



**CITY OF
BLOOMINGTON**
HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

BHPC MEETING PACKET

Thursday September 12, 2024

5:00 p.m. EST

Prepared by HAND Staff

In Person: The McCloskey Room, 401 N Morton St., Ste. 135, Bloomington, IN 47404

Zoom:

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/87295899942?pwd=6FYydXbP1RHiIcbZ4akob3cms8WeZV.1>

[Meeting ID: 872 9589 9942](#)

[Passcode: 834895](#)

Table of Contents

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| AGENDA | 4 |
| MINUTES August 8 | 6 |
| COA 24-32..... | 15 |

Accessibility Statement

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals.

If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact Anna Killion-Hanson at the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department at anna.killionhanson@bloomington.in.gov or 813-349-3582 and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with.

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call 812-349-3429 or email, human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Thursday September 12th, 2024, 5:00 P.M.

In Person:

The McCloskey Room, 401 N Morton St., Ste. 135, Bloomington, IN 47404

Zoom: [Housing & Neighborhood Development is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.](#)

[Topic: Historic Preservation Commission Meeting](#)

[Time: Sep 12, 2024 05:00 PM Eastern Time \(US and Canada\)](#)

[Join Zoom Meeting](#)

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/87295899942?pwd=6FYydXbP1RHiIcbZ4akob3cms8WeZV.1>

[Meeting ID: 872 9589 9942](#)

[Passcode: 834895](#)

AGENDA

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact Anna Killion-Hanson at the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department at anna.killionhanson@bloomington.in.gov or 812-349-3577 and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with. Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call 812-349-3429 or email human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. Aug 8th**
- IV. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Commission Review

A. COA 24-32

930 W 6th St (Near West Side HD)

Petitioner Brad Hedrick

Replacement of doors on gabled el and replacement of siding on gable porch

- V. NEW BUSINESS**
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**

- VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Next meeting date is September 26th, 2024 at 5:00 P.M. and will be held in a hybrid manner, both in person and via Zoom.

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes - August 8, 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:

Ernesto Castaneda
Reynard Cross
Sam DeSoller
Bill Fulk
Elizabeth Mitchell
John Saunders
Daniel Schlegal

Advisory Members:

Jack Baker
Duncan Campbell
Karen Duffy

Staff:

Noah Sandweiss, HPC Program Mgr
Anna Killion-Hanson, HAND Director
Margie Rice, Corporation Counsel
Anna Holmes, Asst City Attorney (Virtual)
Gabriel Holbrow, Zoning Planner
Tonda Radewan, HAND staff

Guests:

Jay Kincaid
Barre Klapper
Margaret Key (Virtual)

Public:

Sarah Alexander
Lois Sabo-Skelton
Dave Askins/B Square Bulletin
Wendy Daulet (Virtual)
Jim Bohrer (Virtual)
Caylan Evans (Virtual)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review & Approval of July 25th minutes will take place at the Aug 22nd meeting.

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA)

COA 24-27

723 W 9th St (Near West Side HD)

Petitioner: Karen Duffy

Removal of tree in back yard

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation recommending approval for the removal of a large silver maple on the SE corner of the lot due to concern for a hollowed out central limb that an arborist from Blue Stone has viewed and predicted will fall on a close-by historic structure. As the Near West Side Historic guidelines apply and the tree is not in the street facing yard, **staff recommends approval of COA 24-27.**

COA 24-28

523 W. 7th Street (Near West Side HD)

Petitioner: John and Jennifer Kincaid

New construction of a house with an attached garage on an empty lot

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation of proposed new construction in the Near West Side Historic District on an empty lot bordered by a double-pen house on one side and a church parking lot on the other side, noting that two-story houses with large footprints pose design challenges which he believes the architect has addressed. He stated that although taller than the house next door, the proposed construction has a further setback from the street without being uncharacteristically distant, the attached garage is differentiated from the side of the house by a porch and protruding bay on the south end of the garage and is stylistically consistent with street facing fenestration and roof line. Sandweiss said that the applicants propose to use materials that meet District recommendations including wood posts and railings, hardie board siding and rusticated or stucco cement block foundation. *(see BHPC meeting packet for additional details).* **Staff is recommending approval of COA 24-28.**

Questions:

- Jack Baker inquired of the Commissioners if they have been in a situation where they think that a house is too large for the neighborhood, compared to nearby houses, and asked for info on square footage. Noah Sandweiss responded that the main floor is 1,911, there is a 482 front porch and the garage is 669 square feet. He added that the neighborhood Design Review Committee didn't express objections to the design but they had some questions about materials used. Karen Duffy said that she is on that committee and a number of people thought the proposed design was too large but as far as their guidelines go, if the design is approved by planning then it's okay and added that at least one member brought up that there is a school and church nearby, which are large buildings.
- Elizabeth Mitchell commented that she understands that the church and school are bigger but it seems that the house is out of character with history of the district and the size overshadows the neighborhood.
- Reynard Cross asked a question about the neighborhood guidelines regarding mass. Noah Sandweiss responded that he felt the design is appropriate is

because the areas that are viewable from the public right-of-way create two distinct blocks that give the effect of a house that's somewhat large for the neighborhood attached to a fairly standard sized garage for the neighborhood.

- Reynard Cross asked about district recommendations about housing height and setback from the street. Noah Sandweiss responded that the recommendation is that the setback be based on the adjacent houses and relative to building height which suggests that a new house that is taller than the house next to it should be set further back from the property line than existing houses.
- Ernesto Castaneda asked if the petitioner documented the location of existing trees and are there any trees being cut down to provide a place for this house to be built. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded "No".
- Sam DeSollar asked for more info on the proposed siding reveal and windows. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that they will probably use hardie board shingle gable with likely a 6 inch lap , but would do 4 inch lap if it needs to be. He also said that the proposal process didn't ask for this much info on the materials and they thought they met the Commission's criteria.
- Sam DeSollar asked if a decision has been made about windows (either Andersons - vinyl or Marvin - fiberglass including grill options and if the foundation will be stucco or split face block. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that their general contractor recommends Marvin, but that he hasn't yet decided on grill options for the four-pane windows and they are looking at manufactured stone that looks like rough-cut limestone for the foundation.
- Sam DeSollar asked questions about the porch construction. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that there will be a slab for the porch floor, veneer columns with a limestone cap and the rails will be wood, likely cedar.
- Sam DeSollar asked how far back the front of the porch is relative to the house next door. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that the adjacent house's front porch is 10 ft off of the sidewalk and the proposed construction is pretty close maybe 11 feet. He also said that they have worked really hard to design a house that meets the requirements, are downsizing from where they had been in Bloomington and want to live in this neighborhood for its diversity.

Comments:

- Jack Baker commented that if he were voting he would follow recommendations from staff.
- Bill Fulk said that he appreciated the detail provided by the petitioner and although it is a big house, it does fit into the neighborhood and that there were no concerns expressed by Peter Dorfman who represents the committee in that area.
- Reynard Cross commented that he is uncomfortable with the COA and feels he is being asked to make exceptions regarding mass, height and setback to make something fit that probably shouldn't.
 - Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that he has met with City planning, read through HPC guidelines multiple times, reached out to neighborhood HOA and met every criteria that was put in front of them and are abiding by the rules given.
 - Corporate Counsel Margie Rice commented that she wanted to ensure that the HPC isn't moving outside their area of jurisdiction and asked if the zoning planner wanted to weigh in on their perspective.

- Zoning Planner Gabriel Holbrow said that it is his understanding that all of the setback distances are in compliance with the UDO. The impervious surface coverage standard is less than the maximum for this lot.
 - Margie Rice noted that these are not issues for the HPC to decide, those are planning issues and asked the petitioner about the conversations he had with planning. Jay Kincaid responded that per his meeting with planning and the HOA that they are meeting requirements, especially with taller buildings on some of the corner lots in the neighborhood.
- Reynard Cross had additional comments regarding the design of the garage.
- Karen Duffy commented that she is troubled by the attached garage and suggested a corridor attachment or connector hallway to break up the mass. Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that there is a connector porch with lattice that creates a break.
- Duncan Campbell explained that setback in historic buildings typically involve a second story being set back from the first story at the front of the house to diminish perception. He also said that he doesn't think height is an issue but perceives the difficulty is the perception of great length, especially on the other side where there is no break nor fenestration alteration.
- Noah Sandweiss explained that it is a corner lot and showed the proposed view from the house next door and what the view would be from the side alley as you drive down the street. Margie Rice reiterated some prior comments.
- Duncan Campbell further commented that there has been a struggle in the older neighborhoods in the community with infill, family demands plus aesthetic and livability demands which have increased the size of houses. The Commission has struggled with it in this neighborhood adding attached garages and additions making the houses bigger than the adjacent houses. One of the difficulties here is that this house is so exposed because it's next to a big parking lot in public view. He thinks the church and the size of the school across the street ameliorate or mitigate the size of the house and can see how this would work better on this lot than it would on just about any lot along Seventh St. He thinks the design could be done better as it exaggerates the length of the house.
- Ernesto Castaneda commented that at first he thought the house looked to big but after digging into the site plan, restrictions under the UDO and the neighborhood design guidelines he thinks it's going in the right direction, likes the design and it is something that is needed in this lot. He pointed out that this is a corner lot so the setback is a front setback, not a side setback, and that typically historic houses on corner lots are bigger and serve as a buffer for the smaller houses in between and the petitioners are taking on the duty of screening the view of the large parking lot for the rest of their neighbors. He said that in his opinion adding all the grills distracts from the actual elements of the architecture of the house, has no issue with the garage being attached and some people see it as a way of accessibility with wheelchairs as they think about aging in place.
- Sam DeSollar gave input to the petitioner on the format of the HPC meetings and said that he thinks he sees all the issues that he is trying to deal with and work within the neighborhood, that he is fan of wood porches and won't take issue with the brick since rusticated limestone will be everywhere else and said thanks for putting all this work in as it does show.
- Duncan Campbell advised the petitioner that there is a need to know exactly what the materials will be and that they should be communicated to staff subsequent to final approval.

- Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that there will be 6 inch reveal, smooth hardie board, window grills as drawn, the foundation will rusticated limestone except for brick veneer for the front porch. He stated that there have been many hurdles, they have put hours and tens of thousands of dollars in trying to make this fit, they are doing the best they can and it's disheartening to sit and listen to unneighborly criticism.
- Duncan Campbell responded that the commissioners are not neighbors and are here to evaluate and regulate additions into neighborhoods. They are design critics. He reiterated his question about the materials and providing an alternate possibility. If there are changes they need to be brought back to the commission for approval.
- Petitioner Jay Kincaid responded that he understands and has been through this process before and there are better ways than being in an adversarial role. He said that they have met with Noah and City Planning and followed the guidelines to the best of their knowledge and if the guidelines come into question, he can't fix that but will come back to the Commission with any changes.
- Reynard Cross commented that his real concern is somewhat in a policy direction regarding zoning issues and guidelines vs. HPC jurisdiction and guidelines. He suggested that the Commission revisit these and that this particular building may create a new precedent in the neighborhood that could continue to deviate from the historic guidelines.
- John Saunders noted that this issue may be a good topic for discussion at the Commissioners Retreat coming up in November and gave some other examples of proposed construction to look discuss.

William Fulk made a **motion to approve COA 24-28 as proposed.**
Daniel Schlegel seconded. **Motion carried 5-2-0** (Yes-No-Abstain)

COA 24-29

811 W 8th St (Near West Side HD)

Petitioner: Barre Klapper

One-story addition, changes in fenestration and construction of a rear garage.

Noah Sandweiss gave his presentation of proposed construction in the Near West Side Historic District to add a one-story 338 sq ft addition to the southwest end of the house opening on the east to an open 126 sq foot porch with an detached garage in the back yard that openings onto an alley. The materials would match the existing house. A casement window would be added (not visible to the public right-of-way) as well as adding additional casing around windows and doors. Part of the 6 ft rear privacy fence will have to be removed to make room for the detached garage and the gravel parking area will be returned to grass. Sandweiss noted that the neighborhood design committee had questions about the choice of shingles for the roof, but did not express any objections. *(see BHPC meeting packet for additional details).* **Staff is recommending approval of COA 24-29.**

Petitioner Barre Klapper added that **owner Margaret Key** reason for the proposal is to eventually have a bedroom on the first floor so she can age in place, as the existing bedrooms are either upstairs or in the basement and that she is attending the meeting via zoom and available for questions as well.

Questions: (None)

Comments:

- Jack Baker commented that it seemed like a reasonable small addition and a decent design and recommends going all with staff to approve.
- Ernesto Castenada said that he thinks it's great, promotes aging in place and is close to downtown.
- John Saunders said that he agrees with the Commissioners and doesn't have any additional comments.

Sam DeSollar made a **motion to approve COA 24-29 as proposed.**

Daniel Schlegel seconded. **Motion carried 7-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain)

Demolition Delays DD 24-14 through DD 24-18

2201 East 7th Street and 310, 314, 318 & 324 North Jefferson Street

Petitioner: Sable Beyers

Full Demolition of 5 properties within Green Acres neighborhood

Noah Sandweiss reported that there has been no new activity since the last HPC meeting. The five demolition delays at 2201 East 7th Street and 310, 314, 318 & 324 North Jefferson Street were previously extended for 30 days and expire on August 14, 2024.

He noted that the next agenda item regarding the proposed Green Acres Conservation District is related and asked if there were any questions or comments specific to the demolition delays.

Comments:

- Sarah Alexander (public) made comments in favor of releasing the demolition delays noting the housing shortage in Bloomington, the desire for low density housing especially in places close to the center of town, that this is an ideal location for more dense development because it's next to IU and would reduce commuting time and the amount of time the roads get driven on. She also said that her only objection would be if what was being built was one big house.
- Noah Sandweiss pointed out that a specific plan has not yet been provided by the petitioners and Corporate Counsel Margie Rice reiterated that the HPC is not supposed to consider future use in terms of their decision making.
- Sarah Alexander continued with a statement "I feel like the names of the Dead have been used to justify the curtailment of the future for the living. If every structure in Bloomington was sanctified just because of the same level of notable personages of the people who live there then I think that the whole city would cease to function as a living growing entity serving the people of today and tomorrow and would instead ossify into little more than a temple compound for the ghosts of the past." She also said that she feels that any objection to the demolishing of these houses is based fear of a large housing development similar to what is in the old Kmart location that is unfounded and misplaced.

Bill Fulk made a **motion to continue** the Demolition Delay discussion to the next HPC Meeting.

John Saunders seconded. **Motion carried 7-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain)

NEW BUSINESS - None

OLD BUSINESS

Green Acres Conservation District Vote Discussion

Noah Sandweiss provided information on the August 12, 2024 5pm special session of the HPC solely to discuss and vote on the application from petitioners for a Green Acres Conservation District noting that there will be an opportunity for the petitioner to present info then he will discuss his staff recommendation and there will be opportunities for questions and comments from the public, including over zoom, and then the vote will take place.

Sandweiss explained that the City sent out letters to property owners in the area and the responses will be included at the upcoming meeting. In addition to the petition submitted which has 73 signatures (25 from renters and 48 from homeowners in the neighborhood representing 59 households, of which 38 are owner occupied) he has received two emails from residents and four from other property owners expressing their objection to the proposed Conservation District, as well as a uReport attached in this meeting packet addressed to the Commission. Also received were two letters of objection earlier in the week, one representing the owner of 10 properties and another representing the owner of one property. These will be forwarded to the Commissioners by the end of the week along with any additional comments received. He anticipates there will be many participating, explained the difficulty in reserving a large enough meeting room and reminded that there will be an option to attend via zoom.

Questions:

- Wendy Daulet (public via zoom) said she had comments about delaying the demolition and asked if it was best to bring those up at the next meeting. Noah Sandweiss explained that the demolition delay on these houses is set to expire on August 14th so the special meeting requested on August 12th will give the Commission a chance to vote before the release of the demolition delay. The zoom link for that meeting was provided in the chat.
- Caylan Evans (public via zoom) with Bloom Design Build said three property owners within the proposed District have asked him to represent their interest in voicing their opposition before the meeting on Monday. Their concerns include why the commission is rushing to a vote when his understanding is that once the petition for a Conservation District is received there are 90 days for the Commission to consider on the petition before a vote takes place. Evans said that if the petition was received just a little over a week ago and the agenda already been set, it seems to suggest a vote is going to be put forth on this matter next Monday when the petition hasn't even been heard yet. He asked what the urgency is for an immediate vote on this District when there hasn't been any dialogue.
- Noah Sandweiss explained that there is 90 days for the demolition delay that can be extended by maximum of 30 days, which this one was. Also there is a deadline for submission of HPC meeting agenda items that is 14 days before a meeting.
- Margie Rice noted that there may be confusion between the demo delay and the neighborhood vote. Bill Fulk explained that the vote on August 12th is about the Conservation District petition moving on to City Council for consideration and that the demolition delays will expire on August 14th and be automatically released so that's what is forcing a vote on these in such speedy fashion on the 12th.

- John Saunders pointed out that Green Acres have had three meetings that were advertised and all three gentlemen (that Evans is representing) have had a chance to attend those meetings and express their concerns.
- Caylan Evans responded that it is troubling that the HPC has not heard the petition yet for this sizable district of 450 total properties that are potentially impacted here and a vote has basically already been set in place, even requiring a special meeting with such urgency that this has to be resolved, when there is so much to consider here. He said he thinks it's clear is that the District vote is being used as a means to block these five demo delays that have been on the table for almost 120 days now and once again they have just been continued. Evans referenced The Graduate Hotel's petition to be considered a Historic District pointing out that they were derided for bringing the petition and was told their action was offensive, insulting and disingenuous and that he thinks the scale of this neighborhood vote is 100 times the scale of that property and rushing to vote as a means to block five demo delays is much more disingenuous, offensive and insulting.
- John Saunders said that when the neighborhood learned about the demolition of those houses they came to the HPC asking for help and there have been numerous opportunities for others to speak about their objections as this topic has been going on for a while. He continued that he doesn't think the HPC is rushing and is moving forward with what the originators in the neighborhood have asked us to do.
- Reynard Cross asked how many meetings have we had since this issue was brought before the HPC and, after noting that there have been four or five, commented that the vote is not being rushed.
- Caylan Evans commented that by looking at the breakdown of the neighborhoods he thinks that 450 total properties are in question and based on communications with Noah, one property is classified as outstanding, five are classified as notable, 189 are classified as contributing, 11 are non-contributing and 244 have not actually had any survey. He said that for this body (the HPC) to look at creating the proposed District, the burden should be on the HPC and the petitioners calling for the district to highlight the architectural or historical significance of these properties. Evans pointed out that the majority of the homes haven't even been surveyed so how can it be determined what is architecturally significant.
- Noah Sandweiss said that he spoke with Steve Wyatt who conducted the survey commissioned by the City and carried out by Bloomington Restorations, Inc in 2018 who said he picked out a representation of houses that he considered contributing or potentially contributing from the postwar period as an indication of what is there. He said that that we don't have complete information on the entirety of the district and a lot will be based on the evidence that we have, like a drive-thru history of the neighborhood, and an important thing to consider is demonstrated by the survey that we have. Sandweiss said he spoke with two of his predecessors to check their opinions and both believe that the proposed District may be eligible. He added that the area has not been brought to the Commission before, nor has it been intensively studied, but it's one that we've had some time to consider. He pointed out that the topics are going to come up again on Monday, that there will be a reading of the application so you know all reasonable points to consider and you know there has been thought going into this.
- Caylan Evans concluded that to already have decided that the vote will be taken before the petition has even been brought only works if the broader intention here is to block these demolition delays. The vote deserves thoughtful consideration as typically this body gives to any petition and strongly recommends more careful timely comprehensive consideration of this petition before rushing into a vote.

- John Saunders thanked Caylan Evans for his comments and urged that the people he is representing to come to the Monday August 12th meeting to speak.
- Dave Askins asked a question to get some clarity on the 90 day deadline that has been discussed previously during the meeting.
- Corporate Counsel Margie Rice read from City Code 8.08.010 A2 "Initiating A Historic District" and explained that there are two ways that this can happen. Based on its survey, the Commission can draw and submit historic district maps for Common Council approval OR owners of property, in fee simple, wishing to establish a historic district which includes their property may petition the commission to consider drawing and submitting a map of such district to the Common Council. If it goes the second approach, the Commission shall determine its recommendation within 90 days.
- Rice pointed out that we have two distinct issues going on - the demo delay and this petition for the establishment of a historic district that Caylan Evans alleges the HPC is conflating, that both are separate issues should be decided separately on their own merits. He believes the HPC is rushing on this vote so that the result of one matter affects this other. She said that these are thoughtful HPC members that will understand these are two separate issues and will decide on their merits and that the HPC is a recommending body and the decision ultimately goes to the Council. She doesn't think it's clear how the HPC is going to vote on either issue and that's up to the Commission to decide on Monday. There has been a lot of conversations and public meetings where these have been discussed and nothing is going on behind closed doors.
- Rice concluded by encouraging anybody who's concerned to show up on Monday August 14th at 5pm and that she is happy to answer any questions by calling the Legal Department at (812) 349-3426.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - None

PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

ADJOURNMENT

John Saunders adjourned the meeting at **6:43pm**

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

https://www.youtube.com/@city_bloomington

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

The special meeting date of the HPC to vote on Demolition Delays DD 24-14 through DD 24-18 and the proposed Green Acres Conservation District is Monday August 14, 2024 at 5:00 P.M. and will be held in a hybrid manner, both in person and via Zoom.

The next regular meeting date of the HPC is Thursday August 22nd, 2024 at 5:00 P.M. and will be held in a hybrid manner, both in person and via Zoom.

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS | Address: 930 W 6th St (Near West Side HD) |
| COA 24-32 | Petitioner: Brad Hedrick |
| Start Date: 8/26/2024 | Parcel: 53-05-32-409-044.000-005 |
| RATING: CONTRIBUTING | c. 1895 T plan cottage |



Background: 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 including the removal of one of the front doors located on the porch-facing interior of the el and replacement of the horizontal vinyl siding with vertical hardie board.

Request: The petitioner is proposing to install two replacement doors with 2/2 glass panes covering the top two thirds of in the locations of the unoriginal existing door and the removed door on the el. The petitioner would also like to retain the vertical hardie board installed on the porch. Staff and the petitioner have discussed a 60 day compliance period.

Guidelines: Near West Side

SIDING RECOMMENDED

1. Clapboard, fiber cement board, wood, decorative wood shingles, or brick when there is another brick structure on the block.
2. When cement fiber siding such as Hardie board is used to simulate wood clapboard siding, it should reflect the directional and dimensional characteristics found historically in the neighborhood. Products imitating the “grain” of wood are discouraged.
3. Efforts to maintain original materials are encouraged.

NOT RECOMMENDED

1. Asphalt shingles for walls.
2. Vinyl siding.
3. Siding products that imitate the “grain” of wood.
4. Vertically-oriented siding.
5. Metal siding

FENESTRATION RECOMMENDED

1. Creative ornamentation with fenestration is not precluded provided the result does not conflict with or draw attention from surrounding historic buildings.
2. Windows and doors should be arranged on the building so as not to conflict with the basic fenestration pattern in the area.
3. The basic proportions and distribution of glass to solid found on surrounding contributing buildings should be reflected in new construction.
4. Window openings should reflect the basic proportionality and directionality of those typically found on surrounding historic buildings.

Staff recommends approval of two proposed replacement doors and replacement of vertical fiber cement siding on porch with horizontal fiber cement siding.

Doors with large windows are not unusual on Contributing houses in the Near West Side Historic District, and the neighborhood design review committee does not object to the choice of doors. 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, the guidelines do recommend against vertically oriented siding.



Peter Dorfman

Thu, Aug 29, 3:41 PM (7 days ago)



to me, Barb, Beth, Bob, Karen, Karlyn, Sandra, William ▾

Noah:

I refer you to the original objection on the part of the Near West Side's Design Review Committee to the CoA application for 930 W. 6th:

"The owner of this house applied for the COA after being notified that he had begun renovations in a historic district without a COA, violating historic preservation code. We can't know whether this was inadvertent or deliberate. It doesn't matter. The fact that the address is in the Near West Side Historic District is a matter of public record.

"The renovation itself is in material conflict with the district's Design Guidelines, in at least two ways: The applicant removed the second entry door (one of the most characteristic features of houses in the neighborhood context), and covered the former entrance with vertical siding — a siding type called out specifically in the Guidelines as Not Recommended. We believe the vertical siding was installed to replace clapboard siding, which is the most appropriate siding type for the Near West Side."

The applicant now proposes to replace the original and second front door with matching new ones. He's provided a photo of the proposed replacement door, and while we feel that a door with a solid lower half and glass in the upper half would be more harmonious with the original doors in the neighborhood, we do not object to his choice of doors.

However, we also noted that the applicant also has covered the original clapboard siding with a vertically oriented paneling, which our Guidelines specifically call out as Not Recommended. The amended CoA application does not acknowledge this objection or propose to remedy the situation. Accordingly, we remain opposed to the granting of the CoA for 930 West 6th.



House prior to alterations



Porch prior to alterations



Porch after alterations



Proposed replacement doors