

**BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**Showers City Hall**

**McCloskey Room**

**Thursday March 26, 2015**

**5:00 P.M.**

**AGENDA**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** September 5, 2014; September 11, 2014;  
February 26, 2015
- IV. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**Staff Approval**
  - A. COA-10-15**  
607 West Allen McDoel Historic District  
Owners Keith and Caroline Clay  
construction of a wood balustrade on the front porch and rear deck of an existing house.
- V. DEMOLITION DELAY**
  - A. 108 West 6th Street (partial) Court House Square Survey Area**  
Owner: Sib Sheikh Representative: Doug Bruce  
Request to enlarge retail windows and remove exterior first floor fabric from a building on the courthouse square.
- VI. NEW BUSINESS**
- VII. OLD BUSINESS**
  - A. Awards and Preservation Month Plans May 2**
  - B. Design Guidelines Subcommittee Showers Buildings**
- VIII. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**
- IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- X. ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- XI. ADJOURNMENT**

Next meeting date is Thursday April 9, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in the McCloskey Room

**Posted: March 19, 2015**

**BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
SITE VISIT  
1021 E. Wylie Street  
Friday September 5, 2014  
MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting is called to order by Chairman, Dave Harstad at 12:16 pm.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners:**

Doug Bruce  
Jeannine Butler  
Chris Cockerham  
Sam DeSollar  
Dave Harstad  
Marjorie Hudgins  
John Saunders  
Chris Sturbaum

**Advisory:**

Jeff Goldin

**STAFF:**

Nancy Hiestand - HAND  
Lisa Abbott - HAND  
Jacob Franklin - HAND  
Patty Mulvihill - LEGAL

**Guest(s):**

Matthew Cole - Realtor for Zadoffs  
Roberta Pergher - Friend of Zadoffs  
Emma Rosenfeld - Friend of neighbors  
Heather Heerssen - Neighbor  
Jon Trinidal - Neighbor  
Mark Kaplan - Neighborhood Design Subcommittee Chairman  
Tom Schwen - Neighbor  
Mirjam Zadoff - Homeowner  
Robert Fakelmann - Neighbor  
Alexis Wreden - Neighbor  
Olda Diamondis - Neighborhood Design Subcommittee  
Brian Stancombe - Pella Windows

Noam Zadoff - Homeowner  
Susan Moses-Bloom - Homeowner

### III. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

A. 1021 E. Wylie Elm Heights Historic District  
Owners: Mirjam and Noam Zadoff  
Window replacement

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her explanation of the purpose of this onsite meeting and gives the commission directions for the purpose of recording.

The commissioners walk around the property to view the window placements and visibility from the street. The commission walks into the home to view the existing and replacement windows.

**Brian Stancombe** explains the window replacement to the commissioners. It is noted that the exterior sash will remain intact and not be replaced. These replacement windows are made to fit into the interior pocket of the window opening.

The commissioners, guest(s) and homeowners gather in one location to discuss the replacement windows.

**Dave Harstad** starts the formal meeting by thanking all in attendance as well as instructions on procedures for a formal meeting.

**Nancy Hiestand** states that STAFF has received, since the last meeting, a number of email(s) from neighbors as well as letter(s) from **Noam Zadoff**. Please see the packet to review the email(s)/letter(s). It is noted that these emails were from individuals and did not reflect the comments of the Elm Heights Historic District Design Guidelines Sub-Committee. **Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation and discusses the notification sent from the City to the previous owners for the Design Guideline booklet. Nancy states that as STAFF, she has to look at the Design Guidelines for her recommendations.

**Dave Harstad** states that he made a factual error in the last meeting by stating the Sales Disclosure Form had a place to check regarding Historic Districts. Dave reasserts that it is when you have a listing agreement or list a property for sale not if it is a sale by owner..

**Noam Zadoff** reads his statement. Please see his statement in the packet.

#### Commissioner's Question(s):

**Chris Sturbaum** asks **Patty Mulvihill** about the notification or the lack of



information with the purchase. **Nancy Hiestand** states that she forgot to mention that if you go to the City's website you can look up properties to see if they are in an Historic District. Nancy states that she has tried several addresses and the information on the website was correct. Nancy further states that the City has done its due diligence. **Lisa Abbott** adds that this address was listed as a mailing for the guidelines and in fact Nancy was contacted by the previous owners to ask questions about some work they wanted to do to this house pertaining to the guidelines, so the previous owners were aware. **Noam Zadoff** states that even though the previous owners knew it doesn't mean that they were informed. Noam asks that if they hid this information how would they have known about the district. **Nancy Hiestand** states that she agrees that just because the previous owners knew doesn't mean that the new owners were made aware. **Lisa Abbott** states that we are not saying that, we are just trying to make sure that the neighborhood understands that we have done all we can do with notification and that we wouldn't know if someone bought property until we read it in the property transfer section in the H-T.

**Chris Sturbaum** states that he didn't mean to imply that the City was negligent or that had not performed the process correctly. **Patty Mulvihill** states that she doesn't think the commission can base approval on whether or not proper notification was given, because under the legal sense there was. Patty states that if you read the guidelines and work with in the guidelines you do have some wiggle room to issue a COA but you are going to have to do so properly. For example the guidelines talk about having flexibility and making sure you review each case on a case by case basis. It is noted that this is not a complete window replacement. Patty states it is touchy because you have to think about this case and how it impacts future cases. Patty states that the guidelines talk about aesthetic character and maintaining the atmosphere of the district and if the commission finds that replacement windows are not noticeable to the average citizen then there is an argument that the replacement of the windows doesn't negatively impact the district. Patty states that it is inappropriate to issue a COA because they already purchased the windows which would be outside of the commission's purview and guidelines of the commission. **Chris Sturbaum** states he is looking for a clean line that says these windows can't go in any house, anytime or any where. **Patty Mulvihill** states she thinks the commission can make this work however they need to have a discussion that backs up the decision. Patty further states that what doesn't need to happen is for the commission to issue the COA because of the money spent and the thought of lack of notification, but won't want to do this for anyone else. The commission will need to base their decision on what information they have. Patty reads for an example, section 1.6 of the Elm Heights Historic District Design Guidelines.

**Jeannine Butler** asks **Nancy Hiestand** if the windows on the side of the property are within the commission's purview since the back windows are not visible from the street. Nancy states it is debatable that they are visible because of vegetation, however vegetation can be removed. Nancy states that what is visible to the

4

public is within the commission's purview.

**Dave Harstad** asks **Patty Mulvihill** if it would be possible to preserve the front windows and allow flexibility by replacing windows to the rear or sides of the house, rather than just approve or reject the petition as requested. **Patty Mulvihill** answers that this motion could be made if it was supported by reasons addressed in the guidelines.

**Public Question(s):**

**Robert Fakelmann** states that **Noam Zadoff** was eloquent in his statement. Robert mentions that Pella Windows are top of the line not bottom of the line and that should be noted. Robert states that he believes one of the purposes and reasons for this commission is to preserve or sustain the character of the neighborhood and that he thinks that not only involves window type but maintenance and quality of the neighborhood. Robert further mentions that when you go through a neighborhood and notice new windows, it says that people care for the neighborhood and are investing in it. Robert further states that the replacement windows will hold their value far longer and that the commission must take technology into consideration when maintaining the historic standards. Robert states that having a materials listing of what is acceptable replacements will enable the commission to grant this COA as well as give them a way of denial. Robert further states that even though you can find this information on the City's website, he feels this is a passive role. Robert mentions that when he purchased their house across the street they received no guidelines of any sort of historic guidelines. He further states that there needs to be a more active role. Robert states the replacement windows should go in.

**Nancy Hiestand** states that the guidelines are a neighborhood discussion and to change them would mean taking it back to the neighborhood for further discussion. Nancy states there has been several window workshops and the Commission has discussed windows for years and the conclusions are different than his.

**Susan Moses-Bloom** states that her block joined the Elm Heights Historic District late- within the last few years and that her home is older than the Zadoff's. Susan hopes the commission is aware that for 15 years they had a neighborhood who was a hoarder who had trash piled all over the place, in his vehicle and all of this was allowed to happen which was a detriment to the neighborhood. Susan states that they changed their windows to Pella Windows before they became part of the district. Susan further states that other neighbors have Pella Windows and with hoping more can be replaced due to the quality and energy savings these type of windows offer.

**Heather Heerssen** states that she is a strong supporter of this project and is happy to see people invest and be willing to spend a lot money in the neighborhood.

5

Heather further states that as a mother you can't have kids around peeling lead paint.

**Alexis Wreden** states she is new to the neighborhood and that they have not received any guidelines either but that it may be possible they are not in the district. Alexis states they have tried to do research on that but are unclear. Alexis thinks this is an interesting problem and how in this context, history is part of a context, that this moment needs to be pure where next door does not need to be pure. Alexis states they need young people in this neighborhood and want to see this neighborhood grow. Alexis asks how we can remain historic yet be modern.

**Mark Kaplan** states that the sub-committee met two weeks ago and voted to not support this petition and has not met since so this verdict is current. Mark states that the guidelines are meant to be flexible but we need to be clear that the matter of windows was discussed over two years and the guidelines are unequivocal about replacing original windows. Mark quotes the guidelines by stating, "If original doors, windows and hardware can be restored and used they should not be replaced". Mark states he is here representing the document that went through a long neighborhood and legislative history. Mark further states that he would not like to see the decision be made on the basis of allowing replacement windows is an acceptable interpretation of the guidelines. He would not like to see it viewed as a guideline and subject to interpretation, or else the document is worth nothing. Mark states this commission exists because we made a choice, a choice of priorities keeping our neighborhood looking the way it is with the character it is. It involves tradeoffs, he does not see how the commission finds wiggle room for making such approval.

**Matthew Cole** mentions that he was the Zadoff's Realtor. Matthew understands the commission's issues with not wanting to make exceptions that will have to be made over and over. Matthew gives a brief work history and states that he sells more houses in this area than anyone in his company. He has sold homes in Elm Heights, not in Elm Heights but off First street and various areas like that. Matthew states when looking up properties he looks up the legal description. Matthew states he sent an email that describes what he his saying. Please see packet for email. Matthew further states that other homes within this area have in the legal description the name of the historic district they belong and notes it was not on this homes legal description. Matthew names several homes in the area that have sold recently that had no mention of a historic value in the legal description. Matthew states the seller did not disclose that this property was in an historic district. Matthew notes the boarders of Elm Heights Historic District are confusing. Discussion is held on how to tag a property to show historic status.

**Brian Stancombe** reiterates **Matthew Cole's** remarks on tagging properties. Brian states he had no idea someone could go online and find this information out. **Lisa Abbott** states the information is tied to GIS. Brain states that the commission and government should always show flexibility especially with

people from out of the country and adds that nothing can be black and white, as a civil society there needs to be flexibility. Brian discusses the decision making process he went through with the Zadoffs. Brian states that communication is something that all parties could work on and the even **Chris Sturbaum** called him to ask about the windows.

**Noam Zadoff** discusses the previous owners and he would like to assume they did not know as opposed to the sellers deceiving them.

**John Saunders** asks when this neighborhood became historical. **Nancy Hiestand** it was July 15, 2012.

**Jeannine Butler** asks what the owners will do with the lead paint that surrounds the windows. **Noam Zadoff** states they will paint all of the wooden parts of the house with encapsulating paint.

**Lisa Abbott** asks about opening and closing of the windows and if that will produce lead paint dust. **Brian Stancombe** answers that this product is made to fit into the opening of the window, so it will be new product rubbing against new product.

**Commissioner Comment(s):**

**Chris Sturbaum** comments that there are people that build without permits and claim they didn't know they needed one. Chris states had this come to us in the proper time, that these windows are repairable and discussions would have been held. The sustainability of these windows are argued all over the country. Chris notes these windows are 80 years old and only in this shape because they were not taken care of. Chris hopes the old windows will be stored because these replacements will not last 80 years and the company may not be around. Chris states he sees this as an acceptance because of the communication break down. Chris further adds he is going to support this with a clear line that there was a break down in the way we communicated, maybe not a legal issue however a moral and community breakdown. Chris states he can support this as well because in his opinion these are the best replacement windows.

**Chris Cockerham** comments that this is very unfortunate, especially with people not being informed. Chris states that if he was a member of this neighborhood he would want to know which homes were in the district. Chris adds that he agrees with **Chris Sturbaum** in what the commission would have done with this decision. Chris further states that he appreciates the work and thought that **Noam Zadoff** and **Brian Stancombe** out into preserving the integrity of the historical look.

**Jeff Goldin** agrees with what **Chris Cockerham** stated. Jeff adds that guidelines are just that, guidelines. Jeff states the words should versus shall as read by mark

Kaplan from the guidelines gives the commission flexibility.

**John Saunders** comments that he agrees with **Chris Cockerham**.

**Doug Bruce** states that he agrees with the other commissioners and would add that being an architect and having worked around buildings with window replacements and restorations that these are exceptional window replacements. Doug adds that by having an onsite meeting and seeing them it gave him two things. One that the original windows are not too far gone and could be restored and refinished regardless of lead paint and adds he does not see the wood rot. Second these are the best replacement windows and you can see by looking across the drive at what others have used before this neighborhood area became historic. That is the example of what the commission has tried to ensure does not happen.

**Sam DeSollar** states that this is a problem that will be city wide due to the district elevations that have taken place recently. Sam states that this is a case that is fraught and he is pretty torn by it.

**Jeannine Butler** states that she will support this because of the lack of communication on the part of the Realtor and Elm Heights Historic District. Jeannine suggests to the Zadoff's that they make themselves known to the Elm Heights Board so they understand the intent of the board. Jeannine also states that somehow we need to hold Realtors accountable for looking into houses in somewhat historic neighborhoods. Jeannine adds that these windows are repairable.

**Marjorie Hudgins** states she will support this due to the lack of communication by the Realtor, the City, and the Commissions part and should not be penalized due to the lack of communication despite what the legal department thinks.

**Dave Harstad** states that he is opposed to granting this request. Dave states that the process we went through with Elm Heights are clear and the commission should support the neighborhood in their guidelines, they worked hard with the commission to realize them. Dave states that instead of appealing to the commission in equity to basically put us in a position to bend the rules, they should have instead gone to the city council and neighborhood and get the guidelines amended. If that is the sense of this street than that should be the remedy. Dave states that in regard to the notice, he vigorously disagrees with the idea that the city commission or city staff didn't take care of this. Dave adds that the Building Codes are not in the mail box, Zoning codes are not in the mail box and the Historic Preservation Commission is no different. Dave states that a trip to HAND or a trip to the PLANNING Departments would have solved this issue. When you're doing a major restoration or renovation those sorts of things are pretty obvious, especially with his experience in real estate. Dave adds that he does not think that city STAFF dropped the ball at all. Dave notes that if the neighborhood wants to get a legal document together and record it to show this area is an historic

area that will show up on the deeds, that would be fine. It is not the job of the BHPC to periodically notify others that they are in an Historic District. Dave states he not opposed to talking with Realtors, contracts etc, however putting this on the commissions lap is unfair to the commission.

**Jeannine Butler** makes a motion to accept **COA-31-14** 1021 E. Wylie Street. **John Saunders** seconded. Motion carries 6/2/0 (yes/no/abstain).

**Dave Harstad** makes a motion to amend the original motion to deny approval on all front windows. Amended motion fails 2/6/0 (yes/no/abstain).

**Chris Sturbaum** makes a motion to amend the original motion requiring that the windows be saved. **Mirjam Zadoff** and **Noam Zadoff** agree to store the original windows for future use. Motion carries 6/1/1 (yes/no/abstain).

**END OF MINUTES**

**BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Thursday September 11, 2014**

**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting is called to order by Chairman, Dave Harstad, at 5:05 pm.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners:**

Jeannine Butler  
Sam DeSollar  
Dave Harstad  
Marjorie Hudgins  
Marleen Newman  
Chris Sturbaum

**Advisory:**

Derek Richey

**STAFF:**

Nancy Hiestand - HAND  
Jacob Franklin - HAND  
Patty Mulvihill - LEGAL  
Nate Nickel - PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION  
Christine Meade - PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION

**Guest(s):**

Jim Lynch - McDoel Gardens  
Anna Lynch - McDoel Gardens  
Mark Kaplan - Elm Heights Subcommittee  
Jenny Southern - Elm Heights Historic Committee

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

No minutes to approve

**IV. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**A. COA-32-14**  
701 West Wylie Street McDoel Historic District  
Owners: Anna and James Lynch  
Demolition of a garage

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation. Nancy notes the McDoel Historic

District Neighborhood Subcommittee approves of the demolition of the garage. Discussion is held on the location of the garage and type of materials used in the construction. Nancy notes the City will be putting a sidewalk down Fairview which will be problematic because of the existing structure.

**Jim Lynch** adds that when they first moved into the property they tried to maintain the structure, however, over time it has fallen to disrepair.

**Question(s)/ Comment(s):**

**Chris Sturbaum** states that he doesn't understand how this building is in the way of the sidewalk. **Anna Lynch** explains that the width of road forces the sidewalks into the property so they will lose some of that space. Anna adds the current garage spacing relative to the property line is grandfathered.

**Sam DeSollar** asks if the petitioners are going to ask to construct a parking pad in place of the garage. **Anna Lynch** answers that they are always trying to find ways to improve the yard however they are going to wait and see how the sidewalks affect the area. Anna further states that they will bring everything before the BHPC. **Jim Lynch** adds that would be nice to have.

Discussion is held on repairing versus demolition of the garage.

**Jeannine Butler** makes a motion to accept **COA-32-14**, 701 West Wylie Street McDoel Historic District, demolition of a garage. **Sam DeSollar** seconded.  
**Motion Carries 6/0/0 (yes/no/abstain).**

**Patty Mulvihill** presents the **Proposed Findings of Fact** for **COA-32-14**, 701 West Wylie Street McDoel Historic District, demolition of a garage.

1. The Commission finds that the garage associated with the property located at 701 West Wylie Street was built without a foundation on three sides.
2. The Commission finds that the foundation on the west side of the garage located at 701 W. Wylie Street is crumbling and is compromised. Repairing the foundation would be difficult unless the actual garage itself is removed.
3. The Commission finds that the garage located at 701 West Wylie Street sits directly on ground and that this ground has become unstable as a result of animal burrows.
4. The Commission finds that the garage located at 701 West Wylie Street has corner supports which are unstable and have separated from the wall of the structure.
5. The Commission finds that overall structure of the garage located at 701 West Wylie Street is in a unsafe condition and making the structure safe again would be difficult.
6. The Commission finds that the McDoel Historic District Design

Guidelines specifically place higher value on structures which contain foundations than on structures which do not contain foundations.

7. The Commission finds that the McDoel Historic District Design Guidelines focus on preserving the character of the district by placing primary focus on houses, and treating secondary structures, such as the garage at 701 West Wylie Street, as less important to the overall historic feel and atmosphere of the district.
8. The Commission finds that removing the unsafe garage at 701 West Wylie Street is appropriate under the McDoel Historic District Design Guidelines.
9. The Commission finds that removing the unsafe garage at 701 West Wylie Street is consistent with Section 8.08.020 of the Bloomington Municipal Code in that the removal of the structure has little historical significance; will not negatively impact the relationship of buildings or architectural features within the district; and will not detract from the overall historic atmosphere of the district.

**Marjorie Hudgins** makes a motion to accept the **Proposed Findings of Fact for COA-32-14**. **Sam DeSollar** seconded. **Motion Carries 6/0/0 (yes/no/abstain)**.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Proposed Findings of Fact for COA 31-14.

Replacement windows at 1021 E. Wylie Street. Elm Heights Historic District.

Discussion is held on the Proposed Findings of Fact. The general consensus is to postpone the vote until our October meeting.

#### Public Comment:

**Jenny Southern** comments that she objects to the Proposed Findings of Fact and further states that there needs to be something that separates this property from others.

**Mark Kaplan** seconds what **Jenny Southern** stated. Mark urges the Commission to base the findings solely on the lack of notification given to the Zadoff's about purchasing a property in the Elm Heights Historic District.

#### Commissioner(s) Comment(s):

**Chris Sturbaum** comments that the Commission should postpone the vote and discuss the Proposed Findings of Fact further.

**Sam DeSollar** comments that he agrees with **Chris Sturbaum** on postponement. Sam further comments that he appreciates the efforts made in creating the Proposed Findings of Fact but does have a few issues with the current draft.

**Derek Richey** comments that he agrees with **Sam DeSollar** and **Chris Sturbaum**. Derek states that the Commission should trim down the number of Proposed Findings of Fact.

**Jeannine Butler** comments that number four in the draft should stay as that is what the petitioners stated in order to obtain the COA.

**Dave Harstad** comments that while hearing other Commissioners during the discussion on site, this decision was based on extreme circumstances and that this property is on the outskirts of the district.

**Marjorie Hudgins** makes a motion to postpone the vote to our October meeting. **Jeannine Butler** seconded. **Motion carries 5/0/1 (yes/no/abstain).**

**Nancy Hiestand** discusses the information that is on the City of Bloomington's website regarding Historic Districts.

Discussion is held on how to better advertise and make accessible the information.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

Guidelines Resolution Issues: **No discussion held**

**VIII. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

**No Commissioners' Comments**

**IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**No Public Comments**

**X. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**No Announcements**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Meeting Adjourned at 6:30pm**

**BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Thursday February 26, 2015**  
**MINUTES**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting is called to order by Chairman, John Saunders, at 5:00 pm.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners:**

Doug Bruce  
Jeannine Butler  
Dave Harstad  
John Saunders  
Chris Sturbaum

**STAFF**

Lisa Abbott - HAND  
Nancy Hiestand - HAND  
Jacob Franklin - HAND  
Patty Mulvihill - LEGAL  
Danise Alano-Martin - ESD

**Advisory:**

Leslie Abshier  
Duncan Campbell  
Jeff Goldin

**Guest(s):**

David Miller - Citizen  
Nikki Gastineau - CFC  
Ron Walker - CFC  
Zach Bode - Studio 3 Design  
Rachel Bunn - Herald Times  
Jim Murphy - CFC  
Craig McCormick - Blackline Studio  
Brad Wisler - Sprout Box  
Elizabeth Kehoe - RDC  
Katie Birge - RDC  
Mike Trotzke - Sprout Box  
Iris Kiesling - Monroe County Commissioner

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES August 28, 2014**

**Jeannine Butler** makes a motion to approve the minutes from August 28th, 2014.  
**Doug Bruce** seconded. **Motion carries 5/0/0 (yes/no/abstain).**

**IV. HISTORIC DESIGNATION**

**A. HD-01-15**

Showers Brothers Furniture Company Buildings:  
Plant #1 401, 501 North Morton, and 320 West 8th Streets;  
Showers Administration Building 601 North Morton;  
Planing or Dimension Mill 335 West 11th Street;  
Kiln Building 333 West 11th Street.  
Petitioner: Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation as well as the Showers family history. Nancy further notes these buildings were listed on the National Register in 1997 as part of the Westside Historic District. Nancy discusses the Historic Designation criteria per State Statue and notes she found all but two criteria that these buildings met. Nancy discusses the type of construction that went into the buildings and discusses the Showers buildings that were lost to fires or other disasters. Please see STAFF report in the packet for a detailed history.

**Question(s):**

**Dave Harstad** asks **Nancy Hiestand** to explain the process of the Design Guidelines and how the Commission makes a decisions. Nancy answers that if the Commission votes to approve the Historic Designation then the **Historic Preservation Commission** and all other interested parties would convene to create the Design Guidelines. Nancy states that each building has different considerations that will need to be addressed. Several meetings with stakeholders will occur and hopefully the Design Guidelines will be in place before the council reviews the designation.

**Dave Harstad** asks **Nancy Hiestand** to explain the map of the buildings to be designated. Dave notes that it will not be the 11 acres that I.U. owns but just the building footprints. Nancy further notes that there will not be Design Guidelines for new construction within district, except for additions to the identified buildings.

**Chris Sturbaum** asks **Nancy Hiestand** to explain the Design Guidelines consensus building of this process. Nancy explains that when going through this process, we analyze the buildings and define what the significant features are. Nancy states that then we go through the process of what should be STAFF Approvals and what shall come before the full commission.

**Dave Harstad** asks if approved would this go before the Common Council before

the Design Guidelines are constructed. **Nancy Hiestand** answers that the idea would be to have consensus and a draft of the Design Guidelines, but probably will not have a published version.

**Doug Bruce** asks what the timeline will be for starting the Design Guidelines if approved. **Nancy Hiestand** answers that we would be moving forward from tonight if approved. Optimistically this would be early May.

**Public Comment(s):**

**Jim Murphy** thanks the Commission for having him today and for the consideration of comments. Jim states that CFC is the only private entity within the Showers Plaza. Jim states that **Chris Sturbaum** emailed him in January to notify him of the designation and he had met with **Lisa Abbott** and **Nancy Hiestand** a few weeks ago. Jim states they have been involved with this building since the beginning in 1995 and that CFC is a preservationist company with 90% of the buildings they own are old though some may not be historic. Jim states he is concerned because as a partner within this building they were not notified of this designation. Jim further states that bothers him and shows a lack of transparency. Jim adds that he appreciates the meeting with Lisa and Nancy, his heads up by Chris, yet he feels like this has already passed and isn't sure how long this has been discussed so there is a level of discomfort. Jim feels like they have been blind sided on this though CFC has been partners for 40 years in preservation with the City of Bloomington and Monroe County Governments. Jim asks why the Show Room located at 555 N. Morton Street is not included in this application while the Showers Plaza building is. Jim states the Show Room Building was a significant part of the business. Jim states that he would like the Design Guidelines in place before this application makes it to the Common Council.

**Iris Kiesling** states that she has no information other than this meeting showed up on her calendar. Iris states that she was very much involved with this building when she sat on the City Council. Iris states she was happy to be a part of the third partner in the building with county offices on the North part of the Showers Building. Iris states the County will be putting money into their portion of the plaza and that she looks forward to seeing this application for designation and what all is involved. Iris states that she agrees with **Jim Murphy** in that the County should be a part of the Design Guidelines as well as CFC.

**Danise Alano-Martin** states that from the perspective of the person being responsible for the redevelopment of the Certified Tech Park that she is really excited about being able to reinvigorate this space. Danise adds that what the Showers Family was able to do in transforming not only this area but also Bloomington she feels the Certified Tech Park will do that again. Danise adds that it is exciting to revere this history and also moving us forward to the 21st century. Danise reiterates that potential users of the space are included when creating the

Design Guidelines and in order to work through the issues.

**Commissioner(s) Comment(s):**

**Jeannine Butler** asks **Nancy Hiestand** to address the issues raised by **Jim Murphy** and **Iris Kiesling**. **Nancy Hiestand** states that she has never disapproved of anything that CFC has done. Nancy notes that when restoring something to its original character you do not have to get a COA. Nancy states the process is to be completely inclusive with all interested parties and have round table discussions when establishing the Design Guidelines. Nancy states that we are mainly concerned with the integrity of the buildings, that alternative energy sources have been written into many guidelines for the past 7-8 years. Nancy further states that we understand things have a shelf life and windows need to be replaced at some point. Nancy adds that she hopes for common sense responses and that she has never seen a conflict with the CFC and the Commission's general trends. Nancy adds that the City has an interest in all the buildings included in the designation and that the Hirons Building is privately owned and is part of a tax credit program.. She stated that the owner will be approached to inquire about this interest.

**Jeannine Butler** makes a motion to approve the Historic Designation of the Showers Brother Furniture Company Buildings: Plant #1 401, 501 North Morton, and 320 West 8th Streets; Showers Administration Building 601 North Morton; Planing or Dimension Mill 335 West 11th Street; Kiln Building 333 West 11th Street. That this be approved and forwarded to the Common Council for approval. **Chris Sturbaum** seconded. **Motion carries 5/0/0 (yes/no/abstain).**

**John Saunders** asks if there are any comments.

**Dave Harstad** makes a comment that this is something that we have been working on for a long time. Dave states that COOK does amazing work within the City and they will be a part of the drafting of the guidelines. Dave notes that the Village Deli recently had a fire and that by designating this building the designation ensures it repair to its original state. Dave adds that he wants to have clear rules.

**Jeff Goldin** states that he is in favor of this as long as the guidelines are flexible so there is room for historic preservation and economic development in the area.

**Chris Sturbaum** comments that not talking to **Jim Murphy** earlier was probably a bad political move and that we were thinking of a bigger picture in how do we preserve this area for centuries to come. Chris further adds that he believes once the guidelines are being constructed that people will feel comfortable about them. Chris states that he is sorry people felt pushed, surprised and that we will be smarter next time.

**Doug Bruce** comments that he thinks this is a no brainer and agrees with Chris on approaching CFC earlier and that sometimes we take them for granted. Doug states he is a little worried about the Kiln Building due to what may or may not be allowed. Doug further states he agrees with **Dave Harstad** in that we need some sort of guidelines and rules that will be a healthy discussion. Doug believes that the guidelines need to be in place before this goes to the Common Council.

**Leslie Abshier** states that she went through the guidelines process with her neighborhood and had a very good experience within the process and the way the City worked with them. The guidelines need to work for the people using the buildings as they do for historic purposes.

Discussion is held on Interim Protection. General consensus is that it is not needed and would show a lack of trust on the City's part.

**V. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
STAFF APPROVALS**

**A. COA-7-15**

914 E University Representative: Aaron McDaniel Owner: Aviva Tavel remodeling of a rear addition to include a bump out and new window and door configurations.

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation. See **STAFF** report in packet.

**VI. DEMOLITION DELAY**

**A. 632 North College Representative: Zach Bode Studio 3 Design Owner :  
ERL II LLC**

Removal of a back wall in order to construct an addition.

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation. Nancy notes the addition to the rear of the structure is not highly visible. She compares it to other construction on historic lots in the neighborhood. It is noted that building another structure will hinder the occupant load whereas adding onto the existing structure will allow maximum occupant load for renting. Discussion is held on the construction of the front porch and what materials have been used in repairs. Nancy states that the Planning Department informed her this meets all planning requirements.

Discussion is held on what type of construction will be occurring in the back of the structure.

**Question(s):**

**Dave Harstad** asks if there is a lot of cut and fill in the back of the lot. **Zach Bode** answers there will be a little bit. Zach states they will be double stacking parking as they will need to expand the parking by ten feet to the west.

**Chris Sturbaum** asks if the **Petitioners** would be willing to work with **Nancy Hiestand** on returning the porch to its historic look. **Petitioners** state they will be happy to and note that the entire front porch has been coated with a cement like material in order to make repair.

**Chris Strurbaum** moves that today regarding the property located at 632 North College Avenue, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) declares that it:

- got notice of proposed demolition, and,
- after today's discussion, sees no need to review the plans any further, and,
- waives the rest of the demolition delay waiting period.

The HPC may later recommend the property for historic designation to the Common Council. **Dave Harstad** seconded. **Motion carries 5/0/0 (yes/no/abstain).**

**B. 512 E. University** Petitioner Loren Wood for Jon Torok and Erin Cooperman

Removal of a chimney and enlargement of a foundation window in to an egress window.

**Nancy Hiestand** gives her presentation.

**Chris Sturbaum** moves that today regarding the property located at 512 E. University Street , the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) declares that it:

- got notice of proposed demolition, and,
- after today's discussion, sees no need to review the plans any further, and,
- waives the rest of the demolition delay waiting period.

The HPC may later recommend the property for historic designation to the Common Council. **Jeannine Butler** seconded. **Motion carries 5/0/0 (yes/no/abstain).**

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Awards and Preservation Month Plans May 2**

**VIII. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

**No Commissioners' Comments**

**IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**No Public Comments**

**X. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**No Announcements**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Meeting adjourned at 6:30pm**

**END OF MINUTES**

**STAFF APPROVAL**

**Summary**

Request to construct a wooden balustrade on an existing porch and a balustrade on a rear deck.

**COA-10-15**

**607 West Allen Street  
McDoel Historic District  
Owner: Keith and Caroline Clay**

**Zoning RC**

**135 C 607 House; modified Vernacular, c.1929 BHD**



This is a two story frame house that is being rehabilitated. The owner has submitted plans for a more appropriate wooden railing and balustrade treatment for both the front and rear porches. The plans are attached. This is a modest change that will assist in restoring the historic appearance of this property and enhance the visual characteristics of the neighborhood. The spindles will be simple 2X2" and the top and bottom rails will be as shown. This is a return to a more traditional look for the porch feature. The current porch has inappropriately scaled and unfinished balusters and rails.



## DEMOLITION DELAY

### Summary

**Removal of facade fabric including brick, glass on both floors and resizing and enlarging retail window openings.**

**Partial Demolition**

**3-19-15**

**108 West 6th Courthouse Square Survey District**

**Owner: Sib Sheikh**

**Representative: Doug Bruce**

**Zoning CD**

105-055-67005

C

108

Commercial, Smith Tuley Hall; Italianate, c.1860 NR



According to the 1991 nomination, this property is a contributing part of the Courthouse Square National Register District, although its facade has been seriously modified over the years. Staff has spoken with several different owners of this building in the last 10 years and it has never been upgraded. The new owner has come forward with plans to restore the storefront level and remove the plexiglass panels in the upper windows.

Of the significant historic detail remaining, the brick work on the second floor of the facade is original, and a wide storefront lintel with decorative consoles the second floor are all that remain visible. (see below) The segmental arch window hoods are



distinctive and original. Another characteristic is its hipped roof, which is similar to Mendelssohn Hall, is a rare roof form on the square and is visible from across the street from most perspectives. There are several archival photographs of the building extant,




which trace changes in the exterior through time. This building is quite early (1860) but what remains beneath the remodeled brick storefront is unknown. It was recently discovered that the lintel is metal rather than wood. The building adjoined the "Waldron Block" in the late 19th Century, which was a cast iron storefront with elaborate cornices, seen below. This storefront was completely removed and

the two modern buildings (Grazie's and Samira) are classified as non-contributing buildings. The following Sanborn Maps follow the redevelopment of the general area



from 1883-1913. This evidence coupled with some archival shots, provide clues as to the facade of the building.


The earlier shot (above) seems to depict an iron front store while the photograph below may either have been painted or the posts removed. But the earlier photograph does not show the door on the east side of the building. It also shows a very low kick plate associated with an iron front building.




The owner submitted two drawings of the proposed facade. Double hung windows will be installed on the second floor to replace the single panes. In designing the entrance, an issue was uncovered with the commercial storefront door, which is framed on one side by an iron support and on the other by a requirement for accessibility. The initial drawing showed an off center panel and a recess entry with recessed transoms. The alternative design centered the door between bracketing side lights, and allows the transom system to go across the storefront in plane with the face of the building. The owner also wants to build a chimney on the west side of the roof that masks a commercial exhaust vent. era.



The owner will be applying for a facade grant and perhaps a consulting grant (more will be known at the meeting).




1883 (earliest Sanborn Map)  
Post Office and Grocery




1887  
Grocery Now a part of the Waldron  
Block  
2nd floor Hall GAR and K of L


29



1892  
Grocery K of L Hall GAR



1898  
Grocery K of L Hall




1907  
Grocery



1913

Bazaar Hand printing



AX'S PLACE

Expert Hand Washing

Central Rugs

LUXURY ADDRESS SERVICE  
FREE DELIVERY • 3746 601/618


Appraisal

EXTENTS OF NEW GLAZING TO BE @  
THE BTM. OF EXIST. STL. BEAM

11/ ADA ACCESSIBLE CONC.  
RAMP TO EXIST. FIN. FLR.

*Fiber  
concrete*

PROPOSED AREA OF RENOVATION



EXIST. UPPER LVL.  
ROOF TO REMAIN

EXIST. BRICK BAND  
COURSING TO REMAIN

EXIST. WHITE PAINTED  
BRICK TO REMAIN

EXIST. UPPER LVL.  
WDW'S. TO BE REMOVED

EXIST. PAINTED WD.  
ARCHITECTURAL TRIM &  
BRACKETS TO REMAIN

EXIST. PAINTED WD.  
ARCHITECTURAL TRIM  
TO REMAIN

EXIST. WD. PANEL  
TO BE REMOVED

EXIST. BRICK  
PILASTERS  
TO REMAIN

EXIST. LOWER LVL.  
WINDOWS & BRICK SILL  
TO BE REMOVED

EXIST. BRICK TO BE REMOV  
NEW STOREFRONT SYSTEM /

EXIST. EXTERIOR MTD.  
LIGHT TO REMAIN


EXISTING

EXIST. WD. DOOR &  
SURROUND TO BE  
REMOVED

EXIST. CONC. RAMP  
& MTL. HANDRAILS  
TO BE REMOVED

28

PROPOSED AREA OF RENOVATION



NEW WD. FRAMED STOREFRONT SYSTEM  
W/ SHADOW BOX PANELS @ BASE.  
EXTENTS OF NEW GLAZING TO BE @  
THE BTM. OF EXIST. STL. BEAM

NEW RECESSED COVERED ENTRY  
W/ ADA ACCESSIBLE CONC.  
RAMP TO EXIST. FIN. FLR.



29

Fiber  
vent

NEIGHBORING STRUCTURE (N.I.C.)

PROPOSED AREA OF RENOVATION


NEW CHIMNEY



RESTORED BRICK ARCH (TYP.)

NEW ENERGY EFFICIENT  
DEL. HUNG WINDOWS IN  
EXIST. OPENINGS (TYP.)


REPAIR EXIST. WOV.  
SURROUND & SILL AS REQ'D.




NEW RECESSED COVERED ENTRY  
W/ ADA ACCESSIBLE CONC.  
RAMP TO EXIST. FR. FLR.

NEW WD. FRAMED STOREFRONT SYSTEM  
W/ SHADOW BOX PANELS @ BASE.  
EXTENTS OF NEW GLAZING TO BE @  
THE BOT. OF EXIST. STL. BEAM

OPTION #4







STONES MEDA

33