

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

March 23, 2020

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, March 23, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting in the room with the following board members present through web conferencing: Ken McWilliams, Mike Pittman, Susan Schmidt, Owen McCall, Betsy Lyman and Thomas Stark. Also present in the room: Brian Martin, Building Inspector and Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator. Devon Sharpe, attorney was present through web conferencing.

J. Wilber 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. Each applicant will be asked to sign the gold affidavit on the podium which states the required signage was up for the required amount of time. 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. J. Wilber added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

2/24/2020 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on February 24th and had any corrections or additions.

O. McCall moved to approve the minutes – seconded by K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber	Approved
O. McCall	Approved
T. Stark	Approved
B. Lyman	Approved
K. McWilliams	Approved
M. Pittman	Approved

Minutes stand approved.

New Applications:

1. Derek Alexis Hughes – C. of A. to repair and enclose damaged second story porch.
Location: **411 Jefferson St.** Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Derek Alexis Hughes and Bill Peckinpaugh were present.

B. Peckinpaugh stated they began the project with a couple of in-kind porch column replacements and when they took the columns off the porch collapsed. B. Peckinpaugh noted that the siding would be cement fiber siding which is rounded shingles. The square shingles would go up to the top of the windows on the enclosed porch and the rounded shingles would be above that.

J. Wilber asked about the window material. B. Peckinpaugh stated they would be vinyl. B. Lyman asked about the size of the windows. B. Peckinpaugh stated they would be 3-ft wide and 6-ft tall. J. Wilber asked about the design. B. Peckinpaugh stated they would be 1/1 windows. M. Pittman asked about the location of the windows. B. Peckinpaugh stated they were on the side but not visible from the street.

N. Schell noted that O. McCall joined the in-person meeting.

K. McWilliams agreed that the work would not be visible from the street. T. Stark wrote in if there were any mullions on the windows. B. Peckinpaugh answered that they were 1/1 windows with no internal dividers. O. McCall asked about the visibility. B. Peckinpaugh stated the windows would not be visible because they will be inset into the siding of the enclosure. O. McCall noted that the porch railing is visible and stated that the whole project would be visible from the street. B. Peckinpaugh stated the siding would be visible but the windows would not be visible because they will be inset 2-3 inches into the siding.

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

J. Wilber asked for questions from the audience.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49, 50	--	<p>O. McCall – On page 50 of the residential guidelines it says that in most cases historic porches visible from the street should be retained and maintained. I would assume that means it should not be enclosed. This does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>B. Lyman – Looking at the guidelines it says that porches on the rear or side may be enclosed if not visible from the street. I believe this is visible from the street and therefore I believe it does not meet the guidelines.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I believe this project should be approved on the guideline that rear or side porches may be enclosed. I have no issue with this project.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I agree with K. McWilliams.</p> <p>T. Stark – I agree this project should be approved but would like to see the windows match the front windows since they can be partially seen.</p> <p>J. Wilber – This is a tough one because you can see a little bit of the porch from the street. I don't know if I will be able to see the windows and vinyl windows are an issue if they can be seen.</p> <p>J. Wilber asked if the applicant would consider aluminum clad. B. Peckinpugh stated the windows needed to be easily kicked out and they have already purchased the windows.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. B. Lyman asked if aluminum clad windows could be used as a fire escape. B. Martin answered yes because of their size. K. McWilliams asked about the building permit. B. Martin stated they did not receive a building permit prior to starting work but the work has not been completed.

M. Pittman made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved as submitted with the vinyl windows since they will not be visible from the street this project meets the guidelines.”

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Disapproved
- O. McCall Disapproved
- T. Stark Approved
- B. Lyman Disapproved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

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

J. Wilber stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed.

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

- O. McCall Approved
- T. Stark Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

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

J. Wilber stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed.

Old Business:

N. Schell presented the board comments she received on the staff review table. J. Wilber recommended the board comment on that document and if they disagree with any of the remarks.

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category	Terms that need defined
Painting or Repainting	X				Not appropriate
Repair or Replacement: Same Material, Design and Exterior Appearance	X			Including non-preferred materials such as vinyl siding & windows	Meets guidelines
Removal of Existing Modern Material to Restore Historic Fabric:		X			Does not meet guidelines
Introduction or Removal of Architectural Elements not otherwise listed in this document:			X		Restore historic material
Foundations:					Alteration
a)Materials: Repair or Replacement:	X (Same Material/design)	X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)		Modification
b)Cleaning and Painting:	X				Same Material
c)Infill Between Piers:		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	What's a Pier?	Different Material
Bricks/Masonry/Stone:					
a)Repair, Painting, Cleaning, or Tuck pointing	X				
b)Removal of any brick/masonry/stone features		x (If stone features are "fake")	X		
c)Addition of Stucco			X		

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category
Siding:				
a)Materials: Repair or Replacement	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or if existing material is not appropriate and proposed material meets guidelines) Hardie Board and equivalents are approved. Hardie board and Smart siding (approved material)	X (New/Different Material does not meet guidelines) Only Vinyl siding	
b)Cleaning and Painting	X			
c)Removal or Introduction of Siding Material		X (Removal of Modern Material to Restore Historic Fabric or introduction of modern material meeting guidelines) Hardie board and Smart siding (approved material)	X (Removal of Historic Fabric or Introduction of Modern Material not meeting guidelines) Depending on condition or X (Removal of Historic Fabric or Introduction of non-preferred Modern Material)	
Awnings:				
a)Replacement of Existing	X (Same Material/ Design matching previous)	X (Same Material but does not match previous or new design/material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material and Design not meeting guidelines)	
b)Removal of Existing (Not Replacing)		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
Lighting/Security systems:				
a) Installation, Alteration or Removal of Exterior Lighting Fixtures: (not including light bulbs)	Does not include security cameras or lighting	X (Same Material/Design matching previous)	X (Same Material but does not match previous or new design/material meeting guidelines)	
Porches/Decks and Porch Elements:				
a)Materials: Repair or Replacement:	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material or approved modern material , different design different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category
Porches/Decks and Porch Elements:				
b)Removal or Introduction of a Porch, Deck			X	
c)Enclosure of Existing Porch (i.e. sunroom; creation of new room)		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
d)Convert open deck into covered porch with roof, etc.			X	
e)Screening-in of existing porch		X		
f)Introduction of Access or Safety Features Using Materials and Design Appropriate to Principal Structure		X		
g)Repair or Replacement of porch columns and/or railings	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	
Roof and Roof Elements:				
a)Materials: Repair or Replacement	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or if existing material is not appropriate and purposed material meets guidelines)	X (New/Different Material not meeting guidelines)	
b)Shape or Form: Alteration, Modification or New			X	
c)Repair or Replacement of Gutters/Downspouts	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
d)Repair or Replacement of Cresting/Finials, Dormers, Chimneys, and Cornices/Eaves	X (Same Material/design if material/design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design)	X (New/Different Material; Alteration/Removal /Introduction of Element)	

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category
Existing Secondary/Outbuildings/Accessory Structures:				
a) Repair or Replacement of Materials or Elements	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	
Doors (Commercial/Residential):				
a) Installation of Storm/Screen Doors:		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
c) Repair or Replacement of existing Doors	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design) X (Same Material, different design) X (New/Different Material) If use approved doors and do not alter size, etc	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	
e) Installation of New or Removal of Door Openings			X	
Storefront Elements:				
a) Repair or Replacement of storefront elements	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material or approved, Different Design)	X (New/Different Material; Alteration/Modifica tion/ Removal/Introducti on of Element)	
Windows and Window Elements:				
a) Installation of Exterior Screens/Storm Windows		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
b) Installation of Interior Screens/Storm Windows	X			
c) Repair or Replacement of existing Windows	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, or approved different design or different material meeting guidelines) Clad windows auto approved If use approved windows and do not alter size, etc	X (New/Different Material not meeting guidelines) Vinyl windows only X (Non preferred Material)	
d) Installation of New or Removal of Window Openings			X	

March 23, 2020

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category
Windows and Window Elements:				
e)Shutters: Introduction of Shutters Where They Did Not Previously Exist		X (Meets Guidelines)	X (Does NOT Meet Guidelines)	
f)Shutters: Replacement of Existing Shutters	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (New Material/Design)		
Accessibility Features:				Does ADA code not supersede Historic Ordinance? Bldg inspector should review/approve?
a)Repair or Replace existing exterior staircases/fire escapes or handicap ramps	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	X
b)New exterior staircases/fire escapes or handicap ramps			X	X
c)Retrofitting existing doors with handicap features	X (Same Material/ Design)	X		
Landscape Features:				
a)Walkways, Driveways and Parking Lots	X			
b)Repair or Replacement of Pools, Fountains, Gazebos, Pergolas	X (Same Material/ design if material/ design meets guidelines)	X (Same Material, different design or different material meeting guidelines)	X (Change in Material not meeting guidelines)	
c)Fences and Walls		X		
d)Trees and Other Landscaping	X			
Signs:		X		
Additions or Expansion of Building Footprint:			X (Design Only)	

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

Type of Work Project	No Review	Staff Review/ Approval	HDBR Review/ Approval	Questions/ Comments from board member on category
New Construction:				
a) Principal Building, Porch, Deck, and Other Elements			X (Design Only)	
b) Secondary/Outbuildings/Accessory Structures			X (Design Only)	
c) Modular or Manufactured Home			X	
Relocation or Demolition of Buildings and Outbuildings:		X Staff Review/approve is bldg constructed after 1932--therefore not covered by Historic Ordinance	X Bldg constructed prior to 1932 (Design Only)	

K. McWilliams asked how long the board would continue to comment on this document. N. Schell stated the comments would be whether the board member agreed or disagreed with another board member's comment. J. Wilber stated that the resolution that the board would later look at would temporarily give N. Schell authority to review additional application while the board prepares to vote on permanent staff approvals in April.

K. McWilliams asked if the ADA law superseded the HD ordinance. B. Martin answered yes. K. McWilliams asked how the HDBR reviews ADA elements. J. Wilber stated the board reviews placement and material elements not restricting ADA elements.

L. Ludington asked if the spreadsheet was on the website. N. Schell stated it was not on the website but would be part of the minutes which are available when requested and will be posted after they are approved.

Old Business:

N. Schell reviewed the 2020 HDBR Goals and gave an update on the current status for each goal.

2020 Goal	Status
Establish a more proactive approach to supporting preservation efforts and expand Preservation and Community Enhancement (PACE) program.	
Modify the Rules of Procedure, ordinance, and design guidelines, if needed, to allow more staff approval capabilities and streamlined process.	In progress
Evaluate the ordinance and design guidelines to clarify distinctions between primary and secondary areas.	
Update the historic property survey and establish list of top ten endangered assets for targeted preservation efforts.	
Create a user-friendly online COA Application and look into the ability to accept credit card payments	In progress
Re-evaluate the PACE program guidelines. Create targeted preservation effort for blight elimination and neighborhood revitalization.	In progress – To be completed in April
Work with Department of Building and Design to establish improved property maintenance standards and strengthen nuisance ordinance to attract/protect capital investments.	

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

March 23, 2020

K. McWilliams asked about the progress on the changes the board discussed last year. J. Wilber stated that was on hold until the ordinance committee with the mayor discuss the changes to the ordinance. K. McWilliams discussed the length of review for HDBR and PACE projects and recommended improving those. K. McWilliams asked if the HDBR was involved with PACE program guidelines. N. Schell answered no and explained the PACE program guidelines are established by the mayor and used by the PACE review committee. N. Schell added that the PACE ordinance is on second reading for the next council meeting to increase their budget limit and complete a few other changes.

New Business:

N. Schell presented a resolution in response to COVID-19.

RESOLUTION NO. 1-2020

A RESOLUTION of the HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW OF THE CITY OF MADISON, INDIANA, for the DIRECTIVES IN RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 EPIDEMIC

WHEREAS, the Governor of Indiana issued Executive Order 20-04 on March 16, 2020 limiting large gatherings; and

WHEREAS, the City of Madison issued a press release restricting public access to city owned buildings and will limit public access to meetings to 10 individuals; and

WHEREAS, the Historic District Board of Review wishes to help reduce and slow the spread of COVID-19 while conducting business.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW OF THE CITY OF MADISON, INDIANA THAT:

Section 1. The Historic District Board of Review will reserve their meetings for the review of applications for demolition, new construction, new additions, or moving buildings until such time restrictions on public gatherings are lifted.

Section 2. The Historic District Board of Review gives HDBR Staff the authority to review all applications submitted and determine which application should be presented before the entire Historic District Board of Review. HDBR Staff will have the authority to approval all applications which significantly meets the guidelines until such time restrictions on public gatherings are lifted.

Section 3. The Historic District Board of Review gives its chair and HDBR Staff the authority to determine when its normal application and review process will be restored.

K. McWilliams asked about how the board would know about the applications staff has reviewed. N. Schell stated that currently all staff approved applications go on the city's website and she would continue to do that within this process. N. Schell stated she would continue with staff review reports and would send it out to the board if there is no meeting.

M. Pittman asked for the addition of new construction to the list of items staff can review. N. Schell noted that staff cannot review the four items cited in the resolution due to restrictions within state code.

B. Lyman recommended applications be reviewed by staff, chair and vice chair. T. Stark would like to see some sort of process where the board is involved with the review of applications. T. Stark agreed with B. Lyman's recommendation. K. McWilliams disagreed and thought staff review was enough.

B. Lyman asked about public comments on applications. J. Wilber asked how they currently participate. N. Schell stated the public does not participate in staff reviews. K. McWilliams mentioned the posting of signs as part of the regular process. J. Wilber asked about that process through staff review. N. Schell noted that signs are not posted for staff review. N. Schell agreed that public comment would be needed through this process but noted that posting of signs would not limit public interaction. N. Schell stated she could post the applications online and allow people time to comment.

J. Wilber recommended allowing staff to post applications online with a period of 30 days for public comment since the resolution would be in effect for 60 days. Board members agreed. M. Pittman suggested 15 days.

J. Wilber asked for board comments on the recommendation for chair and vice chair to review applications with the staff. O. McCall agreed. K. McWilliams disagreed. N. Schell noted that the resolution has only staff reviewing applications. N. Schell expressed concerns about whether allowing board members to review applications without a public meeting would violate the open door law. K. McWilliams and M. Pittman agreed that staff should be the only ones reviewing applications. T. Stark agreed with B. Lyman’s recommendation.

J. Wilber asked for a motion. K. McWilliams made the following motion:

“I move to approve resolution 1-2020 with a single amendment to include 15 days for public comment.”

Motion was seconded O. McCall.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- T. Stark Originally approved but after clarification disapproved
- B. Lyman Disapproved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

The motion to approve the resolution as amended passed.

New Business:

K. McWilliams mentioned the Lilly Endowment for African American sites which is going through Indiana Landmarks and noted that the board should look into that endowment. J. Wilber stated he wasn’t sure who should look into that endowment but offered to discuss that with the mayor.

B. Lyman expressed concerns about the resolution as it was passed. T. Stark stated he did not hear the motion as presented and would like to change his vote to disapproved. J. Wilber accepted that change. B. Lyman stated she wanted to discuss definitions within the motion. J. Wilber stated the resolution was approved.

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Mark Prickett	602 Jefferson St	3/4/2020	Wood 6’ Fence
Trilogy Health Services	120 Presbyterian Ave	3/4/2020	Wood 3’ Fence
Hilary Beall	809 W First St	3/5/2020	Aluminum 3’ railing/fence

Historic District Board of Review: 2019 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Lewellyn, Sarah	324 East St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace wood siding on north, south, and east sides with smooth Hardieboard siding. 	Yes
Riddle, Dana (Scott Lynch)	315 Central Ave.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace front wood windows with Quaker aluminum clad wood windows with a 6 over 6 grid pattern. 	Yes
Helton, Robert and Anna	703 W Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install wood shutters. 	Not started – asking for extension
Suggett Schmidt Properties LLC	1219 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolish accessory structure. 	Yes
Buchanan, Steve	919 W Second St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace windows with aluminum clad windows. Replace aluminum siding with Hardieboard. Replace side entry door with composite door. 	Yes
Parker, Brad and Rhonda	120 East St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build a 16-ft x 33-ft addition instead of the 14-ft x 33-ft addition approved by the board in April 2018. Install textured Hardieboard siding and round gable vent on addition. 	Yes
Modisett, Karen	745 W Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase height of previously approved carport/shed up to 4-ft. Build free standing shed. 	Not started – asking for extension
Heitz, John & Lori	122 E Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand rear deck with new stairs. 	Yes
Hollinger, Ron and Susie	310 Broadway St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace vinyl/plastic siding on west wall with metal siding on west wall. Install dryer vent on north alley wall. 	Yes
Johnson, Bernard and Tony Hammock	1029 W Main St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolish existing structure. 	Yes

J. Wilber asked for a motion on the requested COA extension for Robert and Anna Helton at 703 W Main St. O. McCall made the following motion:

“I move that the COA be extended for one year.”

Motion was seconded by M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

J. Wilber Approved

O. McCall Approved

March 23, 2020

- T. Stark Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

The motion to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness passed.

J. Wilber asked for a motion on the requested COA extension for Karen Modisett at 745 W Main St. K. McWilliams made the following motion:

“I move that the COA be extended for one year.”

Motion was seconded by T. Stark.

Roll Call:

- J. Wilber Approved
- O. McCall Approved
- T. Stark Approved
- B. Lyman Approved
- K. McWilliams Approved
- M. Pittman Approved

The motion to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness passed.

No further business to be brought before the board.

K. McWilliams made the motion to adjourn - seconded by M. Pittman.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Josh Wilber, Chair

Nicole M Schell
City Planner – Preservation Coordinator