

# Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

## Meeting Minutes - October 10, 2024

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Commission Chair **John Saunders** at 5:00 p.m.

**Parties in Attendance** are listed below:

#### **Commissioners:**

Reynard Cross  
Bill Fulk  
Elizabeth Mitchell  
Marlene Newman  
John Saunders  
Daniel Schlegel

#### **Advisory Members:**

Jack Baker  
Karen Duffy  
Jeremy Hackerd

#### **Staff:**

Noah Sandweiss, HPC Program Mgr  
Anna Holms, Sr. Asst City Attorney  
Gabriel Holbrow, Zoning Planner  
Tonda Radewan, HAND staff

#### **Guests:**

Jeff Goldin, Petitioner  
Brad Hedrick, Petitioner  
John Kogge, Petitioner (owner)  
Mark Cornett, for Petitioner

#### **Public - In Person:**

Peter Dorfman, Near West Side  
Design Committee

#### **Public - Virtual via Zoom:**

Real Hue, for Petitioner Singh Gill  
iphone guest

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Reynard Cross** made a motion to approve the minutes from the **August 12, 2024** meeting, **Elizabeth Mitchell** seconded. **Motion carried 6-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain)

### CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)

#### Staff Review

#### **COA 24-37**

606 W Dodds St (McDoel HD)

Petitioner: Jeff Goldin

*Replacement of porch windows on 1925 Bungalow*

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation on petitioners' request to replace the metal storm windows on the enclosed front porch of this property, noting that it is a two story brick bungalow built in 1925 with a cross-gabled jerkinhead roof. The front porch had been a covered porch across the entire front of the house and was enclosed many years ago, with one half converted into a room, and the other half enclosed with metal storm windows only, which are ill-fitting and in poor condition. The petitioners' would like to retain this area as an enclosed porch and replace the metal storm windows with those with white vinyl frames, which are an improvement in both utility and appeal and would match the rest of the exterior windows. The proposed windows will be similar in size, custom made and are not significantly different in fenestration. No change is proposed for the front porch door. *Please see Meeting Packet for details.*

Sandweiss continued that in the McDoel Historic District anything other than the demolition or moving of a building or construction of a new addition or structure is generally decided at staff level, the porch on this house has long ago been enclosed with storm windows not original to the house, the proposed replacement windows would maintain the existing fenestration pattern on the sunroom portion of the porch and the selection of materials is acceptable by district guidelines. **Staff approves COA 24-37**

#### **COA 24-38**

124 N Walnut St (Old Faulkner Hotel, Courthouse Square HD)

Petitioner: Singh Gill

*Replacement awning on 1847 Federal style commercial building.*

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation on the petitioner's request, noting that the The Old Faulkner Hotel is the oldest remaining building on the square, the Hotel was built by Aquilla Rogers, one of the area's earliest settlers. The facade at ground level was significantly altered in the 1920s, although one historic store front is still visible, with marble and glass window displays. The simple cornice and Flemish bond brickwork are indicative of the Federal style. The petitioner is Singh Gill, has a representative attending on zoom, and is requesting installation of a new awning sign to replace the existing one on the facade of Amrit India Restaurant. *Please see Meeting Packet for details.*

Sandweiss added that the proposed awning matches the scale and proportions of the existing awning, which postdates major character-defining alterations made to the building made in the 1920s. The proposed design is simple, avoiding visual clutter and is similar in design, scale, and materials to other newer awnings found in the district. Also, as you can see in the meeting packet, the applicants have taken care to describe the installation process including repairs to holes made for the installation of the previous awning and the use of existing anchoring points. Because the proposed design is of lighter weight than the existing awning and will need fewer brackets to hold it in place so staff believes that it will place less strain on the building's brick walls. **Staff approves COA 24-38.**

## CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)

### Commission Review

#### COA 24-32

930 W 6th St (Near West Side HD)

Petitioner: Brad Hedrick

*Replacement of doors and windows, removal of chimneys and replacement of siding on gable porch on 1895 T-plan cottage.*

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation starting with background information noting that alterations were recently made to the front porch of this gabled-el cottage in the Near West Side Historic District without the receipt of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) including the removal of one of the front doors located on the porch-facing interior of the el, removal of windows, removal of two ridgeline chimney stacks, and replacement of the horizontal vinyl siding with vertical hardie board.

Sandweiss said that the petitioner is proposing to install two replacement doors with 2/2 glass panes covering the top two thirds to be placed in the locations of the unoriginal existing door and the removed door on the el, a printout of the proposed door is available. The petitioner is also proposing to replace the existing vinyl windows with new vinyl windows from the Pella 250 series of the same size and orientation. The petitioner would also like to retain the vertical hardie board installed on the porch and staff and the petitioner have discussed a 60 day compliance period. *Please see Meeting Packet for details.*

Sandweiss said that **staff recommends approval of two replacement doors, proposed replacement windows and removal of chimneys**, but recommends the replacement of board and batten siding on porch **with horizontal siding**. The proposed replacement windows would match the size and configuration of the previous replacement windows on the property. Sandweiss continued that the removal of chimneys or masonry is not treated individually in the district guidelines, but as the removal of historic material, and in previous reviews of the removal of unstable chimneys that are not character defining features in districts that do not recommend retention, city staff has historically recommended approval.

Sandweiss continued that doors with large windows are not unusual on contributing houses in the Near West Side Historic District, and the neighborhood design review committee Has not expressed objection to the choice of doors. He said that while the replacement of siding on the porch is a material improvement on the previous siding and the vertical orientation is limited to the shaded porch area, it is not recommended in district guidelines. He added that vertical siding on other houses in the district had been installed before the adoption of district guidelines. Per Sandweiss, the petitioner does not plan on replacing the horizontal vinyl siding in more visible portions of the house at this point, though if he does his stated material of choice would be with horizontal clapboard.

Petitioner Brad Hedrick added that he provided Noah Sandweiss with a printout of the proposed doors, is new to the COA process and wants to work with the Commission and the neighborhood and that he is open to recommendations.

**Commissioner Questions:**

- Reynard Cross asked for clarification on the changes that were made without the required COA and why the petitioner made these changes without one. Noah Sandweiss said these included the removal of doors, windows, chimney stacks and the change of siding on the porch. Petitioner Brad Hedrick said that he is new to renovating a house in downtown Bloomington, lives on the south side of Bloomington recently purchased the house, and his son, nieces and nephews are attending IU so the intention is to have an additional home. Hedrick said his understanding from previous communication with the City is that he could paint the house and make slight adjustments that weren't visibly noticeable. He said on the porch - my mistake and I'm just going to beg for forgiveness and I didn't realize that taking the door off was such an issue and he's fine with putting the door back on. Regarding the set-up of the porch, Hedrick said that compared to what the house looked like when he bought it 10 months ago there have been significant improvements and he is here today because he is now aware of the COA process and hopefully everything going forward is in compliance. Hedrick added that one of the windows was replaced because it was in complete disrepair and the others are falling apart and the sills are destroyed due to window A/C units.
- Reynard Cross asked the petitioner when he purchased the house 10 months ago if he was aware that the property is in a historic district. Brad Hedrick said that he was aware that it was a historic district but did not know all the details, the house was being rented at the time and his intention is to move forward on updates to the home in an appropriate manner.
- Elizabeth Mitchell asked the petitioner if he knew the history of the neighborhood and why it has been deemed a historic district. Petitioner Brad Hedrick responded that he didn't know complete details other than being homes of Shower's employees, has always liked the Near West Side neighborhood and the houses in it and that this house has a lot of issues that can be addressed.
- Elizabeth Mitchell asked what information regarding districts is provided by realtors. John Saunders answered that the realtor has to inform the buyer that the property is in a historic district, but not about the COA process involving approval from the HPC for any changes. Therefore it is up to the homeowner to educate themselves.
- Marleen Newman asked if it were possible for realtors to add this information on the listing with the property description listing. John Saunders provided info on what the realtors' responsibility is and discussion ensued on this topic.
- Daniel Schlegel asked for clarification on the staff and neighborhood design committee recommendations. Both said that they were in opposition to vertical siding.
- Karen Duffy (Advisory) asked the petitioner why the chimneys were removed. Petitioner Brad Hedrick responded that there were safety concerns due to the way they were either constructed in the 1900's or poorly repaired after that time.
- Reynard Cross asked for clarification if the chimneys were removed would have normally required a COA. Noah Sandweiss responded yes and would fall under the guideline removal of original material.

### **Commissioner Comments:**

- Bill Fulk told the petitioner he appreciated his participation with the HPC meeting and working with the neighborhood. Brad Hedrick responded that he has had several people in the neighborhood tell him that they are happy to see the property getting repaired and cleaned up.
- Reynard Cross said that he has a problem with retroactive COA's and does not feel they should be entertained at all, that ignorance of the regulations are no excuse, expressed frustration that owners purchasing in historic districts are not penalized in some way for moving forward on removal or repairs without following procedure and there isn't a process in place to inform buyers of their responsibilities. John Saunders suggested that these be a topic of discussion at the upcoming Commissioner Retreat.
- Elizabeth Mitchell commented that much of what Reynard Cross said makes sense and that the HPC often is being presented with retroactive COAs and Marleen Newman agreed that there should be effort put into finding a solution.
- Daniel Schlegel agreed that discussion at the retreat regarding the process would be good and that he appreciated the efforts of the petitioner and the info provided by Noah Sandweiss in the meeting packet and staff recommendation.
- Jeremy Hackerd (Advisory) said that he agreed with staff's recommendation.
- Karen Duffy (Advisory) said she would like the HPC to work further with the Planning Dept and realtors to provide better information to prospective buyers and for clarification from Noah Sandweiss regarding the chimneys, noting that they aren't character defining. Sandweiss responded that in past COAs chimney removal was approved by staff, especially in situations where the chimney was deemed unsafe or unstable and there aren't specific guidelines on their removal. Reynard Cross added that there should be a documented way to certify that the chimneys were unstable besides the word of the homeowner.
- Commission Chair John Saunders reiterated that this would be a good discussion topic for the upcoming HPC retreat and that he does not think it is appropriate to request that the petitioner put the chimneys back in.
- Karen Duffy (Advisory) commented to the petitioner that the neighborhood design committee did not agree with his choice of siding because of the mix of styles. Brad Hedrick responded that he is happy to work with the HPC on the change to the siding, he can provide pictures of the condition of the chimneys, that many of the houses in the neighborhood have had their chimneys removed and that he is making improvements to the property.
- Jack Baker (Advisory) commented that he thinks the issue of penalties that has been brought up is worth looking at and recommends that the Commissioners support the staff recommendation.
- John Saunders asked Anna Holmes, Sr. Asst Attorney, for her input regarding fines. Holmes responded that she would get something prepared for further discussion with the HPC on how that could work. Noah Sandweiss explained that typically there is a Notice of Violation issued, then either the changes are reverted or a retroactive COA is applied for. If neither of these happen, that is when a fine is issued. Anna Holmes added that the issuance of a fine is at the discretion of the Legal Department and HAND Director, not the HPC.

**Bill Fulk** made a **motion to approve COA 24-32 as recommended by staff.**  
**Daniel Schlegel** seconded. **Motion carried 4-2-0** (Yes-No-Abstain)

### **COA 24-34**

701 W 4th St (Greater Prospect Hill HD)

Petitioner Dennis Burch

*Construction of front additions and open front porch on 1935 American Small House.*

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation on petitioners' request for construction of a 156sqft front addition and front porch on a slightly altered minimal-traditional 1935 house with a small 1950s addition added to the southwest ell. The house is several decades younger than most its neighbors on 4th Street, and sits on a lot at the base of a hill ascending Fairview Street. Sandweiss noted that COA 24-34 came to the HPC on September 26th, 2024, and received conditional approval for a side addition and a garage/ADU. Further conversation following the vote demonstrated that there was general support for the proposed front addition and mixed support for the proposed front porch, which he had reservations about because of the front addition. *See Meeting Packet for details.*

Noah Sandweiss said after further consideration, he feels that the proposed front addition closely mimics the historic minimal façade. Sandweiss added that he does not believe that the proposed porch would have an excessive impact on the mass or primary façade, it reflects a similar scale and sense of entry to that of porches on surrounding buildings and while the proposed porch doesn't reflect the style typical of minimal 1930s houses, it is sympathetic to the neighborhood and staff believes it meets district guidelines. Sandweiss said that both proposed additions have received a positive reception from neighborhood residents and that he **recommends this approval of front addition and porch for COA 24-34 as an amendment.**

### **Commissioner Questions:**

- Jack Baker (Advisory Member) asked for clarification that the front of the house is being pulled out approx 6 feet across the entire width of the house and then the porch is pulled out from that addition, therefore the 156sqft is the pull out of the 6x26 room. Noah Sandweiss responded that this is correct.

### **Commissioner Comments:**

- Jack Baker (Advisory Member) commented that it is curious that the house is listed as a 1930s minimal house and understands that the style of the house is being changed, but since the present house doesn't have much of a presence or show much style and the proposed additions have a style that is similar to what is in the neighborhood, he doesn't have a problem with staff's recommendation.
- Marleen Newman asked if the petitioner is required to get a zoning variance. Gabriel Holbrow, Zoning Planner, affirmed that the proposal would require a variance due to being a corner lot with frontages on Fairview and Fourth St. where a 15ft setback is required for both and a relatively small area of the proposed addition on the north side does not meet the setback standards and that among the criteria for zoning variances are that the proposed would not be injurious to the community or neighboring properties. Holbrow added that the HPC certainly has expertise in the

area of design and fit into the neighborhood and suggested to the Commission that if they chose to deny they may want to add comments on how it did not meet the zoning criteria and if they chose to approve, they might want to add comments that could be forwarded to the BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) about how the proposal does meet into the character of the neighborhood.

- Marleen Newman commented that she thinks that the house has a modernist style, defined by the minimal plain facade, and the HPC needs to start thinking about the effect of proposals drastically changing the style of a house to something that it was never meant to be, and if neighborhood fit can be reduced simply to scale. Newman continued that the Board has to decide if they value this characteristic (modernism).
- Jeremy Hackerd (Advisory) said that he agreed with staff's recommendation.
- Karen Duffy (Advisory) said that she too would support this if she were a voting member and advised the commissioners to vote in support of staff's recommendation.

Mark Cornett (MCA Architects) for the petitioner, reiterated that his clients, John and Heather Kogge, have shared with the HPC why they wanted to live in the neighborhood and the improvements they wanted for their home, including utilizing the porch and front yard area to better interact with their neighbors.

- Reynard Cross asked Mark Cornett to address Marleen Newman's comments regarding changing the modernist style of the house and asked why wasn't a more appropriate style to the neighborhood used to design the porch addition, that meets the owner's needs and is within the guidelines of the historic district.
- Mark Cornett responded that when he is hired by a client he determines what their needs and desires are for the use of the house, and this is what the owner wanted.
- John Saunders asked about the aluminum awning to confirm that it is not part of the roof of the house. Mark Cornett confirmed that the awning is not part of the roof structure and his clients are wanting to use the porch without the aluminum awning.
- John Kogge, homeowner, said that the existing porch and concrete steps are crumbling, the iron rail is barely hanging on and the hipped roof is short and very shallow so something has to be done to be able to hook on to it. Kogge added that this is the first time he has ever heard the term "modernist" and he has a book of arts and crafts houses with a picture that looks exactly like his house in it.
- John added that previously his wife Heather Kogge approached a member(s) of the HPC asking for recommendations, since their submitted proposal was not approved, and was not provided with any guidance or suggestions.

Noah Sandweiss commented that these FHA (Federal Housing Administration) minimal houses have a transitional style that borrows from traditional styles, being a modern more minimal take on them, which is difficult to design for. Sandweiss said that many of them don't have porches, just an awning or a portico, and when he looks at the guidelines which say that porches should be of a style appropriate to the house or street scape there basically are two options, what is seen on the existing house which precludes the possibility of a porch, and the proposed porch, which is sympathetic to the neighborhood. Sandweiss added that it's clearly not the original house, it's not an arts and crafts house, it doesn't create a false sense of history or obscure the facade and the addition that is being proposed is simply an

extension of the facade that exists there. Sandweiss concluded that given the feedback from the neighborhood and his reading of the guidelines, **the porch as proposed is appropriate.**

- Marleen Newman commented that as a committee the HPC needs to make a distinction between a house that is contributing, since once the work as proposed is done it will mimic the style of the neighboring houses but will no longer be designated as a contributing building.
- Reynard Cross reminded that the same question/concern was brought up by Sam DeSollar at the prior HPC meeting and wanted to formally ask what is the position about making a change to a contributing house that, having made the change, the house would no longer be contributing. Are we (the HPC) deliberately removing a contributing structure from a historic district by a decision made by the commission and therefore making it less historic? Cross said he thinks he has a problem with that.
- Marleen Newman said that a lot of buildings have additions and you don't want a building or neighborhood to be frozen in time, because that is what makes neighborhoods grow and look different and/or better. She asked how does the HPC deal with change? Newman added in this particular case she thinks what is being proposed looks really nice, however the HPC needs to consider the statement being made about this house and that it should be considered non-contributing.
- Bill Fulk commented that he thinks that Marleen Newman is making a very valid comment about this particular home and that the frustration that the HPC is feeling today is related to the transitional time we are in, especially in older neighborhoods, where the houses need to change in a certain manner for people today to live in them. Fulk said that is the conflict that we are living in and suggested building sub-guidelines that give the HPC more direction. Fulk added that what the HPC doesn't want to do is to penalize the homeowners, who are trying to do their best efforts, when perhaps the HPC has guidelines that haven't kept up with the times.
- Bill Fulk said that he thinks what is being presented by the petitioner radically changes the house, fits into the neighborhood pretty good and meets the needs of the homeowner. Fulk added that the HPC needs to be homeowner friendly and provide them with recommendations but to also keep in mind that if the HPC approves this COA it will no longer be a contributing home, however based on the neighborhood and the limited desirability of the footprint he can support staff's recommendation. Fulk added that regarding retroactive COAs, he believes that this likely is always going to occur and the homeowner has plenty of information to recognize that the property is in a historic area, but they may not know the degree to which they have to comply with the neighborhood guidelines. Also, if a structure or part of a structure is a (safety) threat to the house or people and is dangerous, there is a potential issue of liability if the HPC says that removal/repair can't be addressed so there need to be some boundaries and guidance in place with more detail.
- Reynard Cross commented that if the HPC makes incremental changes for one particular house, then perhaps the house next door proposes a change that makes sense and is approved and then later one across the street, before you know it the neighborhood will no longer be a historic district based on the criteria that was used to elevate it. Cross said that it is the HPCs mission to guard against this and asked for an answer to his original question if the HPC has the authority to approve a change that would deem a house as non-contributing structure. He said it makes no sense.

- Commission Chair John Saunders said that he feels that the HPC does this already, that each case is determined individually and there have been several proposals that have not been approved by the Commission.
- Marleen Newman said that if you look at the history of historic preservation, this is essentially facadism which would render the building as non-contributing.
- Elizabeth Mitchell asked for an answer to the question that Reynard Cross posed. Noah Sandweiss responded that this is a minimal traditionalist building with a front addition that essentially maintains the style of the house.
- Reynard Cross suggested tabling the proposed COA until the next meeting to allow more time to research the issue and answer his question. Noah Sandweiss suggested that the HPC make a decision on the front addition if the opposition is limited to the front porch design. Cross asked why the front porch has been re-submitted as is, without any design changes, if it was not approved at the prior meeting. Sandweiss replied that though it has not ever happened before, he changed his mind after having more conversations with members of the HPC and the neighborhood who asserted that the proposed build is going to be an extension of what is already there and is in keeping with the original design of the house. Sandweiss added that with these minimal traditional houses, the detail that you have is the fenestration and perhaps the type of siding therefore the proposed front addition would be appropriate and not significantly alter the building.

#### **Public Comments:**

- Jeff Goldin (public) stated that he was a former 8 year member of the HPC with five years serving as the Commission Chair and that he was one of the original framers of the Prospect Hill Historic District guidelines. Goldin pointed out that the neighborhood was automatically elevated from a conservation district, not by the choice of the neighborhood but by state law, and that their guidelines were purposefully left very vague because they wanted to keep the feel of the neighborhood as “historic light” which would allow it to grow so families would move there and stay. Goldin said that this kind of change is acceptable and that context is important and this proposed addition fits.

*Note: Commissioner Daniel Schlegel needed to leave at 6pm.*

#### **Commissioner Comments & Questions (continued):**

- John Saunders reminded the Commissioners that some of the neighborhoods did not want to be elevated to historic district status and because of the elevation the HPC is put in the position of limiting what happens. In this case it appears there is support from the neighborhood.
- Reynard Cross commented that he follows the parameters of the guidelines when voting, even in situations where he may desire to vote differently, and that he doesn't feel that much of what has been presented is not relevant here. Jeff Goldin pointed out that guidelines are not laws.
- Reynard Cross asked again if the HPC can make a decision to approve an addition to a building which is contributing and, by that approval, make that building

non-contributing. Bill Fulk and John Saunders responded yes the HPC can. Noah Sandweiss said there is no restriction and the HPC can do that. *Discussion ensued.*

- Jeremy Hackerd (Advisory) asked Noah Sandweiss if the proposal meets the neighborhood guidelines and adheres to the City's criteria. Sandweiss answered that the applicants followed the process, the proposal meets the district guidelines and although he has personal reservations about changing a contributing building to non-contributing, from his reading of the guidelines and the neighborhood feedback, which he takes very seriously, which is what he is basing his judgment on.
- Bill Fulk reiterated Sandweiss' comment that the neighborhood is receptive to the proposed changes. Reynard Cross countered that one or two people from the neighborhood speaking in favor is not as relevant as a change to the guidelines taking place through a prescribed process. Bill Fulk responded that if there were parties in opposition from the neighborhood they should have shown up to express their views.
- Marleen Newman brought up federal guidelines, the Secretary of the Interior standards, which affects how many view historic preservation, and though she doesn't have any problems with the project she is troubled by the decision which would take a contributing building that has a style, and puts a coating around it that will change it forever.
- Noah Sandweiss checked in with the Commissioners if they had any opposition to the front addition. Reynard Cross said that there was an objection to the front addition at the last meeting. Karen Duffy recalled that at the time the front addition was not voted on in hopes that the petitioner would come back with a different design.  
*Discussion on this topic continued among the Commissioners and staff.*

**Bill Fulk** made a motion to approve amended COA 24-34 as recommended by staff for the proposed front addition and porch. **John Saunders** seconded. **The vote was 2-1-2** (Yes-No-Abstain) **therefore it does not carry.**

- Noah Sandweiss confirmed that the Motion did not pass, however it was not rejected.
- Anna Holmes referred to Robert's Rules noting that an abstention doesn't count in either direction, therefore if you don't have enough votes to sustain the motion (the majority of the quorum) then it doesn't pass.
- Reynard Cross asked how much time was left on the COA. Noah Sandweiss said that it lasts for 30 days from the time that it was originally suggested.
- Reynard Cross said that there are many unanswered questions, he is not going to advise that anyone spends more money to change any plans, has asked for information that is important in his decision making and he needs an answer before he can vote. Since he has not received an answer that satisfies him he would like to have this matter tabled and would have conversations with HPC's legal advisor and staff to try and get an answer to his question.

**Bill Fulk** made a motion to approve amended COA 24-34 for the proposed front addition, minus the porch, with the architect to work with staff and members of the Commission to recommend a design for the front porch that would be brought back to a future HPC meeting for consideration and approval. **John Saunders** seconded. **The Motion carried 3-2-0** (Yes-No-Abstain) with Marleen Newman noting that the only reason she is voting No is because she wants the roof issue to be addressed.

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

### **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

There was additional discussion between the Commissioners about concerns brought up in this and prior meetings and what topics should be addressed in their upcoming Retreat.

*Commissioner Jeremy Hackerd left at 6:59pm*

*Commissioner Elizabeth Mitchell left at 7:03pm.*

The Commissioners also discussed a mechanism to either meet or communicate prior to the Retreat taking place, especially in matters of urgency, that doesn't violate Indiana's Open Door law. Anna Holmes provided info on what types of communication are acceptable and which ones are in violation.

Commissioner Reynard Cross wanted it on the record that he had a Motion on the table which was shut down by another member of the Commission and he objects to the manner in which the situation was handled. He also asked where is the appropriate forum to have HPC procedural related discussions, if not at these public commission meetings.

Discussion also ensued about the mission and responsibility of the HPC related to homeowners expectations and cost burden and considerations regarding adding to available housing stock and affordability.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A representative from Real Hue (virtual) asked about the status of COA 24-38 on behalf of Petitioner Singh Gill. Noah Sandweiss informed her that the request was approved.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**John Saunders** adjourned the meeting at **7:29pm**

**A video record of this meeting is available on the City of  
Bloomington YouTube Channel**

[https://www.youtube.com/@city\\_bloomington](https://www.youtube.com/@city_bloomington)

**For a transcript click on "videos" select more and then "show transcript"**

**Cats - Community Access Television Services**

<https://catstv.net/m.php?q=13886>

The next regular meeting date of the HPC is Thursday October 24, 2024 at 5:00 P.M. and will be held in a hybrid manner, both in person and via Zoom.

More information about the Historic Preservation Commission can be found here:  
<https://bloomington.in.gov/boards/historic-preservation>