

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOAD OF REVIEW

Minutes

May 26, 2020

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, May 26, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. via Zoom Conferencing. Josh Wilber presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Ken McWilliams, Mike Pittman, Susan Schmidt, Owen McCall, Betsy Lyman and Thomas Stark. Also present: Brian Martin, Building Inspector; Devon Sharpe, attorney; and Nicole Schell, City Planner – Preservation Coordinator.

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. 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. J. Wilber noted that only one public comment was received for one application.

4/27/2020 Minutes:

J. Wilber asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on April 27th and had any corrections or additions.

K. McWilliams moved to approve the minutes – seconded by S. Schmidt.

Roll Call:

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

Minutes stand approved.

New Applications:

1. Jim Pruett – C. of A. to remove front and back porches. Replace side stoop with patio. Add shutters to front window. Replace side door with window. Replace side window with door as originally located. Remove rear door and east window. Add stoop or awning over front door. Replace current vinyl windows with vinyl windows to match original size.
Location: **708 E Second St.** Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

N. Schell showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Jim Pruett was present and noted that siding was removed from the house which showed the original window openings.

B. Lyman asked about the brand of vinyl windows. J. Pruett stated the windows would be a Strouse Ultra Replacement window and would be either a 4/4 or 6/6 grid pattern. B. Lyman asked about the front window. J. Pruett stated they would be removing the picture window and installing a window which is taller than it is narrow.

S. Schmidt asked about the changes to the side entrance. J. Pruett explained they would be bricking in the lower half of the existing doorway to create a window opening. J. Pruett stated they would also be removing the rear door and replacing it with a window. T. Stark asked if the applicant would be reusing the door. J. Pruett answered yes. B. Lyman asked about the door material. J. Pruett answered wood.

T. Stark asked about rebuilding the porch on the front. J. Pruett asked if the porch was original. N. Schell stated the porch that was removed prior to approval was not original but guessed the flat roof porch shown in the historic photo was original or at least historic. J. Pruett stated he would probably install a stoop with an awning. B. Lyman asked about the installation of the shutters. J. Pruett stated he would follow the guidelines.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
<p>Doors & Entrances</p> <p> Porches</p> <p> Shutters</p> <p> Windows</p>	<p>39 - 42</p> <p>49 - 50</p> <p>55</p> <p>60 - 63</p>	<p>40 - 42</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p> <p>56 - 59</p>	<p>O. McCall – The applicant is maintaining the historic doors and will be closing the rear door. The rear door is not visible from any right of way and therefore should be allowed. He will also be moving a door back to its original opening. On porches, the porch which was not original was torn off. I would like to see a porch returned since historically it had a porch. The guidelines state original porches should not be removed however it was not original. The applicant will be turning the front window from a picture window to the correct size. The shutters will be placed on the new window. They will be attached to the window frame. The windows will return the windows back to the original size which is appropriate. I worry about the use of vinyl windows. I would rather see wood or aluminum clad windows.</p> <p>T. Stark – I agree with O. McCall regarding the windows. I would be okay with the vinyl clad windows N. Schell had at city hall. For the shutters and doors and entrances, I agree with O. McCall for the same reasons. It is appropriate to return the windows back to their original size and move the door to its original location. The shutters should be hung from the window frame instead of the house.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I don't think the front porch was original and it doesn't make sense to have a transom over a front door then cover it with a porch. I do not have a problem with replacing the vinyl windows with new vinyl windows because I believe the guidelines allow for replacement of like material for like material. I think the application for the doors, windows, and shutters is appropriate as submitted.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I agree with M. Pittman. It would be nice if the applicant would replace the windows with wood or a wood clad but they are vinyl now and therefore I see no issue with replacing them with vinyl.</p> <p>B. Lyman – I appreciate the investment in this house. The rear porch cannot be seen readily and therefore I do not think it is a problem to remove it. Under residential guidelines on page 49-50 number 3 states "if the historic porch is missing, it is appropriate to replace it. Replacement porches should use materials and styles that are compatible with the building to which they are attached and when possible be based on historic photographic or documentary evidence. Removing a front porch that has been added where there was not one historically may be appropriate in some circumstances". Since we have some historic photographic evidence that the porch that was there, I feel that based on the guidelines, a porch should be replaced to match the one in the photo.</p>

Historic District Board of Review

May 26, 2020

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Doors & Entrances	39 - 42	40 - 42	<p>B. Lyman – I appreciate moving the historic door to the front and adding a transom over it. I think that is a great thing to do with a wood door. The residential guidelines state on page 39-42 “deteriorated or damaged historic doors should be repaired using methods that allow them to retain their historic appearance and as much of their historic fabric as possible”. The applicant will be following those guidelines. The shutters, in the application state they are going to be wood. The guidelines on page 55 state they should be wood. “The addition of new shutters should be of wood and with dimensions that match the window opening... Shutters should be attached to the window frame, not attached directly to the façade wall”. The applicant has agreed to do that. Windows are on residential guidelines on page 60-63. Number 3 states “baked enamel or anodized aluminum windows may be appropriate. Vinyl or vinyl clad wood windows should not be installed on the any façade visible from street views”. Based on that guideline I do not believe the replacement with vinyl windows is appropriate.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I do not have an issue with the applicant replacing the windows with the same material. I do not believe porches were original on this structure and therefore their removal is appropriate.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I agree with K. McWilliams and M. Pittman for the same reasons.</p>
Porches	49 - 50	--	
Shutters	55	--	
Windows	60 - 63	56 - 59	

J. Wilber asked for a motion. S. Schmidt made the following motion:

“I move that a COA be approved for 708 E Second Street as submitted with the shutters attached to the window frame instead of the wall.”

Motion was seconded M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

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

May 26, 2020

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Chimneys	38		<p>B. Lyman – Based on these guidelines the application does not meet the guidelines. I do not think a COA should be approved.</p> <p>K. McWilliams – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>O. McCall – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons.</p> <p>M. Pittman – I do not agree. I have two chimneys which are a constant source of repair and replacement. I believe unless the chimney is extremely ornate or on a significantly historic property, then the chimney should be allowed to be removed. I would encourage the owner to get a second opinion on the repair of the chimney.</p> <p>S. Schmidt – I am torn. I agree with M. Pittman that when things are in such bad condition that they cost over and over. Sometimes if they are not spectacular then it is time to remove them. I do think it would be a good idea to get a couple more opinions and try to salvage the chimneys.</p> <p>J. Wilber – I think the owner should get some other opinions on the chimney. It doesn't look like it is a state of deterioration requiring removal. I would recommend repairing it.</p>

J. Wilber asked for a motion. B. Lyman made the following motion:

“I move that the application submitted on May 4, 2020 for a COA for the residence at 411 E Third Street and discussed at the HDBR meeting on May 26, 2020 be denied based on the residential guidelines on page 38 which state in part that ‘chimneys should not be removed or altered if original or architecturally significant’. The applicant has request for the removal of the chimney to install a steel flue pipe. Since the chimney is original and architecturally significant, it is not in conformance with the guidelines.”

Motion was seconded O. McCall.

Roll Call:

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

The motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness passed. A Certificate will not be issued for the entire project.

New Business:

T. Stark stated his appreciation of N. Schell and her ability to remind the board about continuing education opportunities. T. Stark mentioned Indiana Landmarks is offering virtual training for commissions. N. Schell will coordinate.

Page 9

Historic District Board of Review

May 26, 2020

Old Business (Staff Review):

T. Stark discussed changes to the final draft of the staff review table under bricks/masonry/stone and recommended staff approval for tuckpointing. J. Wilber and M. Pittman didn't see how staff review could be done since the board does not have review over maintenance or repair. M. Pittman recommended a survey of applicants after the work is done to see how they felt about the contractor's work. B. Lyman and J. Wilber agreed. B. Lyman expressed concern regarding public comments on this process. K. McWilliams and M. Pittman disagreed. B. Lyman expressed concerns on the notification process on fast-tracked applications. N. Schell stated the public notification is not required. J. Wilber did not see how delaying the vote on this would affect public input. B. Lyman asked if any public comments were received on this document. N. Schell answered no. M. Pittman stated he has talked with several people about these changes and it was well received.

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

"I move to accept the new rules of procedure."

Motion was seconded M. Pittman.

Roll Call:

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

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
Mike Green	317 E First St	4/28/2020	Wood fence
Vince Kidd	622 West St	5/14/2020	Restoration of porch (currently enclosed)

Historic District Board of Review: COA Approved by Staff

Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Building Element
KTC Holdings LLC	322 West St	5/8/2020	Roof
Johnathan Van Crafton	304-306 Broadway St	5/20/2020	Door Overhang

Historic District Board of Review: 2019 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Shelton, Lisa	605 Jefferson St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace French doors on second story porch with window. 	Yes
McWilliams, Kenneth & Sally	315 Poplar St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use brick on the recently approved infill garage instead of Hardie board. 	Yes

Page 10

Historic District Board of Review

May 26, 2020

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
Grooms, Kirk	618 W Second St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build a 24-ft x 30-ft garage with Hardie board siding and metal roof. Garage will have brick patio and carriage style door. 	Yes
Suggett Schmidt Properties LLC	1219 W Main St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build a 12-ft x 28-ft carport with attached 12-ft x 6-ft storage shed. 	Yes
Hartsaw, Robert	806 W Second St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace metal roof with shingles. 	Yes
Heritage Trail Conservancy	109 1/2 Cragmont St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install new 3 metal carriage style garage doors, exposed fastener metal roof, and smooth LP Smart Siding. 	In progress

No further business to be brought before the board.

M. Pittman made the motion to adjourn - seconded by O. McCall.

Meeting adjourned at 7:19p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Josh Wilber, Chair

Nicole M Schell
City Planner – Preservation Coordinator