

**Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission
Showers City Hall
McCloskey Room
Thursday April 26, 2018
5:00 P.M.
Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chairman, **Sam Desollar**, called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Sam Desollar
Flavia Burrell
Lee Sandweiss
John Saunders
Chris Sturbaum
Leslie Abshier

Staff

Rachel Ellenson
Eric Sader
Philippa Guthrie
Jackie Scanlan
Eddie Wright

Guests

Reza Kaffash
Jamie Kaffash
Mary Friedman
Barrie Klapper
Thomas Densford
Allen Balkema
Rebecca Stanze

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 12, 2018

Lee Sandweiss made a motion to approve April 12, 2018 minutes. **Flavia Burrell** seconded. **Motion carried 5/0/1 (Yes/No/Abstain).**

IV. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Staff Review

A. COA 18-21

2500 North Fritz Drive: Matlock Heights

Petitioner: Ian Yarbrough

Replacement of existing wrought iron posts that support the main entrance portico with wooden posts. Fascia will be removed and the portico will be opened but will remain in place. Removal of existing planter next to the portico and infill with gravel.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

B. COA 18-23

917 West Kirkwood Avenue: Greater Prospect Hill

Petitioner: Chris Bomba

Amendment to COA 18-03: Reconstruction of burned-out garage on the rear of the property to preexisting dimensions and design. Replacement of door and window. Wrapping the garage in wooden siding to match the house. Shingle roof.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

C. COA 18-24

120 South College Avenue: Courthouse Square

Petitioner: Stardust Development, LLC

Replacement of non-original sliding door that leads onto the roof of 210 West 4th Street with an aluminum framed window. Stone sill to match existing sill, and the infill brick will match historic brick.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Commission Review

A. COA 18-22

402 South Jordan Avenue: Elm Heights

Petitioner: Nora Dial, represented by Rachel Ellenson

Replacement of 13 windows with Anderson 400 series windows in Sandstone color. The new windows will fit existing openings. The three lite upper design will be retained.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Prior to **Rachel Ellenson's** presentation **Sam Desollar** asked if **Rachel's** representation of the petitioner was allowed or might be a conflict of interest. **Philippa Guthrie** stated that petitioners have been represented in the past by staff, and it is not a conflict of interest because the petitioner asked **Rachel** to represent her.

John Saunders asked if the neighborhood association has weighed in on the replacement of the windows. **Rachel** stated that everyone on the neighborhood association is out of town except for Johnnie and she did not want to make comments based upon her opinion, as she did think this was fair. **John** asked if **Rachel** thought the windows are repairable. **Rachel** stated that she feels like they are, but she understands that long term maintenance is not always cheap or easy but she feels like the windows should remain in place. **John** asked if storm windows are in place. **Rachel** stated they are, but not all of the windows on the house are the original windows. The petitioner is replacing the remaining thirteen original windows. **Chris Sturbaum** asked if commission approval would be needed for new storm windows. **Rachel** stated they would need to submit a COA but that she could approve that at the staff level. **Chris** stated that these windows are of a period that they are likely still in good shape. There was a period where windows were poorly made and asked if these windows are rope and weight windows. **Rachel** stated they are. **Leslie Abshier** asked if the non-original windows are going to be replaced. **Rachel** stated that the petitioner was going to leave the non-original windows but is replacing one of the non-original windows with a wood window to match the original wood windows. **Leslie** asked if that is included in her request or if it's just the thirteen original windows. **Rachel** clarified that the COA is only for the original thirteen windows. **Flavia Burrell** asked if the windows are being replaced because they are beyond repair or for more energy efficiency. **Rachel** stated that they are being replaced for energy efficiency and less maintenance. The petitioner is planning on retiring back to Bloomington and doesn't want to keep up with the maintenance of the current wooden windows.

John Saunders stated that typically the commission has denied window changes in the past and cited a previous instance where a home owner blatantly replaced all of his windows without commission approval. **John** further stated that he would not be supportive of this change. **Chris Sturbaum** stated that the original windows are likely 80 years old and have out lasted the equivalent of most modern windows. He is sympathetic to those who have trouble opening these windows. But the commission is a historic preservation commission and therefore encourages repairing the windows. **Leslie Abshier** asked if there was a quote for repair of the original windows. **Rachel** stated that there is no quote for repair of the original windows but that over time it would cost a couple of thousand over the years for repairs. **Lee Sandweiss** stated that she

would support keeping the old windows and get them repaired. **Flavia Burrell** stated that the windows appear to be close to the end of their useful life. If they deny now the petitioner could return in a couple of years asking to replace the windows again. She would be sympathetic to replacement due to the age of the house and it seems that the petitioner is trying to maintain the architectural integrity of the home. **Rachel** clarified that the entire window frame is not being replaced and the windows are being replaced with wooden windows while maintaining the trim. **Philippa Guthrie** asked if she was only replacing the glass. **Sam Desollar** explained that would be pulling all the sashes and stops then replacing with a window unit. **Philippa** asked if the look would be same. **Sam** explained the outside profile would be a little different and **Chris Sturbaum** explained there would be a little different look. **Sam Desollar** further explained that there have been cases where individuals have replaced original windows that were repairable. One of which was on Woodlawn last year. But these windows have lasted 80 years and he understands that you may not want to do maintenance but that is something you have to do. If you maintain the windows they will last longer than new windows and be energy efficient. **Sam** further stated that he could not support replacement. **Chris Sturbaum** stated that he has replaced similar windows with new wood windows and repaired them when they rotted, new wood windows will not outlast the original windows. The comparable energy loss is negligible. These just need to be repaired in a way to where they are easier to open. This same issue could be in front of another commission in the future.

Chris Sturbaum made a motion to deny, **Lee Sandweiss** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

B. COA 18-25

1026 East 1st Street: Elm Heights

Petitioner: Reza Kaffash

Replacement of existing front door with solid knotty alder, full glass door that will fit the existing door frame. Installation of a roof mounted solar light tube into the living room.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Reza Kaffash stated that the door is not square and he has tried to square the frame and brought that before the commission two years ago. He stated that the replacement door is a solid door.

John Saunders asked about finding a similar door. **Reza** stated that you could find a similar door but they would like a door that allows more light into the house. So there is nothing available that has a similar look that allows more light. **Chris Sturbaum** asked about the secretary's standards for such a replacement. **Rachel** stated that the standard is retain in place and repair if possible. **Sam Desollar** asked **Chris** if the door might be repairable. **Chris** stated that appears to be repairable. **Reza** stated that it appears that the door was cut at some point but he is unsure. **Chris** further stated that the door could be

squared, raised and have something added to the top to close the gaps. **Reza** stated that they could save money keeping the old door over the new door. **Jamie Kaffash** stated that the new door would be a dark brown to match and would be knotty alder to maintain appearance. **Sam** stated that it is a lovely house. **Jamie** stated that is a love project and they attempted to keep the house all original.

John Saunders wondered if this was the original door for the house, because the house was in very bad shape. **Chris Sturbaum** stated that this is likely the original door for the home. **Reza** stated that if this is the original door why is there such a gap and why did they have to cut the door. **Chris** stated, that he doesn't know what happened if the foundation settled or the door was just cut. But that the question as a preservation commission isn't do we think the other door is better or lets in more light or even if the builder should have put a cooler door on the front. That's not our question. **Reza** stated that they will keep the original door and if the commission doesn't like the new door he would remove it and return to the original door. **Chris** stated the guidelines are pretty clear about the replacement of the door. **Rachel** stated that the guidelines state that under rule 4.5 if original door and hardware can be restored and reused they should not be replaced. **Chris** stated that is in line with secretary's standards and he would have to vote against replacement. **Leslie Abshier** stated that they couldn't ignore John's question of whether the door is original. If it's not original then she is fine with replacement. But they have to determine whether the door is original, and if it is then if it should be retained. **Sam Desollar** asked **Chris** if he would have time to go with him to look at the door. **Chris** stated that he would be willing to do that. **Sam** asked if **Reza** would be ok continuing. **Jamie** stated that she believes the door is not original but something from the 60's. **Sam** stated that you should be able to determine that upon inspection.

John Saunders made a motion to continue discussion of replacement of the door to the next meeting to allow time for Commissioners to view the current door, **Lee Sandweiss** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

The commissioners then discussed the installation of a roof mounted solar light tube into the home.

Chris Sturbaum stated that you really can't see this and he loves the light they add without negatively impacting the historic integrity of the house. **Reza Kaffash** stated that it would go in the back. **Reza** was asked if it's a tile roof, it's a shingle roof. **Jamie Kaffash** stated it had a flat roof but it was changed sometime in the 80's. The storm door is not original as they didn't have aluminum at that time.

Chris doesn't see a problem with the solar light tubes. Commissioners agreed. **Raza** asked if he could put one or two, the commission allowed up the two solar tubes.

John Saunders made an amended motion to up to two solar light tubes, **Sam Desollar** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

V. DEMOLITION DELAY

Staff Review

A. Demo Delay 18-14

901 North Maple Street

Petitioner: Tina and Tom Ryan

Partial demolition – enclosing a window on the South elevation.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Commission Review

A. Demo Delay 18-09 (cont. from last meeting)

717 North Maple Street

Petitioner: Michael Kee, on behalf of Richard Wells Full demolition

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Tom Densford representing the petitioner asked if there are any updates on the house, can they demolish or is it historic. **Sam Desollar** asked if there any updates on historic designation. **Rachel Ellenson** stated that the neighborhood has struggled to get their application together and are struggling to get their meetings in and she is not sure if they will get that done in time. **John Saunders** asked how much time is left in the Demo Delay. **Rachel** stated that she received the application March 12th so the waiting period ends June 10th. **Lee Sandweiss** asked about nudging the neighborhood association to set up historic designation. **Rachel** stated that she has told the neighborhood association of the deadline. **Leslie Abshier** stated that they set up historic designation in Prospect Hill and would be willing to help the neighborhood in any way possible in an advisory role. **Chris Sturbaum** stated the neighborhood is working well and should come up with something. **Rachel** agreed and she is helping them in any way she can without overstepping her bounds. **Sam** stated that if this doesn't happen then the commission will need to release the Demo Delay and not continue to drag out the process.

John Saunders made a motion to continue to the next meeting, **Chris Sturbaum** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

Chris Sturbaum asked about the actual age of the house, as it is listed as late 1920's but actually appears to be late 1800's. **Rachel** stated that it was a guess on the age as she has no actual data. Derek Richey provided a little information on the house.

B. Demo Delay 18-10 (cont. from last meeting)

1209 West 2nd Street

Petitioner: Barre Klapper

Full demolition

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Leslie Abshier asked about research into the historical significance of the home in relationship to previous owners. **Rachel Ellenson** stated that she has not found anything to this point. She has determined that there are only 8 cottages of this type in Bloomington. **Barrie Klapper** stated that the property owner has purchased two properties and the house sits right in the middle of the properties and it is a design challenge at the present location. **John Saunders** asked if there was no way at all to design around the house. **Barrie** stated that it is very difficult and would be supported by parking. There are also other factors on the property including access points as well as trees. So there are a number of significant issues impacting the site. **Chris Sturbaum** inquired as to the possibility of moving the house to another location on the property, maybe moving to the front or the rear of the property. **Barrie** stated that the owner has spoken with house movers. **Mary Friedman** stated that she met with Wolf House movers which has done work for Indiana University and got a bid from them. It would require extensive work to the home before moving, including the basement, the front porch would have to come off, also the back alcove area. The stone from the ground up all around the house would have to come off. It would be very costly to move the house in addition to the work required prior to movement. Then they would need to know where to move the house. If it's put in the back ultimately you wouldn't see the house. Even now you don't see the house from the street due to the development in the area. The site prep would include the placement of a slab to set the house. So overall it's very cost prohibitive. That's not factoring in setback requirements and tree issues. **Mary** stated that she would be willing to donate the house but it would have to be moved but she might be willing to help with the cost. At this point its cost prohibitive for her to move the home on site, she can't imagine the cost to move off site. **Chris Sturbaum** stated that if you calculate the square footage of creating that much square footage from scratch you would have an idea of the cost to move. **Mary** said that she doesn't know about that cost but she's looking at the cost of just picking up and moving the house. **Chris** stated that if you move on site you won't have as much of a cost. **Leslie Abshier** asked if anyone has spoken with BRI to partner to move the house. **Mary** stated that there is a youth shelter nearby and they might be contacted if they might be interested in the house, or could even handle the cost to move. **Leslie** asked if during Demo Delay the commission takes into consideration the use of the property after demolition. **Rachel** stated what goes on the property after demolition is not within the commissions' purview.

John Saunders would like to see the house saved, maybe someone that would take it and get it moved. He would hate to lose another house like this one because you don't see many houses in Bloomington like this one anymore. **Chris Sturbaum** stated it's not like we are saving an area or beloved landmark. He has lived near here and never noticed the house. It is a significant home and he wonders if there's a way to integrate the home. It is a difficult home to fight for though. **Leslie Abshier** stated it's the commissions' job to designate it historical but she doesn't think the council will approve. This is difficult and she wishes they didn't have to vote on this at all. Also she would like to talk with planning about the tree issues on the lot. **Lee Sandweiss** stated that when they went to London a few years ago she was impressed with the imagination of taking a bombed out church and placing steel and glass and saving a building for current use. She feels like something similar could be done with this house. **Flavia Burrell** agrees with **Leslie** that the commissions' job is to preserve. **Sam Desollar** stated that they have looked at other properties that have been zoned and the commission has let those buildings go. They should try to designate but the council is not going to approve. He would support donating the building to BRI as a whole or piecemeal. But he doesn't think the energy of the commission is best used fighting for something that doesn't have a presence. **Lee Sandweiss** further stated that their job is not to consider whether the council will approve or disapprove. They do their job independently of the council. **Philippa Guthrie** asked if the cost of the move was mentioned. **Sam** stated that it wasn't. Rachel stated that the cost shouldn't factor into the commission's decision. **Barrie** added that there are no immediate plans for the house so there is time to get out in front of this as they are in no rush. They can advertise the house for adoption. **Eric Sader** asked if they knew when the property was purchased if it would be subject to Demo Delay. **Barrie** stated they did not know about Demo Delay when they purchased.

Chris Sturbaum made a motion to continue to the next meeting to give the petitioner more time to consider their options, **John Saunders** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

C. Demo Delay 18-15

1201 West 6th Street

Petitioner: Rebecca Stanze

Partial demolition – construction of a rear addition.

Rachel Ellenson gave her presentation. See packet for details.

Rebecca Stanze stated that she is hoping to remove what she categorized as a wart on the back of the house. With substandard materials and terrible windows that doesn't respect the house. It does have a BRI covenant and they have approved the materials list.

John Saunders stated that he once owned the house and he did not do the addition to the rear of the house. He did a lot to save the house as it was in bad shape. **Leslie**

Abshier asked if the home owner wanted designation for the home, as the commission likes to have the home owner on board with such a designation. **Rebecca** would like to know about the process. **Rachel** stated that once designated the exterior is under the commission's protection and then you would have to undergo the COA process. Once designated you have to abide by the best practices of rehabilitation. If designation is pursued then she would have to wait for council designation and then return to the commission for the COA process. Leslie asked about releasing the Demo Delay today then continuing to discuss local designation.

John Saunders likes the idea of the removal of the rear addition and would have done this himself had they had the money at the time. **Chris Sturbaum** asked if once a petitioner has submitted a design to the commission then do you have to remain with that design or return to the commission for changes. **Jackie Scanlan** stated that as they negotiate they don't have to remain with that design. A picture is not a design. If the commission makes a decision today this property will not come before them again. **Chris** stated that's a problem in that anyone could say they are doing one thing then change after release and do something different. He feels like the picture of a design is a commitment its part of the proposal and the agreement. **Jackie** feels like the code is written to designate the house notable regardless of the proposed changes to the house. **Rebecca** stated that she is planning to build what she has shown. **Leslie Abshier, Lee Sandweiss** and **Flavia Burrell** all like the changes to the home.

Alan Balkema lives next door the property and stated that what is there currently is a wart and he supports changes to the house.

John Saunders made a motion to waive the waiting period but may recommend local designation to the council at a later date, **Leslie Abshier** seconded. **Motion carried 6/0/0.**

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Chris Sturbaum stated that the side walk at Euclid & Howe is substandard because the street hasn't been ground and the side walk is deteriorated from freezing and thawing. A lot of the stone is damaged but this is the only WPA sidewalk in Bloomington that is actually dated. There is another sidewalk in the same condition. He has been trying to get help restoring the sidewalk. **Leslie Abshier** asked about a small and simple grant. The neighborhood got a grant in the past but it was difficult. These sidewalks become a hazard once the sidewalk deteriorates to this point. **Rachel** commented that is unfair because they don't have funding available to the homeowners and repair of these sidewalks are a greater cost to the homeowner. If the locally designate they will have another Dunn Street sidewalk issue and they still don't have funding for that project. All they can do is tell the homeowner to keep it there. **Chris** stated that due to deterioration less than 50% of the sidewalk is usable. Also the Street Dept. has taken up and

preserved the stones in other sidewalks. **Rachel** will add this to the next meeting and do some research.

Chris stated that when they do the staff reviews then a consent agenda might be a better format. That way everything goes on the table and then any member can take it off the table to talk about all the posts. Similar to what the plan commission does. **Sam Desollar** asked if the commissioners would remove an item at the meeting. **Chris** said they would, but then approval would not occur at the staff level but only during the meetings. **Rachel** stated that she is happy to sit down and discuss what the staff can and cannot approve. **Chris** stated this is no way a criticism of **Rachel**. **Flavia Burrell** asked if maybe there was a bulletin board that shows what is being approved.

VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Leslie Abshier stated that camp was fun and **Rachel** has flash drives with information from camp if the commissioners would like to review. **Leslie** is confident in what the commission does in comparison to similar commissions around the states. This is a shooting star commission.

Chris Sturbaum provided an update that the review of appointments is a matter of state law and the council has to affirm Mayoral appointments. Apparently the Commission did this some years ago but at some point Council approvals stopped. **Rachel** has received applications for appointments to the commission. **Sam** feels like it is better to have a large number of candidates to draw from.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lee Sandweiss reminded the commission of the Henry Glassie lecture on May 4th in the Council Chambers at 7pm.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Sam Desollar adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.