

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

February 22, 2021

The Madison City Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, February 22, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. at 101 W. Main Street. Thomas Stark presided over the meeting with the following members present: Ken McWilliams, Jerome Vernon, and Owen McCall. Also present were Brian Martin – Director of Building and Design, Devon Sharpe –board Attorney, Brooke Peach – Historic Preservationist, and Nicole Schell – City Planner/Preservation Coordinator.

T. Stark 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. Peach will present the particulars on the project. The board will then go through a list of items to see if they meet the guidelines. T. Stark added that at the end of each application the board will vote.

1/25/2021 Minutes:

T. Stark asked if everyone had a chance to read the minutes for the meeting on January 25, 2020 and had any corrections or additions.

K. McWilliams asked B. Peach to clarify if the Lumber Mill Antique Mall installed vinyl windows as B. Peach had stated at the last meeting during the 2020 COA Review. B. Peach stated she incorrectly used the term vinyl windows and that the Lumber Mill Antique Mall had indeed installed the windows correctly according to the approved COA.

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

**Roll Call:**

O. McCall      Approved

J. Vernon      Approved

T. Stark      Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

*Minutes stand approved.*

**Extended Applications:**

- 1. Lisa Riggio – C. of A. to replace wood siding on rear addition and enclose second story porch with metal siding.

Location: **704 West St.**

Zoned: Central Business District (CBD)

B. Peach stated L. Riggio requested to have her application extended until the April meeting.

K. McWilliams made a motion to extend the application for 704 West St. to the April meeting – seconded by O. McCall.

T. Stark asked for public comments and noted there were none.

**Roll Call:**

T. Stark      Approved

O. McCall      Approved

J. Vernon      Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

*The motion to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness application review to the April 26, 2021 meeting passed.*

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

2. Donald and Tamara Courtney – C. of A. to build a new 20’ x 17’ garage with vinyl siding, one 3’ x 3’ vinyl window, and fiberglass shingle roof.

Location: 709 E. First St.

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach gave a brief property description, showed photos provided by the applicant, and explained the building as proposed by the applicant. Donald and Tamara Courtney were present.

D. Courtney stated he had just retired from the army and did not know he had to have a building permit or COA. The City Inspector [building inspector] condemned the shed and he [Courtney] took it down. We want to replace it.

J. Vernon and K. McWilliams stated they did not have any questions.

O. McCall asked D. Courtney if he intended to use vinyl windows and vinyl siding even though they were not on the approved list of materials. D. Courtney replied yes.

T. Stark asked D. Courtney if he had considered using Hardie board or LP smart siding. D. Courtney stated his neighbor, who is on this board, just had to redo his whole house because he had that “what I call Hardie board siding. It ain’t no good. I’ve done a lot of research on it and if you’re rich you can do it because you’ll be replacing it every 3-4 years like he did. When it gets wet, it ruins the whole house.

K. McWilliams stated O. McCall is the closest board member living to the Courtney residence.

O. McCall stated he is not aware of any neighbor that is on the board and lives near the Courtney residence. He asked D. Courtney if he was perhaps confusing Hardie board with particle board because they’re two very different materials. D. Courtney stated he knew the difference.

T. Stark asked for comments from the public and noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact

Building Element	Residential Guidelines Page #	Commercial Guidelines Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Infill Buildings	69-71		<p><i>O. McCall</i> – It seems to me that the proposal is not consistent with the guidelines because vinyl siding is prohibited as is the vinyl window. Everything else seems to be fine as far as it’s height, setback, size, etc. Only problem I see is in the materials. We do have a lot of vinyl in this town. Sometimes it goes up at night or during holidays when the building inspector is not around, but just because some people have done it doesn’t mean it’s okay for everyone to use it.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – Hardie board or smart siding will last 20-30 years.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – It appears to me the garage right across the alley from you has vinyl siding and vinyl windows and a couple of the other garages in the alley have vinyl siding too. The material itself is not approved, but I assume you knew that when you applied?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – I just moved here from Alabama. Down there we don’t have to have a building permit to build a garage.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – Is a contractor going to build this?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – No. Brother and brother-in-law.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – Have you looked at going with other types of materials for the garage?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – I can, but me myself I’d have to look at the cost of it.</p>

			<p><i>J. Vernon</i> – So the cost is a primary factor of going with the vinyl siding?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – Yes.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – It's not visible from the street.</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – No, sir, it's not.</p> <p><i>J. Vernon</i> – It becomes a gray area then. The garage to the east of you has wood siding.</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – The one Bob just built? Yeah, and I wanted to make mine just like his except I wanted to use vinyl siding. We want to keep it uniform looking in the neighborhood.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I drove down the alley last week, and like you said, there's a combination of wood, Hardie board, aluminum, but we are trying to stick to the guidelines and ensure we are using the appropriate materials for historic Madison. I guess my question is have you actually compared prices for using LP siding or Hardie board as opposed to the vinyl siding?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – No sir, I have not.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – Would you consider doing that?</p> <p><i>D. Courtney</i> – Yes, sir, I'll look at it, but if I don't like it, I'm not going to put it on there.</p>
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

T. Stark asked for a motion. K. McWilliams, based on the preceding findings of fact, "I move that the Madison HDBR grant a COA to Don and Tamara Courtney at 709 E. First St. to build a garage at the rear of the property, 20' x 17' with vinyl siding and vinyl windows and fiberglass shingles and steel door".

Seconded by J. Vernon.

Roll Call:

- T. Stark            Denied
- O. McCall        Denied
- J. Vernon        Approve
- K. McWilliams Approved

T. Stark asked for the procedural process in the event of a tie. N. Schell stated because there must be four votes to deny any application, there were only four members present, and two of those four voted to approve, the application must be approved.

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

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

- 3. Kim and Jeff Kennard – C. of A. to build add a 12' x 16' porch on the southeast rear side that follows the existing roofline and existing siding on the home.  
Location: **506 E. Main St.**                      Zoned: Specialty District (SD)

B. Peach gave a brief property description, showed photos provided by the applicant, and explained the changes proposed by the applicant. Kim Kennard was present.

K. Kennard stated they purchased this home to be a weekend home. They currently live in West Chester which is a 3-hour drive roundtrip. We will be attending the zoning meeting in 3 weeks. We did hire approved contractors and we understood they were supposed to go through all proper protocols. We did stop by several times to make sure everything was being done correctly. We wanted to do the right thing.

# Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

When we purchased the house, it was in extreme disrepair and it had vinyl siding across the back and vinyl windows that were broken. We're putting LP siding on the back. We also had a new roof put on. We did replace the old vinyl windows with new vinyl windows in the rear. All of the other windows are the original windows and the doors are all original. This Spring we are planning on redoing them. The front of the house is going to look much better than it did, as will the back. We wanted to have this porch as an outdoor living area.

T. Stark asked K. Kennard if she intended to keep the windows in the rear of the home.

K. Kennard Yes, those are actually new windows. We're hoping that they stay. There's actually the LP siding up on the back of the house now.

T. Stark Asked if the siding was on the addition?

K. Kennard responded no, it's just on the back of the house. The porch is going to be open. It does follow the roofline, but it's going to be an open porch; it's not closed in. It will look like the porch on the front of the house, but right now, the project's been stopped because we're waiting on two more approvals – this one and one from zoning. There are two additional posts that have to be installed against the house to support the new porch roof.

J. Vernon – For clarification, did you say construction on the property started without a permit?

K. Kennard – Yes.

J. Vernon – Currently the back of the property has siding applied and the roof is being put on. Are the supporting pillars going down into the earth?

K. Kennard – Yes. There is a roof on the porch. In fact, the whole house got a new roof.

J. Vernon – So the roof is attached to the existing structure? The pillars supporting the new porch are put directly into the earth?

K. Kennard – Yes. They are put in poured concrete in the holes in the ground.

J. Vernon – You said you're waiting for zoning approval?

K. Kennard – Yes, because it's a 3 foot set back but we don't have that much clearance there.

J. Vernon – Is that going to be a gap that's going across?

K. Kennard – No, it's just an open patio. Eventually, we will come to get approval to put in brick pavers. There's not going to be any type of wood platform or anything.

J. Vernon – So there will be a walkway?

K. Kennard – Yes, there will be a walkway going to the back yard.

J. Vernon – When I drove by, I couldn't really see it from the alley or the adjacent street. It's not really visible.

K. Kennard – The realtor told us the back didn't matter. Although I saw the guidelines and saw adding a porch was in there, so I think it was just not understanding the contract or process.

J. Vernon – So currently, you have applied for a permit?

K. Kennard – Yes, and I have sent 7 certified letters to the people the office told us to send them to plus we have your sign in the window for this meeting.

J. Vernon – So it was the contractor doing this that didn't apply for the permits and COA?

K. Kennard – Correct. We thought he'd do all that.

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

K. McWilliams – Is Bumper Johnson your contractor?

K. Kennard – Yes.

K. McWilliams – Brooke, Brian, you need to get Bumper in the office and beat his ass. I love Bumper to death but he does this all the time. Kim, you hired a great guy, but he does this all the time.

O. McCall – No questions.

T. Stark – Brian, maybe you can answer this, when is the zoning planning to approve or disapprove the project?

B. Martin – Two weeks from tonight.

T. Stark – Does work have to stop until then or can it continue?

B. Martin – No, we did a stop work order.

T. Stark – So, no work until zoning approves.

K. Kennard – They let us finish our siding.

B. Martin – When I stopped to talk to the guys that were working there, certainly that concept was to let them do what they needed to to protect their investment. The reason for the zero lot line is because most of downtown side yards/rear yards set backs are 3 foot. Of course, to follow the roofline there, they're at a zero lot line. But, I think Nicole and I talked about part of this process of changing things a little with the Historic Board is to allow people to move along with their projects in a timely manner, so they won't get their building permit until they get their zoning approval, but regardless of what happens tonight, it's only one part of the puzzle. To make them wait for the zoning board would make them wait another month in relation to the historic board. This is one part. They have to do the BZA for the zero lot line, but upon approval on both, they can continue.

T. Stark – Brooke, do we need to include that in any motion we would make?

B. Peach – No, you would not. And also to clarify, what Ms. Kennard is talking about is that she did receive staff approval on siding that did follow guidelines and a few other projects that she had listed. Usually, the way Mr. Willbur handles it is to remind everyone that there may be further permits they need to apply for.

T. Stark – And, you've already applied for those, Kim, correct?

K. Kennard – Yes.

T. Stark asked for public comments and noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches  New Construction – Additions – Residential Guidelines	49-50  68		O. McCall – It seems like it's consistent with the guidelines. The construction is in the back and is consistent with the rest of the house. It's smaller, so it's secondary to the house. It's compatible in design with the house. It's not trying to imitate some sort of earlier historic style. It seems consistent with the guidelines. K. McWilliams – I agree with O. McCall. J. Vernon – I agree with O. McCall. T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons.

T. Stark asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, "based on the preceding findings of fact that Madison Historic District Board of Review grant a COA to Kim and Jeff Kennard for the

## Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

proposed addition of the 12' x 16' porch on the southeast rear side that follows the existing roofline and existing siding on the home located at 506 E. Main St".

Seconded by K. McWilliams

## Roll Call:

T. Stark  
Approved

O. McCall      *Approved*

J. Vernon  
Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

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

T. Stak stated the COA was approved and the applicant could go ahead with the project pending the requisite permits were filed. And, thank you for this project, it will be a nice addition to the house.

4. Charles Requet - C. of A. to demolish the shed located on the lot.  
Location: **737 Jefferson St.** Zoned: Residential Medium Density (R-8)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Charles Requet was present and stated that he wanted to tear it down because they were having issues every time we get a really strong storm and water was getting into the house.

T. Stark asked for public comments and noted there were none.

## Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Demolition	80-81		<p><i>J. Vernon</i> – No questions. It's not historic. I drove by and took a look at it and it's actually pretty dilapidated.</p> <p><i>K. McWilliams</i> – No questions.</p> <p><i>O. McCall</i> – No, it's a non-contributing structure, so it shouldn't even be covered by the guidelines in my opinion.</p> <p><i>T. Stark</i> – I agree. It's not historic and it's causing problems to the historic structure, so I think that it should be demolished.</p>

T. Stark asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, the HDBR grant a COA to Charles Requet for the proposed demolition to the shed on the otherwise empty lot located at 737 Jefferson St”.

Motion was seconded T. Stark.

### Roll Call:

T. Stark  
Approved

O. McCall      *Approved*

J. Vernon  
Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

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

**Historic District Board of Review****February 22, 2021**

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

5. Richard and Sallie Plass - C. of A. to add an additional 3 feet to the existing second floor rear porch and enclose the 10' x 10' structure, installing Mastic carved wood vinyl siding to match the existing siding, a glass sliding door unit with integrated side windows, and an EPDM black rubber roof.  
Location: **811 W. First St.**  
Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. Richard and Sallie Plass and their contractor Nathan Thompson from Sandusky Construction were present.

*K. McWilliams* – B. Peach, did the application not include the extension? If not, can it be amended verbally?

*B. Peach* – Not at the time of the initial application, but yes, it can be amended.

*K. McWilliams* – We met at a yard sale a couple of years ago, but you know Joe and Hilary have issues with your project [referring to the emailed public comments submitted prior to the meeting and given to each Commissioner; full transcript included below in public comments section] and so I wonder if you should request a delay for a month until they get back from New York.

*S. Plass* – We want to make it right with them; we love our neighbors. We didn't know there was an issue until last night, but we've been delayed on the project since September because we had that nice door and window unit that came in damaged.

*K. McWilliams* – You can understand their issues concerning water because they spent so much money repairing their home because of its poor construction this Spring.

*N. Thompson* – The two homes have downspouts that merge into one. Essentially, what we have proposed is to run a similar 6" gutter downspout, so there would be an additional downspout run. The only thing that might get tricky is where the two are merged together. It may be in everyone's best interest to run a new downspout for the neighbors, but I don't think there would be any change to the drainage now.

*K. McWilliams* – There's no issue with the new roof being fairly flat.

*N. Thompson* – No, sir. It would be slightly tapered towards the south and it would have another gutter in similar fashion and would have a downspout.

*K. McWilliams* – How do you address their concerns in regards to the extension of the deck?

*R. Plass* – The concern is about privacy. I think we've been pretty diligent given they're continuous units around privacy. That deck already extends four feet. We were under the impression that extending the deck several feet does not really change the dynamics about privacy. As a result, we didn't think it was an issue because already it's not terribly private if you're on our deck because of that 4 feet extension beyond the terminus of that wall. We felt adding a few feet would not be an issue, but apparently, to Joe and Hilary it has become one. And, so if you see all the decks currently across the entire building, all the decks have the same extension and extend out. We want to extend the center deck out 3 feet.

*S. Plass* – One of the things that we did consider when we were thinking through the plans is that this is an old picture and now there is a home on the right side and four more homes on the left of that condo, so when you look down the sightlines from that whole row, our deck doesn't even extend as far as the other 5 homes.

*K. McWilliams* – That's on this grassy area. I won't say any more, but I've got concerns.

*J. Vernon* – Looking at your application, it appears to me the extension of the deck has occurred after.

*S. Plass* – We understood it was part of the original application.

Page 8

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

*T. Stark* – Was the extension added later or was it part of the original application.

*S. Plass* – The original drawings that were submitted show it. I don't know what was actually written on the application.

*B. Peach* – On the original application it is written to enclose a 10' x 10' porch and the way that it is written explains it is to enclose what was already there, however, the site drawings make it appear as if it an extension, so there has been some confusion. There's a conflicting written portion and site plan.

*J. Vernon* – All the rest of the materials seem compatible. The issue is that the way this request is written in the executive summary, it doesn't match what's being requested here.

*K. McWilliams* – But it was included in the original drawings, so does that carry some implications for consideration that it was their intent that it would be in the consideration.

*T. Stark* – So, Brooke, if that's written down, but is it clearly communicated in the application?

*B. Peach* – I do believe the site plan, it is clearly communicated, upon closer inspection, that it did include the extension.

*O. McCall* – I'm a little confused about the vinyl siding. Brian, if you're going to build a new house in Madison, is that within the building permits?

*B. Martin* – Well, that was approved on those existing houses when they were originally built, so I don't know why it wouldn't be consistent now. It seems acceptable to keep going with that.

*O. McCall* – To add vinyl where there's already vinyl.

*T. Stark* – If I read correctly, you're actually matching the vinyl to the existing vinyl on the property already, correct?

*N. Thompson* – Yes, but I would add that it's going to actually reduce the total amount of visible vinyl because of the proposed door unit will take up most of that face.

*O. McCall* – To me the whole issue, there's nothing about privacy in the guidelines, so as far as I'm concerned, that's an issue between you and your neighbor. I don't know why we should even voice our opinion on it. It's one thing to do but it's outside of the HDBR.

*B. Martin* – I agree with O. McCall. I think that if there are issues in relation to that they can be brought up at BZA for zero lot line. What you guys are discussing are simply to be the project as it stands. And same thing about concerns for water issues or canting issues, those are to be discussed when they get the building permit. They need to show what they're doing is acceptable to basic code enforcement. Again, those are issues outside of this Board.

*O. McCall* – I think as a Board, we need to constantly keep in mind that what color we like, or how we would do it if it were our project, that is all really not anything we should even address. We have to contain our comments to the guidelines. It just keeps the meeting more efficient as well.

*T. Stark* – And I would agree. I pondered over this for quite some time and even drove by again this afternoon. Personal issues between you and your neighbor have to be resolved between the two of you. The site view, there's nothing that really addresses that in the guidelines. The materials that you're using all follow the guidelines, so I don't have an issue with the project.

*S. Plass* – I know it's out of your guidelines, but to the neighbors, we're trying to be good neighbors. We thought 3 feet wouldn't really be an impact.

*T. Stark* – We'll let you guys work that out.

*T. Stark* asked for public comment. *B. Peach* noted those submitted to the Board in writing by Joe Tesoriero, Hilary Beall, and Randy Eggenpiller. Also, neighbor Ben Canada spoke.

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

B. Canada – I’m one of the five neighbors S. Plass spoke of and a former resident of this condo unit and lived in that unit and experienced the privacy issues. I understand some of the neighborly concerns, but also that’s part of being in a community that’s close together. It’s part of everybody shares and lives together. It’s a shared space that everybody does in good harmony and community. Certainly, in the present state of the decks, if you wanted to look into the adjacent home, you could. Three feet is not going to change that fact. I’m speaking in favor of this. As Sallie’s mentioned, all 3 of these decks are protruded from the neighbors. Even with the extension, it’ll still set back from Vaughn Drive. In view of the decks, they will all look in line. In fact, I noted today Joe and Hilary have actually extended their deck when they rebuilt. Theirs extends 10-11” past their face, so they’re asking for 3 feet. Joe and Hilary just extended close to a foot themselves, so I think it’s well in line with what’s there. It would be very appropriate and would dramatically improve the view and enhance the existing structure in Madison. I’m fully supportive.

*Emailed Public Comments from H. Beall, J. Tesoriero, and responses by S. and R. Plass:*

**Brooke Peach**

**From:** Hilary Beall <hljoe@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2021 2:54 PM  
**To:** Sallie Plass  
**Cc:** Nicole Schell; Brooke Peach  
**Subject:** Re: Historic District Board of Review Meeting 2/2, 2/2021 / Plass  
**Attachments:** Rear Exterior 809 - 811 - 813 W 1st.jpg

Sallie and Rich - Thank you for the quick reply and for taking with your contractor to clarify the sketches they provided to the Board of Review.

I have to say that we're not happy with your new deck extending out an additional 3 feet. The expanded footprint gives you a deck that is almost 90 square feet (12.7 ft x 7 ft) which accommodates more than a couple of chairs and will afford a line of sight into our dining / kitchen and also from our dining / kitchen to you on your deck. The townhouses were well designed by the original architect to provide consistent line across the back and to afford each unit with outdoor deck space that is largely private with just ~4' where each of us can see the other (with the exception of our side that is also exposed to the patio / deck for the house to the east of us). This has worked well for living close to neighbors, but maintaining a bit of privacy.

We appreciate your sensitivity to our privacy concerns, and you have always been good neighbors, but that can't speak to whoever you may sell your townhouse to in the future. Any new occupant gets a 90-square foot deck which looks directly into our dining area window only a few feet away and we look at them too.

In addition, your plans are not clear as to how the expanded footprint will be supported and we are reliant on your contractor, the roofer they will use and building inspector to ensure that the water management / guttering is well designed and installed.

We have attached a picture taken at closer range that may help the Board of Review to visualize the implications of an expanded footprint for your townhouse.

We will await the decision of the Board of Review. Thank you - Hilary Beall & Joe Tesoriero

Brooke Peach

---

From: Sallie Plass <sallieplass@gmail.com> on behalf of Sallie Plass  
<sallieplass@etiquetteenrichment.com>  
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 12:46 PM  
To: Hilary Beall  
Cc: Nicole Schell; Brooke Peach  
Subject: Re: Historic District Board of Review Meeting 2/22/2021 / Plass

Hi Joe and Hilary,

Sorry it took so long, but I just talked to the contractor in response to your email we have several thoughts.

First, the gutters will be configured to not create a water problem for our shared wall. It will use the existing connection and an additional gutter across the face to exit like all the other gutters.

Second, Sallie and I don't believe the extension of our deck three feet negatively effects the aesthetics of the back elevation, nor do we think the extension modifies the level of privacy from our current circumstances with the deck that presently extends out four feet. We have been, and will remain conscientious regarding matters of privacy and will continue our current efforts at courtesy for your privacy. The extension is simply for the purpose of having a small exterior balcony. This extension would be less than the rear sight line of surrounding properties. The balcony will not be large enough for gatherings of people, only for a few chairs.

Thank you for contacting us with your concerns. Our goal is to be good neighbors.

Best regards,

Sallie Plass  
811 West First Street  
502-210-1193  
sallieplass@gmail.com

From: Hilary Beall  
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 6:03 PM  
To: Sallie Plass  
Cc: Nicole Schell; Brooke Peach  
Subject: Historic District Board of Review Meeting 2/22/2021 / Plass

Dear Rich and Sallie:

We have recently looked at your plans submitted to the Historic District Board of Review for the enclosure of your deck. We have no objections to the aesthetics of your having an enclosed deck generally, but we do have two questions / concerns concerning the particulars.

First, are you planning on extending the deck further outward than it already is? The plan shows the deck extending 7 feet beyond the outer wall (where your existing south facing kitchen windows are located). If so, it will protrude beyond the current footprint, will no longer be consistent across the units and will impact our privacy. We would like to understand how that extension will be supported or is it cantilevered? Or is the measurement in the drawing incorrect?

Second, how is rainwater to be diverted off the new, flat roof, as your drawing doesn't show any guttering or downspout configuration. Further, it appears that the current run of downspout along our common wall may need to be re-configured to maintain the necessary slope while accommodating the new enclosed space. Since our shared wall would be impacted by any water issues, we would be interested in understanding the guttering and downspout design.

We are out of town and cannot attend the Review Board Meeting tomorrow, but we are available to talk by phone or participate on a zoom call.

Regards -

Hilary Beall & Joe Tesoriero  
809 West First Street  
Madison IN  
917 864 5114 (Joe)  
917 714 0773 (Hilary)

Page 11

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

Transcribed public comment received prior to the meeting by Randy Eggenspiller and requested to be read at meeting.

Existing deck is only 14' but plans show 7' footprint. How will this extension be secured (i.e., cantilever secured into concrete block)? The plans show more square footage than currently exists, but does not mention an addition - only enclosure. How does this work?

Randy Eggenspiller  
812-401-2552

# Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

## Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
Porches	49-50		<i>O. McCall</i> – The guidelines are really talking about porches added to or modified on historic buildings, contributing structures, in Madison. This is not a contributing structure, so to me, the guidelines hardly cover this. It's more of a putting us in the position of an appearance commission, which Madison doesn't have. Going down the list, it's all situations applicable to historic structures, so as far as I'm concerned, if Brian Martin is satisfied as to how this will be done, the HDBR should be satisfied as well.
New Construction - Additions	68		<i>K. McWilliams</i> – I agree with O. McCall. <i>J. Vernon</i> – I agree with O. McCall. <i>T. Stark</i> – I agree with O. McCall.

T. Stark asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, "based on the preceding findings of fact, the HDBR grant a COA to Richard and Sallie Plass for the proposed 1) enclosure of existing 10' x 10' porch, 2) installation of Mastic wood carved vinyl siding to match the existing siding, 3) installation of sliding glass door unit with integrated windows, 4) installation of black EPDM black rubber roof, and 5) include the proposed extension of the deck by 3' located at 811 W. First St".

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

## Roll Call:

T. Stark  
Approved

O. McCall *Approved*

J. Vernon  
Approved

K. McWilliams *Approved*

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

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

6. William and Sheri Tandy – C. of A. to build a new 16' x 28' home with features of a Colonial design.

**Location: 1017 Park Ave.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

B. Peach showed photos provided by the applicants and explained the changes proposed by the applicants. William and Sheri Tandy were present.

*W. Tandy* – The pictures make it look like a big house, but you've got to keep in mind this place is the size of the podium the commissioners are sitting in. It's 28' long, but we want to keep it in the style of Madison. I did have some questions about the materials. Previously, you approved us to use a pre-ribbed barn-style metal roof not a standing seam roof. One of the reasons for that is if you go to that area early in the morning it's almost eerie because there are hundreds of those turkey buzzards around everyone's house tearing up the shingles. We plan to use Hardie board shiplap siding but I would like to use vinyl windows. The reason for the vinyl windows is that I'd like to have a net-zero very efficient house.

*S. Tandy* – We do plan on putting some decorative period correct molding around the windows to make them look period correct. We don't just want stark windows there.

*J. Vernon* – I don't see anything in the application that specifies vinyl windows.

Page 13

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

*W. Tandy* – I just want to make it as efficient as I can. No bigger than it is, I should really be able to do that, but there are several windows.

*J. Vernon* – In the guidelines of the historic district, vinyl windows are not appropriate. We like to see aluminum clad or wood.

*W. Tandy* – I know they're more expensive and for a house this size, you can put all the money you want into it but it's still only worth a certain amount. I understand about the vinyl window policy but I would like to have an exception to the rule.

*S. Tandy* – We are worried about the area somewhat. It is a really small place and it'll look really unique to where when people drive by people are going to be wow, that's nice. The neighborhood is sketchy and I'm hoping that some requirements are made to neighbors or landlords surrounding us to upkeep their properties as well. We're not here all the time. We just come during the summer and on weekends because we drive from Richmond. We love this area, but it is concerning that we're building in. We're trying to start something positive over there.

*K. McWilliams* – The vinyl windows will be front facing?

*W. Tandy* – Yes, most of the windows will be in the front to achieve the design of the house. The previous design after we moved around and cleaned up the lot was turned the opposite direction with the gable facing the street but it won't fit with that hill. I'm scared of that hill shifting or water coming off of it.

*O. McCall* – I also have a concern with the vinyl windows. We recently rejected an application by one of your very near neighbors there on that same street that wanted to use vinyl. He had an even more modest house than this.

*W. Tandy* – What is acceptable?

*T. Stark* – Aluminum clad or wood window. They are very efficient and they last longer than the vinyl windows. I think the project looks great. I love the design and it will be a major hit on the East side. There's already so much improvement with the new entrance into the city, the road. I think it's going to be a beautiful place and as you said as you drive by it will catch everyone's eye.

*W. Tandy* – I've discussed with Brian and Nicole a garage, but I think the carport will do the trick. If we can agree on the materials, I think we'll be happy with it.

*T. Stark* – And that's the only issue I have also. The reason we encourage the wood or aluminum clad windows is because they have the bulk of the historic windows that were originally here. The vinyl windows, not so much. We try to stick to as close to that as possible. My only exception is the windows. Everything else, the materials, are fine and the design is stunning. Would you consider either of those windows?

*W. Tandy* – Yes. I want to heat that house with a book of matches.

*T. Stark* – That's reasonable. Aluminum clad or wood windows can be double or even triple pane, so there should be no reason they should be less efficient. In fact, I think they would be more efficient than the vinyl.

*W. Tandy* – I'm fine with that. What are the guidelines for doors?

*T. Stark* – Wood, steel, or fiberglass.

*B. Peach* – As long as it meets the guidelines, it's a staff approvable item, so you would just need to submit an application along with a picture of the door and type of material and we can get that approved fairly quickly for you.

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

W. Tandy – Is that the same for the rear door too?

B. Peach – Only on doors visible from the street. If you know the materials you want to use tonight, you can get approval now.

T. Stark – You can get approval tonight or work directly with Brooke or Nicole and they could do staff approval and you wouldn't have to come before the board again.

W. Tandy – I'd rather just work with the girls on that. So, if it's not visible, the door can be whatever material.

N. Schell – We don't review anything not visible from the street, so windows, doors, siding, etc.

T. Stark asked for public comment and noted there were none.

Certificate of Appropriateness Findings of Fact Worksheet

Building Element	Residential Guideline Page #	Commercial Guideline Page #	Discussion
New Construction – Infill Building s	69-71		K. McWilliams – Read the guidelines. It basically talks about compatibility. You meet all of them except number 7 where it states the garage should be at the rear, but due to the depth of that lot, yours will face the street. This is a great project. I knew you'd have to come back. You thought you had a deeper lot. J. Vernon – Yes, it meets the guidelines. O. McCall – I agree with K. McWilliams and J. Vernon. T. Stark – I agree for the same reasons.

T. Stark asked for a motion. O. McCall made the following motion, “based on the preceding findings of fact, the HDBR grant a COA to William and Sheri Tandy for the proposed construction of a new 16’ x 28’ two-story residential home being a change in plans from those previously approved and located at 1017 Park Ave. Subject however, to the conditions specified in the findings of fact made previously to wit – wood or aluminum clad wood windows will be used rather than the vinyl windows proposed in the application”.

Motion was seconded K. McWilliams.

Roll Call:

T. Stark            Approved

O. McCall        Approved

J. Vernon         Approved

K. McWilliams Approved

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

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

Old Business:

T. Stark noted there was no old business from the Board.

K. McWilliams asked for a follow-up to the question of the Lumber Mill Antique Store’s installation of windows included in the 2020 COA Review from the January 25, 2020 meeting. B. Peach stated the

Historic District Board of Review

February 22, 2021

windows were installed properly according to the COA and was mistaken in using the term vinyl window; vinyl windows were not installed.

New Business:

T. Stark noted there was no new business from the Board.

Business – Staff Report:

Historic District Board of Review: Fast Track Applications			
Applicant	Address	Date of Approval	Material
David Joe Craig	810 E. Second St.	1/26/2021	Wood porch columns
Lindsay Clark	828 W. Second St.	2/01/2021	Wood windows; wood doors

Historic District Board of Review: 2019 COA Review

Applicant	Address	What Was Approved	Done According to COA?
• Demolish non-historic house			
Bob Greene	904 ½ W. Third St.		Stated this should be done on 2/24/2021 but may need a few extra days due to weather
Amy & Steve		• Install gas lights by front door facing Jefferson St.	Yes
Hensley	508 Jefferson St.	• Install gas lights on north side of house	

J. Vernon made a motion to adjourn the meeting – seconded by T. Stark.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE MADISON CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW



Josh Wilbur, Chair



Brooke Peach

Historic Preservationist