BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION Showers City Hall McCloskey Room Thursday October 26, 2017 5:00 P.M. MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman, Jeff Goldin called meeting to order at 5:00pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Flavia Burrell Jeannine Butler Sam DeSollar Jeff Goldin Lee Sandweiss

Advisory

Duncan Campbell – arrived @ 5:30pm.

Staff

Rachel Ellenson Alison Kimmel Philippa Guthrie Eric Sader Adam Wasson Brian Payne

Guests

Jason Banach Steve Riggins Steve Wyatt Nicholas Carder Allen Yoder Barre Klapper Mike Shively

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 12, 2017

Sam DeSollar approved October 12, 2017 minutes. Lee Sandweiss seconded. Motion carried 4/0/1 (Yes/No/Abstain).

IV. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Staff Review
NONE
Commission Review
A. COA 17-78
210 W. 4th Street: Courthouse Square
Petitioner: Stardust Development, LLC
Installation of a custom access door on the second-story West wall of 214 W. 4th Street and removal
of a portion of the existing door to allow for new flashing and a roof membrane.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.

Sam DeSollar asked if the new fiberglass door was going to be flush. The petitioner stated it would be a flush door, painted to match what is currently there.

Jeannine Butler made a motion to approve COA-17-78. Sam DeSollar seconded. Motion carried 5/0/0.

B. COA 17-77
209 S. Dunn Street: Restaurant Row
Petitioner: City of Bloomington Public Works
Removal of pioneer sidewalk by Bloomington Restorations, Inc. (BRI) and relocation to BRI's Hinkle-Garton Farmstead.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.

Adam Wason explained the sidewalk does not meet ADA compliance. His hopes are to preserve the stones by having BRI move them to the Hinkle Garden Farmstead.

Eric Sader commented that a complaint through the city's uReport system has also been received regarding the sidewalk. He mentioned this petition is not solely derived from the city but also IU.

Flavia Burrell asked if there is a specific procedure for removing the stones. **Jason Banach** stated Indiana University has offered to remove the stones at the University's expense. BRI will be supervising the removal. The stones will then be shipped to Hinkle Garden.

Lee Sandweiss asked if they have identified a spot at Hinkle Garden where the sidewalk will be installed. Steve Wyatt stated they have not committed to putting the sidewalk back the exact same way as it lays now. There is a fieldstone sidewalk around a barn that is missing sections and this

sidewalk could help supplement or complete the sidewalk that is currently there. It might also be used as a patio off the sunroom on the farm house. **Lee Sandweiss** asked if there would be some sort of interpretation for the public to know this was the 209 S. Dunn Street sidewalk. **Steve Wyatt** replied, yes.

Sam DeSollar asked if the public works department first initiated this request to remove the sidewalk. Adam Wason stated it came from the University after they purchased the property. Jason Banach stated he contacted public works because the sidewalk is a safety issue. The University needed to know if it was their responsibility to fix or the city's. After discovering it is the adjacent property owner's responsibility to maintain their sidewalk (in this case the University), but that the technical property owner for filing a COA is the City, they ended up with the COA application from the City. He stated that leaving it in place creates a liability for the University and the City. They also looked to see if the sidewalk could be made ADA compliant in its current state and they could not figure out a way to do that.

Sam DeSollar asked staff why they were in support of the COA. **Rachel Ellenson** commented this seemed to be the best compromise, although she would be in support of other ideas to allow the sidewalk to stay. She did not want the stones to end up in a landfill.

Jeannine Butler expressed her concern with the sidewalk not being reinstalled at the Hinkle Garden farmstead in the same form it is now. Once you move it, the sidewalk loses its historic integrity.

Flavia Burrell asked if the sidewalk would be placed back in the exact same pattern. **Steve Wyatt** stated their plan is to number the stones and photograph them so they would be able to see how it was set at the original location, but they do not have a plan to do a straight 56' sidewalk in the same layout as now.

Sam DeSollar stated if you take the sidewalk out of its original context, they're just a bunch of rocks. Even if someone takes the stones and makes an exact replica of the sidewalk, it is still just a bunch of rocks. ADA was in effect in 1993 when the stones were re-set by BRI, therefore he would argue there needs to be better signage. There's a balance between public safety and history and he would argue this would not pose significant danger with adequate signage.

Lee Sandweiss commented she would be a lot more comfortable approving the COA if she knew where it would go and what it would look like.

Jeff Goldin stated the sidewalk would not have the same significance if moved, but with proper removal and installation the memory of the resource could be retained.

Jason Banach commented Indiana University is not obligated to preserve this asset. They are attempting to go about this process in an appropriate fashion, but if the COA is denied, he cannot guarantee the future of the sidewalk.

Jeannine Butler commented she would be more likely to approve the application if BRI could guarantee it would be moved and resituated in the exact form it is in now.

Steve Wyatt stated he cannot speak for BRI because they make decisions as a committee.

Adam Wason asked the commission if they would be interested in looking for an alternative spot for the sidewalk such as a public park.

Duncan Campbell stated if you move the sidewalk it is just going to be a bunch of stones. He asked if there have been conversations for compromises regarding ADA regulations. There have been compromises made in the past for historic structures for building code and ADA regulations.

Adam Wason asked the commission whether if BRI guaranteed the replication of the 56' sidewalk at the farmstead they would be in support. The commissioners stated they could not speak for the members who were not in attendance.

Jeannine Butler made a motion to continue COA-17-77. Lee Sandweiss seconded. Motion carried 4/1/0 (Yes/No/Abstain).

C. COA 17-79

335 W. 11th Street (Showers Dimension Mill): Showers Brothers Furniture Complex Local Historic District / West Side National Register Historic District Petitioner: Craig McCormick (Blackline Studio) Requested approval of structural alterations to approved COA 17-08.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.

Duncan Campbell asked for clarification regarding an entry door under the stairs. Rachel Ellenson stated if it is possible to have an event space downstairs, there will be a set of double doors, if there is not room, it will be a single door for staff.

Duncan Campbell stated for the future, please include current elevations so the commission can see what is changing on the buildings.

Sam DeSollar commented he generally would like to see what exists, and what is going to be proposed with COA applications. There was a lot of conflicting information between the two designs.

Jeannine Butler made a motion to approve COA-17-79. Flavia Burrell seconded. Motion carried 5/0/0.

D. COA 17-80

722 W. 2nd Street: Greater Prospect Hill Petitioner: Allen Yoder, representing Mike Shively Architecture Demolition of a non-contributing structure and construction of a new, three-story mixed-use building.

COA 17-76 application withdrawn; resubmitted application COA 17-80.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.

Lee Sandweiss commented she appreciates the changes.

Sam DeSollar stated it is obvious the architect has made changes based on the previous comments and appreciates the changes made.

Jeannine Butler made a motion to approve COA 17-80. Sam DeSollar seconded. Motion carried 5/0/0.

E. COA 17-81

506 S. Ballantine Road: Elm Heights Petitioner: Henry R. Harbaugh Construction of a courtyard wall and a wood entry gate between the existing garage and the proposed wall. Removal and backfill of a portion of the existing concrete driveway and walls. COA 17-71 application withdrawn; resubmitted application COA 17-81.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.Duncan Campbell asked staff to clarify what would be happening in front of the garage door.Rachel Ellenson explained there will two terraces at 36 inches. The garage door will be replaced with a slider door. There will be infill around the terracing.

Barre Klapper explained the goal was to formalize the backyard. The backyard is currently taken up by a large concrete drive. The owner would like to make his yard more of a private courtyard by infilling the driveway and leaving the original garage door opening. The garage to the left would maintain two parking spaces.

Duncan Campbell asked if the wall was going to be split faced limestone or concrete. **Christina Kruger** stated it would be split faced limestone.

Duncan Campbell asked if the house was smooth or split faced limestone. **Henry Harbaugh** stated it is split faced.

Sam DeSollar asked if a guard rail would be required for the 6 foot drop. **Barre Klapper** stated there would be a thick 3 foot hedge around it. They would be willing to come back to the commission if the building department required a railing.

Sam DeSollar made a motion to approve COA 17-81. Jeannine Butler seconded. Motion carried 5/0/0.

V. DEMOLITION DELAY

Commission Review A. Demo Delay 17-18 113 E. 10th Street Petitioner: Anthony Vice, on behalf of Stardust Development, LLC Partial demolition and addition on the rear of the house that will entail opening a rear wall and adding on approximately 5 feet to the footprint.

Rachel Ellenson gave presentation. See packet for details.

Jeff Goldin waived the demolition delay waiting period for **Demo-Delay 17-18. Jeannine Butler** seconded. Motion carried 5/0/0.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Rachel Ellenson gave update on Batman House.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

Rachel Ellenson stated per the HPC's meeting guidelines, petitioners have to be present at the meetings during hearings on their petitions. At a recent meeting, a petitioner did not show and the HPC approved part of a COA request and denied another part. Staff proposes that the petitioner be given another hearing on the portion denied. Under the guidelines they are provided one additional meeting to show up. HPC agreed the petitioner will have its COA petition moved to the next meeting to give them a chance to appear.

IX. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

NONE

X. PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 6:45pm.