by the HDBR.  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.  14.6 Covering a porch with non-historic material such as vinyl or metal siding, or “winterizing” a screened porch by permanently attaching plastic sheeting is not appropriate.  14.7 Using indoor-outdoor carpeting to weather-proof a porch floor is not appropriate.  14.8 The creation of a false historical appearance, such as adding Victorian ornament to a plain early twentieth-century porch, is not appropriate.  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.  14.10 Removing a porch that is not repairable and not replacing it, or replacing it with a new porch that does not convey the same visual appearance on contributing historical properties is not appropriate.  14.11 Reconstruct missing porches or porch details based on accurate documentation of such features. Such documentation may include evidence found on the building, historic photographs, or compatible details found on another porch in the district of the same period and general style. The owner shall provide the HDBR with such documentation in the application for a COA.  14.12 It is not appropriate to add new porches, entrances, or balconies to primary elevations or other areas of a building that are seen from the public view if none existed historically.  14.13 When replacing a missing or non-historic porch railing keep the height as consistent as possible with adjacent dwellings. Indiana’s building code requires a 36” handrail when the porch height is 32” or more above ground level. However, existing handrails in the Madison Historic District are typically less than 36” high.  *W. Jewell* – I believe this meets the requirements.  *K. McWilliams* – I agree.  *J. Skillman* – I agree.  *H. Smith* – I agree.  *M. Pittman* – I agree. |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project at 820 Fillmore Alley to enclose the rear deck.”
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Seconded by W. Jewell.

**Roll Call:**

M. Pittman Approved

H. Smith Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Skillman Approved

W. Jewell Approved

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

1. Nova Group Inc. – C. of A. to add an addition onto the Circle K gas station building.

Location: 224 E. Second St. Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Jacob Moss was present, on behalf of Nova Group.
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J. Moss explained that the addition would be roughly 100 square feet on the east side of the building, and it would take away one parking space to accommodate. The exterior design of the addition will match what is already on the building, with the same brick color. The front door would be relocated a few feet west.

J. Skillman asked if there would be any regrading done where the parking spot is going to be removed. J. Moss said that is not planned at this point.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION - ADDITIONS | p. 106-108 | *Madison Historic District Design Guidelines* – 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-ADDITIONS p. 106-108  26.1 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.  26.2 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.  26.3 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, details, surface texture, and location. Contemporary adaptations of the original which clearly look like an addition and reflect the period of construction are encouraged.  26.4 Additions should be constructed so that they can be removed from the original building in the future without irreversible damage to significant features. Additions should be set in at least one foot (1’) to show a break between the original structure and the new addition.  26.5 Vinyl, aluminum, or pressed wood are not appropriate on additions to historic buildings. Other substitute siding or trim may be allowed. SEE SIDING GUIDELINES.  26.6 Wood windows are most appropriate for new additions within the historic district; however, substitute window materials may also be acceptable for new additions. SEE WINDOWS GUIDELINES.  26.7 Rooflines of new additions should be similar in form, pitch, and eave height to the roofline of the original building.  26.8 Foundations should be similar to or compatible with the existing foundations in material, color, detailing, and height. SEE FOUNDATIONS GUIDELINES.  26.9 Consider in your plan older additions or other alterations to existing buildings that have acquired significance over time when planning and building a new addition.  26.10 Additions which are appropriately sized and scaled may be added at the rear of commercial buildings.  26.11 Rooftop additions for commercial buildings may be approved under certain conditions. Rooftop additions for additional living space or decks may be appropriate if the addition is stepped back from the main façade of the building by at least thirty (30) feet. On corner lots, the addition should be stepped back at least twenty (20) feet on the side street. With the zoning height restriction of forty-five feet, only a small number of commercial buildings would have the potential for a rooftop addition.  *W. Jewell* – I think you meet the guidelines.  *K. McWilliams* – I agree.  *J. Skillman* – I agree.  *S. Palmer –* I agree.  *H. Smith* – I agree.  *M. Pittman* – I agree. |

M. Pittman asked for a motion. J. Skillman made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve the Nova Group for their improvements on 224 E. Second St.”
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Seconded by K. McWilliams.

**Roll Call:**

M. Pittman Approved

H. Smith Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

J. Skillman Approved

W. Jewell Approved

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

1. Findley Properties – C. of A. to add addition to rear of structure to allow for two new bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms.

Location: 111 E. Fourth St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Matthew Findley was present.

M. Findley explained that the new structure would be a 20’x30’ addition on the rear of the existing house and a garage that is 16’x26’. K. McWilliams asked why the garage would not be usable from the alley. M. Findley stated that the alley is too small to allow enough room to turn and back out. It is only large enough for golf carts to turn around. K. McWilliams asked if the M. Findley had gotten approval from the street department for the driveway. M. Findley said he had not.

H. Smith asked what the plans for the front façade were. M. Findley stated that it would be rehabilitated to the same look but would be replacing the windows. He said he would probably use LP Smart Siding for the front. W. Jewell said that he was able to get a close look at the siding, and it could be replicated at a wood mill. M. Findley said he would consider the options for a more accurate siding to match the original.

H. Smith asked if property owners are given any time to fix the unsafe elements of their house to avoid a demolition order. B. Haley confirmed that the process allows for an abatement period. The city did not order the demolition.
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H. Smith asked if he had had the windows looked at by restorers, and M. Findley confirmed that Roger Welch had looked and said they needed to be replaced. K. McWilliams asked what the roof would look like on the addition. M. Findley said it would be either asphalt shingles or standing seam metal. M. Pittman said the motion could be made to allow for either one. K. McWilliams asked what the garage door will look like. M. Findley said it would look like a carriage house door.

M. Pittman asked for public comment. Link Luddington explained that he was a former co-owner of the house and felt that there had been some misinformation spread about the house during the presentation. He gave a history of the house and why it was moved to the current location. He said that the only original siding on the house left is on the façade. He said he would be happy to answer any questions anyone else had about the house.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Building Element** | **Guideline**  **Page #** | **Discussion** |
| 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION - ADDITIONS | p. 106-108 | *Madison Historic District Design Guidelines* – 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-ADDITIONS p. 106-108  26.1 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.  26.2 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.  26.3 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, details, surface texture, and location. Contemporary adaptations of the original which clearly look like an addition and reflect the period of construction are encouraged.  26.4 Additions should be constructed so that they can be removed from the original building in the future without irreversible damage to significant features. Additions should be set in at least one foot (1’) to show a break between the original structure and the new addition.  26.5 Vinyl, aluminum, or pressed wood are not appropriate on additions to historic buildings. Other substitute siding or trim may be allowed. SEE SIDING GUIDELINES.  26.6 Wood windows are most appropriate for new additions within the historic district; however, substitute window materials may also be acceptable for new additions. SEE WINDOWS GUIDELINES.  26.7 Rooflines of new additions should be similar in form, pitch, and eave height to the roofline of the original building.  26.8 Foundations should be similar to or compatible with the existing foundations in material, color, detailing, and height. SEE FOUNDATIONS GUIDELINES.  26.9 Consider in your plan older additions or other alterations to existing buildings that have acquired significance over time when planning and building a new addition.  26.10 Additions which are appropriately sized and scaled may be added at the rear of commercial buildings.  26.11 Rooftop additions for commercial buildings may be approved under certain conditions. Rooftop additions for additional living space or decks may be appropriate if the addition is stepped back from the main façade of the building by at least thirty (30) feet. On corner lots, the addition should be stepped back at least twenty (20) feet on the side street. With the zoning height restriction of forty-five feet, only a small number of commercial buildings would have the potential for a rooftop addition.  *H. Smith* – I think you meet the guidelines.  *W. Jewell* – I agree.  *K. McWilliams* – I agree.  *J. Skillman* – I agree.  *M. Pittman* – I agree. |
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M. Pittman asked for a motion. W. Jewell 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 Findley Properties Inc., for 111 E. Fourth St., to rehab the house and that would include saving the siding on the front, using the same siding from the east side, using windows that have the same grid pattern as the originals on the front, and either an asphalt shingle or standing seam metal roof.”

Seconded by J. Skillman.

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

**New/Old Business:**

H. Smith asked if a house that was approved for a PACE grant that includes window replacement was inspected to determine if replacement was necessary. B. Haley confirmed it was.

Sandy Palmer addressed the board saying that she did not willingly leave the board, but was instead not asked back, and she wanted to make that clear.

**Staff Report:**

January 2025 Fast-Track Applications

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant | Address | COA |
| Roger Welch | 515 Jefferson St. | Replacing windows with full wooden windows |
| Matthew Binzer | 518 Jefferson St. | Replacing vinyl windows with aluminum clad |
| John Riddick | 309 E. Third St. | Fascia repair and tuckpointing |

January 2024 COA Review

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant | Address | COA | Completion Status |
| Landon Ralston | 409 E Second St | Windows | Yes |
| William Jewell | 601 Walnut St | Fence | Yes |
| Helenna Hayes | 704 W Main St | Sign | Yes |
| Rebeccah Brown | 304 West St | Window | Yes |
| Robert Hayden | 745 W Main St | Porches, siding, architectural elements | Yes |

W. Jewell made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by H. Smith.
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Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

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

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

Mike Pittman, Chairman Brenna Haley, Historic Preservationist