

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

November 25, 2024

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held the regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, November 25, 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 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.

10/28/2024 Minutes:

M. Pittman asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on October 28, 2024, and had any corrections or additions.

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

Roll Call:

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

Minutes stand approved.

M. Pittman announced that Carol Ann Rogers resigned as a member of the board and that the board was looking to fill the position. Anyone interested should indicate as much to the mayor's office.

Applications:

1. 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.

The new rendering provided showed more detail for the proposed structure than the last set of pictures had. S. Calkin explained that his CAD program did not have the correct textures to show the board and batten siding he planned to use, so the picture made the structure appear smooth. He said that the new garage would have the same footprint and would match the house in terms of color and roof pitch.

W. Jewell asked if the foundation would be replaced, as he noticed cracks when he went to the property. S. Calkin said it will be repaired, but there are no plans to fully replace it. The cracks will be filled in.

H. Smith expressed concern with the design, as it is not historically accurate to the main house. She was opposed to the idea of another pole barn in the historic district. S. Calkin assured that the structure would be wood framed, rather than metal pole framed.

J. Skillman asked if S. Calkin had considered using treated plywood and attaching battens to that, rather than using the metal board and batten. S. Calkin stated that he was planning to use the metal board and batten siding as it would hold up much longer than wood would.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

A letter was submitted ahead of the meeting by Dee Comstock of 310 Marine St. In the letter, she explained that the proposed garage would be facing Marine Street. She expressed concern that the garage would end up larger than the one already there, stating it would end up being too big for the property if it was much larger. She requested a like-sized building replace the garage already there.

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> – I think this does meet the requirements.</p> <p><i>H. Smith</i> – I'm worried that it does not meet the materials aspect of the guidelines. I don't think metal sided buildings are compatible with the historic district.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree with W. Jewell.</p> <p><i>J. Skillman</i> – I agree with H. Smith. I don't think we should a metal sided building.</p> <p><i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree with H. Smith. I realize there are other metal buildings on the alley, but they aren't as visible as yours is.</p> <p><i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree with W. Jewell.</p>
--	--

M. Pittman asked for a motion. K. McWilliams 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 Shane Calkin at 1300 W. Second St. for the demolition and replacement of the garage."

Seconded by W. Jewell.

Roll Call:

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

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

- 2. Ryan Leach – C. of A. to remove and replace deck, extending it 6', and removing chain-link fence and replacing it with a black corrugated metal privacy fence.
 Location: 708 W. Third St. Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Haley showed photos provided by the applicant and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Ryan Leach was present, on behalf of Tricia Bird.

R. Leach explained that T. Bird wanted to have a privacy fence made of the corrugated metal and treated lumber in the backyard. It is not visible from the public right-of-way. The deck is currently rickety, according to R. Leach, so the rebuild would address this and make it safer and more visually appealing. The roof would also be extended 6' in the rear to cover the porch.

J. Skillman expressed concern with the privacy fence and the proposed materials. R. Leach explained that T. Bird was disappointed last time she Bird was disappointed last time she came to the HDBR and got denied for a vinyl fence, as she had seen some around town. She wants to do what she wants in her

backyard. R. Leach said that the proposed metal would be less like roofing metal and more like the kind on old barns.

H. Smith said that the guidelines would say that the proposed fence is inappropriate, but since it is out of the visibility of the public, an exception could be made.

M. Pittman asked for public comment.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Guideline Page #	Discussion
14.0 PORCHES	p. 68-70	<p><i>Madison Historic District Design Guidelines</i> – 14.0 PORCHES p. 68-70</p> <p>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.</p> <p>14.2 Maintain historic porch features and components. Follow design guidelines for wood or masonry materials as relevant.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>14.7 Using indoor-outdoor carpeting to weather-proof a porch floor is not appropriate.</p> <p>14.8 The creation of a false historical appearance, such as adding Victorian ornament to a plain early twentieth-century porch, is not appropriate.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

<p>20.0 FENCES AND WALLS</p>	<p>p. 88-90</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>20.1 Retain and preserve historic cast iron fences and walls. These features contribute to the overall historic appearance of the property.</p> <p>20.2 Maintain historic cast iron fences and walls. Keep these site features in good repair.</p> <p>20.3 Repair historic cast iron fence and wall material following the standards for the relevant material, such as wrought iron, wood or masonry.</p> <p>20.4 Replace in kind. If replacement is necessary, use new materials that match the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern and texture.</p> <p>20.5 Design new fences that are compatible with the associated building, site and streetscape in height, proportion, scale, texture, material, and design. Appropriate fence materials along front or readily visible side property lines include wood pickets or metal designs. Fence types such as wire, chain-link, and vinyl are not appropriate.</p> <p>20.6 Fences shall not exceed a height of three (3) feet in front yards and other areas of primary visual concern. Fences at rear yards and other areas not readily seen from the public view may be up to six (6) feet in height. The transition between low front fences and higher rear fences should be made as far to the rear of the enclosed structure or yard as possible, and no more than half the depth of the yard forward of the principal structure.</p> <p>20.7 Historic retaining walls should be preserved. New retaining walls are appropriate where a distinct change in grade exists. Such walls should be constructed of brick, stone, or concrete block covered with stucco.</p> <p>20.8 The use of false historical details or other non-original architectural embellishments on existing fences is not appropriate.</p> <p>20.9 Contemporary or utilitarian fence materials are not appropriate for fences in the public view. Inappropriate materials include: plastic, vinyl, chain-link, and wire. The use of these materials may be appropriate for rear yards and side yards not visible from the public view. If chain-link fencing is introduced it is recommended to be vinyl coated (dark green or black) to be as unobtrusive as possible. Use plantings such as ivy or other vines to screen metal fences.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – I think you meet the guidelines. <i>W. Jewell</i> – I agree. <i>H. Smith</i> – I agree. <i>J. Skillman</i> – I disagree. <i>S. Palmer</i> – I agree. <i>M. Pittman</i> – I agree.</p>
------------------------------	-----------------	--

Page 6
 Historic District Board of Review
 November 25, 2024

H. Smith asked if T. Bird has talked to the neighbors to warn them that the fence was coming. R. Leach said he didn't know, but the sign has been up in the window, so it shouldn't be a surprise. M. Pittman explained that B. Haley also posts the applications on the website as they come in for HDBR review, so neighbors can look there. B. Haley said that it is also published in the newspaper.

M. Pittman asked for a motion. S. Palmer 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 Ryan Leach at 708 W. Third St. for the revision and extension of the back porch and the installation of the 6' high, 300' long fence."

Seconded by W. Jewell.

Roll Call:

M. Pittman	Approved
H. Smith	Approved
K. McWilliams	Approved
J. Skillman	Denied
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.

New/Old Business:

W. Jewell suggested City Council discuss the excess of outdoor cords and HVAC connections that make the outsides of buildings look cluttered.

Staff Report:

November 2024 Fast-Track Applications

Applicant	Address	COA
Jessica Hale	319 E. Main St.	sign
Stephanie Reed	809 W. Second St.	New aluminum clad windows

November 2023 COA Review

Applicant	Address	COA	Completion Status
Elizabeth Riley	605 W. Main St.	Lighting, sign	Yes
Cheryl Huy	511 Mulberry St.	Fence	Yes

Scott Murphy	1205 W. Main St.	Siding, lighting, roof	Yes
Kathryn Rutherford	423 W. Main St.	Windows	Yes
Catherine Le Saux	414 Elm St.	Porch steps, handrail	Yes
Marcus Gray	928 Park Ave.	Sign	Yes
Heitz Sign Company	114 E. Main St.	Sign	Yes
Brian Guetig	805 E. Second St.	Windows	No
Bumper Johnson	125 Jefferson St.	Siding	Yes
Gary Burdette	705 E. Second St.	Roof	Yes

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

Meeting adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW



Mike Pittman, Chairman



Brenna Haley, Historic Preservationist