

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

October 28, 2024

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, October 28, 2024 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, Jed Skillman, and Sandy Palmer. Also present was Nicole M Schell – Director of Planning and Brenna Haley –Historic Preservationist. Board member Carol Ann Rogers was absent.

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.

9/23/2024 Minutes:

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on September 23, 2024, and had any corrections or additions.

S. Palmer moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by H. Smith.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| C. Rogers | Absent |
| H. Smith | Approved |
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| W. Jewell | Approved |
| J. Skillman | Approved |

Minutes stand approved.

Applications:

1. Duane and Sheryle Raab – C. of A. to tear down current garage and replace with new garage. Location: 117/119 St. Michaels Ave. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Duane and Sheryle Raab were present.

M. Pittman asked for explanation on the drawing that was submitted the morning of the meeting. D. Raab explained that they are proposing a 25'x25' garage with an additional 12' lean-to style carport. There will also be a new concrete sidewalk from both sides of the house to the carport. He confirmed that the structure will not be taller than the house.

The roof will be a standing seam to match the house. The siding will be Hardie board. There will be two 9'x8' garage doors, and they intend to keep the design to a historic look similar to carriage houses with stained wood.

M. Pittman asked if there would be a loft and if it would be for living or storage. S. Raab said it would be for storage and for use as a stained-glass studio.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| 24.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-OUTBUILDINGS | p. 101-102 | <p><i>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines – 26.0 NEW CONSTRUCTION-OUTBUILDINGS p. 101-102</i></p> <p>24. 1 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.</p> <p>24.2 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.</p> <p>24.3 If reconstruction of a missing garage or outbuilding is desired, it should be based on accurate evidence of the original configuration, form, massing, style, placement, and detail from photographic evidence or other documentation of the original building.</p> <p>24.4 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.</p> <p>24.5 Materials used for new garages and outbuildings should reflect the historical development of the property. Materials used at exterior façades of garages and outbuildings were often different (and less costly) than that of the main dwelling. Materials that are appropriate for new secondary buildings include wood or brick. If frame buildings are constructed, alternative materials may be considered if they resemble traditional wood siding in texture, dimension, and overall appearance. Materials such as T1-11 siding, plywood and oriented strand board (OSB) are not sufficiently durable for exterior use and are not appropriate.</p> <p>24.6 Generally, the eaves and roof ridge of any new outbuilding should not be higher than those of the existing primary building.</p> <p>24.7 Windows which are readily visible from the public right-of-way should be appropriate to the style of the house. Visible pedestrian doors should either be appropriate for the style of house to which the outbuilding relates or be flat with no panels.</p> <p>24.8 Metal garage doors with a paneled design may be appropriate. These doors can be used on garages that are located at the back of the lot and are minimally visible from the street or public right-of-way. If the garage and garage doors are highly visible from a public street or located on a corner lot, solid wood or wood garage doors with a paneled design are more appropriate.</p> <p>24.9 At double garages, two single garage doors rather than one larger, double door should be installed. This will maintain the scale and rhythm of older structures, making a two-car garage seem smaller and more compatible with the primary dwelling.</p> <p>24.10 New carports should be located at the rear of dwellings and not visible. Most carport designs have flat roofs and metal support columns and are not compatible with historic dwelling designs.</p> <p><i>W. Jewell – I think this does meet the requirements.</i> <i>S. Palmer – I agree.</i> <i>K. McWilliams – As long as you don't use vinyl windows, I believe it meets the guidelines.</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree. |
|--|--|---|

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer made the following motion, "Based on the preceding finding of facts, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a certificate of appropriateness to Duane and Sheryle Raab for the construction of the garage."

Seconded by J. Skillman.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- W. Jewell Approved
- S. Palmer Approved

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

- 2. Mark and Patricia Dare – C. of A. add shutters to front window and stained glass above front door.
 Location: 318 E. First St. Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Mark and Patricia Dare were present.

The proposed shutters would be made of cedar and M. Dare would be building them himself. It would be three strips of wood with three supports.

H. Smith asked how the Dares came to pick the style. M. Dare said it was just the style they liked. They want the style to match the ones on a building near the pool (Crystal Beach). They also explained that they intend to put stained glass into the transom above the front door. H. Smith had submitted pictures ahead of the meeting of properties with similar transom styles nearby. She asked if they would be willing to keep the wood cutouts in their transom. The Dares confirmed that the glass is what is broken in their transom and that they intend to keep the wood cutouts.

H. Smith then asked if the Dares would consider more traditional shutters. P. Dare said that they found the ones by the pool and thought they looked nice. They confirmed that the shutters would be operational.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---|
| 9.0 DOORS AND ENTRANCES | p. 59-61 | <p><i>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines – 9.0 DOORS AND ENTRANCES p. 59-61</i></p> <p>9.1 Retain and preserve original doors and entrances.</p> <p>9.2 Maintain and preserve original doors and entrances. Retain historic entrance features including decorative and functional aspects such as original jambs, sills, and headers of openings. Retain original primary doors on the main façade, as they contribute to a building’s historic appearance. It is not appropriate to infill or cover historic door openings on primary facades or readily visible elevations.</p> <p>9.3 Repair deteriorated or damaged historic doors consistent with historic materials. The repair of historic doors should be undertaken with methods to retain their historic fabric and appearance as much as possible. Use epoxy to strengthen deteriorated wood.</p> <p>9.4 Do not enclose or conceal an original door opening on the primary façade or an elevation readily visible from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>9.5 If historic doors are missing or are deteriorated/damaged beyond repair, install replacement doors that match the originals. Select replacement doors carefully to match the original doors in materials, dimensions, and panel configuration. Appropriate materials may include wood or fiberglass. The new doors should be in keeping with the style and period of the building. Use historic photographs to identify details about original doors if possible.</p> <p>9.6 Never create a new door opening where none existed on a readily visible facade. Creating a new opening in a historically solid wall surface compromises the building’s architectural integrity and is not appropriate. A new opening may be permitted on a rear or side elevation if it is not readily visible from the public right-of-way. The new entrance should still be compatible in scale, size, proportion, placement, and style to historic openings.</p> <p>9.7 Use storm doors to improve energy efficiency where needed. New storm doors should be compatible with the original exterior doors and with the style and period of the structure. Wood and metal storm doors of the full view or large single-pane type are most appropriate because they do not obscure the original doors. Louvered wood doors are also appropriate, as are storm doors with a panel configuration matching that of the historic door. Otherwise, storm doors should be the full-view type. The standard “colonial” type storm door with scalloped trim and cross-buck bottom half is not appropriate.</p> <p>9.8 Preserve historic screen doors, or select a screen door design that allows view of the original primary door it covers. Wood screen doors should be appropriate for the period and style of the structure.</p> <p>9.10 Full-view security doors are appropriate for entrances not visible from the street. These should not be ornate or elaborate in their structural framework.</p> |
| 19.0 WINDOW SHUTTERS AND SCREENS | | <p>19.1 Retain and preserve original or historic shutters and screens.</p> <p>19.2 Maintain and repair original or historic shutters and screens.</p> <p>19.3 Repair and preserve original or historic shutters and screens. It is also appropriate to add louvered shutters to a historic structure if there is evidence that it once had them. If no evidence exists,</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>shutters may also be added if appropriate for the age and style of the dwelling. All shutters shall be installed as to fit the window frame opening if closed and shall be of correct proportions for each window. Shutters shall be provided with operable hardware, consisting of hinges, pintles, and holdbacks located in the appropriate positions. Shutters may be operable or fixed.</p> <p>19.4 Replace in kind. Shutters made of alternative materials that duplicate the look, appearance and patina of wood may be allowed. Vinyl shutters do not accurately duplicate the appearance of wood and are not approvable.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i>– Even though I think we have some issues with the look of the cedar, I think you meet the guidelines. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree. <i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – I think it does not meet the guidelines. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I think it does meet the guidelines.</p> |
|--|--|

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, “Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a certificate of appropriateness to Mark and Patricia Dare at 318 East First Street to add shutters to their house and to redo their transom.”

Seconded by W. Jewell.

Roll Call:

- M. Pittman Approved
- H. Smith Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- J. Skillman Approved
- W. Jewell Approved
- S. Palmer Approved

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

- 3. Shane Calkin – C. of A. replace the garage.
 Location: 1300 W. Second St. Zoned: R-8 Residential Medium Density (R-8)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Shane Calkin was present.

S. Calkin said that the pictures don’t do the structure justice, as it is leaning much more than it appears in the presentation. He said that the back right corner of the garage is off the foundation and the garage doors aren’t working. He wants to demolish the current garage and replace it with a pole barn similar to one or two down the street. It would match the colors of the house, and would otherwise not change in shape or style.

Page 6
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 28, 2024

W. Jewell asked if S. Calkin could elaborate on the profile of the siding. S. Calkin said he didn't know much about the siding, but thought it was metal. He explained that he hadn't really thought that far ahead and didn't know how to answer several design questions. He was unsure of what he needed to have prepared for the meeting. He said he was willing to do whatever he needed to with the design to get the application approved.

K. McWilliams asked if S. Calkin is familiar with Hardie board for siding. S. Calkin stated that pole barns are usually metal, so that's what he had been looking at. He said he had planned to go with a kit pole barn. J. Skillman asked if a rehabilitation had been considered, rather than a replacement. S. Calkin said that the structure is off of its foundation and that he had tried to have it moved, but the building has some elements that are rotting.

M. Pittman said that the board didn't have enough information to really make a decision. He asked if S. Calkin would like to table the application and come back with more information. S. Calkin agreed.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer made a motion to table the application to next month's meeting.

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| H. Smith | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| J. Skillman | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| W. Jewell | Approved |

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

4. Trevor Templeton – C. of A. to change roof pitch on rear of house and add deck to connect to front porch from rear.
 Location: 1030 East St. Zoned: R-8 Medium Density Residential (R-8)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Trevor Templeton was present.

Prior to the meeting, work had already been started. The deck had been constructed and the roof pitch had already been changed. T. Templeton stated that he was unaware the deck would need to be approved. The roof pitch was ultimately removed from consideration, as it is not visible from the public right-of-way. T. Templeton also explained that there had been a mix up with the building inspector, leading to the post holes being approved ahead of the meeting. He misunderstood the process for the meetings and thought the confirmation was approval. He did confirm that the new deck is not actually attached to the house.

B. Haley stated that, once it was found that the work was done, a stop work order and a violation letter were issued.

Page 7
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 28, 2024

W. Jewell expressed concern over the design of the railings on the new porch. He did not feel it tied in well with the rest of the house. T. Templeton said he had no issues changing out the spindles to something more historically appropriate.

H. Smith said that she was having trouble accepting the wraparound porch, as it felt inappropriate for the house. T. Templeton said that he felt the porch was needed to provide a space for the residents of the house to have a place to relax and enjoy the scenery, and there was no place for that on the original structure.

J. Skillman suggested removing any of the porch extending beyond a side window. T. Templeton agreed to do that. H. Smith said she was uncomfortable with the designing on the fly during the meeting. She suggested T. Templeton coming to meet with B. Haley to design something better and be tabled until the next meeting. He said he wouldn't have the time to come back with a new design. Instead, he said he would just rip off the deck.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

M. Pittman made the following motion, "Based on the preceding findings of fact, I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve the removal of the new construction on 1030 East St."

Seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| H. Smith | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| J. Skillman | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| W. Jewell | Approved |

The motion to approve the removal was passed.

- David Carlow – C. of A. to demolish unsafe garage structure and replace with new garage on same footprint.
 Location: 747 W. Main St. Zoned: SD – Specialty District (SD)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. David Carlow was present.

D. Carlow explained that the property used to belong to his parents until they traded houses with him. He proposed demolishing the garage that currently sits on the property and replacing it with one that is nearly identical. He said he didn't want a modern garage, as he feels it wouldn't be appropriate in the downtown area. He confirmed that the footprint would grow about four feet to accommodate two vehicles.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

| Building Element | Guideline Page # | Discussion |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 24.0 New Construction - Outbuildings | p. 101-102 | <p>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines – 24.0 New Construction - Outbuildings p. 101-102</p> <p>24. 1 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.</p> <p>24.2 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.</p> <p>24.3 If reconstruction of a missing garage or outbuilding is desired, it should be based on accurate evidence of the original configuration, form, massing, style, placement, and detail from photographic evidence or other documentation of the original building.</p> <p>24.4 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.</p> <p>24.5 Materials used for new garages and outbuildings should reflect the historical development of the property. Materials used at exterior façades of garages and outbuildings were often different (and less costly) than that of the main dwelling. Materials that are appropriate for new secondary buildings include wood or brick. If frame buildings are constructed, alternative materials may be considered if they resemble traditional wood siding in texture, dimension, and overall appearance. Materials such as T1-11 siding, plywood and oriented strand board (OSB) are not sufficiently durable for exterior use and are not appropriate.</p> <p>24.6 Generally, the eaves and roof ridge of any new outbuilding should not be higher than those of the existing primary building.</p> <p>24.7 Windows which are readily visible from the public right-of-way should be appropriate to the style of the house. Visible pedestrian doors should either be appropriate for the style of house to which the outbuilding relates or be flat with no panels.</p> <p>24.8 Metal garage doors with a paneled design may be appropriate. These doors can be used on garages that are located at the back of the lot and are minimally visible from the street or public right-of-way. If the garage and garage doors are highly visible from a public street or located on a corner lot, solid wood or wood garage doors with a paneled design are more appropriate.</p> <p>24.9 At double garages, two single garage doors rather than one larger, double door should be installed. This will maintain the scale and rhythm of older structures, making a two-car garage seem smaller and more compatible with the primary dwelling.</p> <p>24.10 New carports should be located at the rear of dwellings and not visible. Most carport designs have flat roofs and metal</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>support columns and are not compatible with historic dwelling designs.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> –This project meets the guidelines. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p> |
|--|--|

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion, "I move that the Madison Historic District Board of Review approve a certificate of appropriateness for David Carlow at 747 West Main St. to demolish his current garage and build a new garage on the same site."

Seconded by S. Palmer.

Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| M. Pittman | Approved |
| H. Smith | Approved |
| K. McWilliams | Approved |
| J. Skillman | Approved |
| S. Palmer | Approved |
| W. Jewell | Approved |

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

New/Old Business:

H. Smith introduced another window glazing workshop presented by the Madison Friends of Wood Windows happening at the History and Art Center Southern Indiana Folk School on November 23 from 1-4pm.

Staff Report:

October 2024 Fast-Track Applications

| Applicant | Address | COA |
|-----------------|------------------|---|
| Dean Hornberger | 1032 W Second St | Replacing vinyl siding with LP Smart |
| Dave Patterson | 118 W Fifth St | LP siding, new door, alum. clad windows, gutters, roof, foundation repair |
| Kayla Rodenberg | 1054 W Second St | Temporary banner |
| Tina Stambaugh | 116 Jefferson St | Replacing storm doors |
| Rachael Headley | 815 W Second St | Lighting, gutters, concrete in front and back, HVAC behind fence, fence |

Page 10
 Historic District Board of Review
 October 28, 2024

| | | | |
|--------------|---------------|-------|--|
| Ashley Swick | 128 E Main St | signs | |
| Todd Boone | 113 W Main St | sign | |

October 2023 COA Review

| Applicant | Address | COA | Completion Status |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Roger Welch | 211 E First St | windows | Yes |
| Chris & Gina Lynn | 214 W Second St | fence | Yes |
| Lisa Farris | 803 E Second St | storm window/door | Yes |

S. Palmer made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by H. Smith.

Meeting adjourned at 7 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW



 Mike Pittman, Chairman



 Brenna Haley, Historic Preservationist