

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

Showers City Hall, McCloskey Room

Thursday August 8, 2019

MINUTES

Meeting was called to order by Jeff Goldin @ 5:00pm

ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Present

Susan Dyer
Jeff Goldin
Deb Hutton
Lee Sandweiss
John Saunders
Chris Sturbaum

Absent

Leslie Abshier
Doug Bruce
Sam DeSollar

Advisory members

Present

Ernesto Casteneda
Jenny Southern
Derek Richey

Absent

Duncan Campbell

Staff

Conor Herterich, HAND
Doris Sims, HAND
Eric Sader, HAND
Angela Van Rooy, HAND

Guests

Jaime Galvan, COA 19-45
Emily Black, COA 19-47
Chris Valliant, COA 19-44
James H., COA?
Angie Ricketts, Elm Heights
Marian Forney, Maple Heights
Barb Lund, Re: 523 W 7th

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

John Saunders made a motion to approve July 25th, 2019 Minutes, **Lee Sandweiss** seconded.

Motion carried 5-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Staff Review

A. COA 19-46

326 S Fairview Street (Greater Prospect Hill Historic District)
Petitioner: Janis Price
Remove chimney below roof deck level.

Conor Herterich gave presentation. Staff approved. See packet for details.

Commission Review

A. COA 19-44

346 S. Buckner Street (Greater Prospect Hill Historic District)
Petitioner: Chris Valliant
Full demolition of primary structure on the lot.

Conor Herterich gave presentation. Staff recommends approval of demolition request. See packet for details.

Chris Valliant, Petitioner, stated he has been trying to buy this home for years. It's been in disrepair for a long time, and he would like to build something in place of this home that would contribute to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Questions

No questions

Commissioner Comments

Chris Sturbaum, John Saunders, and Jeff Goldin agreed that it is time to replace this property. **Conor Heterich** added that the neighborhood review committee was unanimous in support of demolition.

John Saunders made a motion to approve COA 19-44, 346 S Buckner St. **Chris Sturbaum** seconded.

Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain).

B. COA 19-45

324 S. Rogers Street (Prospect Hill Historic District)

Petitioner: Jaime Galvan

Two story addition to the rear of the home. Addition of decorative shingles and round vents to east and south facing gables. Renovate shed structure

Conor Herterich gave presentation. Staff recommends conditioned approval of the petition. See packet for details.

Jeff Goldin reminded commissioners that this home is in the original Prospect Hill Historic District which is more restrictive.

Jaime Galvan, Petitioner, asked for suggestions for getting light into 3rd floor if shed dormer and balcony are eliminated. Current shingles are straight/regular shingles, not decorative. **Jeff Goldin** replied that we will go through a question and answer period where those issues will be addressed.

Commissioner Questions

Chris Sturbaum: Is the aluminum siding is coming off the front of the house? **Jaime Galvan:** Yes on the back addition, also on the gable section on the front of the house, where decorative shingles will be added. **Chris Sturbaum:** What is goal of expanding this house? **Jaime Galvan:** Family is expanding and the additional space is needed. **Chris Sturbaum:** What siding are you using on back addition? **Jaime Galvan:** Cement board 5-7" exposure. **Chris Sturbaum:** Are there window changes on the front perimeter? **Conor Herterich:** No windows are changing on the original structure.

John Saunders: Why are you not removing all of the aluminum siding and restoring the original siding on front as well? **Jaime Galvan:** I may do so at a later date, when I can get additional assistance. **John Saunders:** Why add decorative shingles to gables? **Jaime Galvan:** The neighborhood has many examples of these shingles.

Ernesto Castaneda: I have no comments at this time. **Deb Hutton:** Question for architectural experts: Are gable shingles, as proposed, appropriate for this John Nichols style of home? **Chris Sturbaum:** Restoration approach is needed on this Nichols house, and adding false details to a house in this district would be wrong and bad for the historic character of the house. Siding on the addition should match the original siding. Putting false details on a home is not the way to go for a restoration. **Jaime Galvan:** By removing back siding I can see original siding and will model new addition to match.

John Saunders: Will original windows be restored? **Jaime Galvan:** Original windows have already have been restored, 90% of original glass remains.

Jenny Southern: Is chimney going to be removed? Chimney seems to be missing. **Jaime Galvan:** There are two chimneys (originally three), roofer recommends taking the one at the back down to roof level and sealing it. The chimney at the front of the house will remain. **Jenny Southern:** Are there any photos of this original house? **Conor Herterich /Derek Ritchey:** None are known to exist. **Jaime Galvan:** There is little original decoration, so decorative shingles are modeled after the neighboring house. **Jenny Southern:** What are you intentions with the garage? **Jaime Galvan:** Plan to update, stabilize and add proper foundation. **Chris Sturbaum:** Why not pour a thickened slab? **Jaime Galvan:** I am doing the work myself. A slab is more than I can manage alone. **Jenny Southern:** Are you replacing garage door? **Jaime Galvan:** Garage door stays as is, until something

historically accurate can be found. Windows will be replaced. **Jenny Southern** expressed concern that we usually go through much more detail on work like this, and is concerned that the applicant has not provided enough construction specifications.

Derek Ritchey: There should be a demarcation where addition is added, so it's obvious that the addition is not part of the original house. **Conor Herterich:** There is an offset. **Derek Ritchey:** Conor why are you saying that the balconies are inappropriate? **Conor Herterich:** They represent a different architectural style. **Derek Ritchey:** Typically houses grow from back and are often not consistent with the original house. **Conor Herterich:** I have no trouble with the house growing or the addition in the back, I just have trouble with the open porch. **Jeff Goldin:** The difference is that this house has two street fronts so it's highly visible. **Jaime Galvan:** I'm happy to remove porch structure on second floor if you can give suggestions to add light to third floor. **Derek Ritchey:** Traditionally, we allow homes to grow at the back and it's not the petitioner's fault that there are two street fronts. If this is a distinct addition to the house, it can look different from original house. Dormer is ok because it's obvious that it doesn't belong to the first generation house.

Deb Hutton: With the two opposing comments about the balconies on the back, what do you think about the balconies on the third floor. **Derek Ritchey** replied that he is ok as long as it is to the rear because that is where houses grow. **Conor Herterich:** Secretary of the Interior Standards say additions should be different but also compatible. Adding a shed dormer to a Victorian home is not compatible. **Derek Ritchey:** There are a lot of inconsistent additions to homes in Bloomington. I want to be fair about what rear additions are. What they look like tends to be more flexible.

Chris Sturbaum: We don't want balcony to look like a suburban deck. Is it for looks only? **Jaime Galvan:** Balcony will look like style of neighboring house. It is meant to get more light into 3rd floor. **Chris Sturbaum:** Why not just windows? **Ernesto Casteneda:** Original house has large windows, may be big enough to bring light into 3rd floor. **Jaime Galvan:** I can see downtown from 3rd floor, and would like to have a balcony to take advantage of this view. The balcony doors also provides light. The balcony is not directly in view from Prospect Street and the vegetation from the street blocks change in that area of the house. I am concerned about getting enough natural light into the home.

Commissioner Comments

Chris Sturbaum: Petition is very complicated and we need more time to convene Prospect Hill Sub-Committee. We need a resubmittal on the garage. **Jeff Goldin:** Is there a subcommittee? **Conor Herterich:** There is not, Richard told me there is not. **Chris Sturbaum:** We could get Patrick and two other neighbors in the neighborhood to look at this differently. **Jaime Galvan:** I have had conversations with neighbors which is where I got these designs. They did not seem to think there were any issues. **Chris Sturbaum:** We really need a resubmittal that breaks the project down into smaller pieces. **Jaime Galvan:** I can break that out as a separate packet.

John Saunders: I would like this better with a gabled roof over back deck rather than shed roof. I'm ok with house growing at the back. I object to how far the balcony comes out on side of house. Doesn't fit with windows below it. Better to be pair of windows. **Jaime Galvan:** Balcony is not intended to be dominant feature, but it is intended to mimic the angles of the architectural structure below it.

Chris Sturbaum: Is that a secondary deck on top? Is the top 3rd story deck the same size as the deck below? **Jaime Galvan:** No, it is a little larger, it projects out more.

John Saunders asked about the size of the balcony doors on the third floor. He stated that he is not objectionable to the doors but is objectionable to the size of the balcony. **Jaime Galvan** argued his reasoning for the balcony size. **Ernesto Casteneda:** Agree with John Saunders on balcony. Would prefer doors that swing in with very shallow balcony for safety (e.g., Juliet balcony). Balcony is too big as drawn. Also gable instead of shed roof on back. 3rd floor balcony on back is too much. **Jaime Galvan:** I could reduce size of balcony on 3rd floor. **Ernesto Casteneda:** If intention is to gain square footage, why not just focus on back and leave side and front alone? **Jaime Galvan:** Additional square footage on the 3rd floor will impact the north side gable. Structure needs to be added to east and south sides to build the addition. **Ernesto Casteneda:** I don't agree. **Chris Sturbaum and Jaime Galvan** disagreed that wood siding disintegrates after covered by aluminum

siding after an extended period of time. **Chris Sturbaum:** Commends Jaime on the project but he thinks this is a lot of work and the amount of work to take the siding off is relatively minor compared to what Jaime is proposing. Agree that gable is preferable to a shed roof on back. **Derek Ritchey:** Is there a consensus that a gable is preferred? Yes.

Deb Hutton: West elevation 3rd floor balcony is too big. Agree that Juliet balcony is preferable on the north side.

Lee Sandweiss: Agree that Juliet balcony or just windows would bring in light without the clutter of something else tacked onto the house.

Jenny Southern: Go at back as if you already restored front so that it matches. Double windows share their trim. Details matter. You are keeping one window at the back, what are the new windows going to look like? **Jaime Galvan:** I'm ok with modifying windows at back to look more like long windows in rest of house. **Jenny Southern:** You could use the original back windows on the new addition. **Jaime Galvan:** I could reposition the existing windows. I am planning to match the new addition to the original siding. **Chris Sturbaum and Jeff Goldin** suggested that the applicant should take the aluminum off, expose the original siding, and align the new siding on the addition with the original siding on the rear of the original structure. **Jaime Galvan** said that will not work because of the corner caps on the aluminum siding.

Derek Ritchey: Petitioner is making a real effort to do the right thing with his John Nichols house. Maybe biting off too much to start. Should break the project into pieces. **Jaime Galvan:** I am amenable to breaking it up into three pieces. **Derek Ritchey:** Side balcony should be Juliet style. Have less trouble with growing backwards. At this point it may be best for you to take what you've heard from us, and then come back with another proposal. **Jaime Galvan:** I will break the project into thirds. The first section that would be done is the attic which would impact the east and west side. That can be done relatively quickly in six to eight months. That give me the ability to add a bedroom. The second would be the rear addition expansion and the last would be the shed. I have concerns about the decorative shingles in the front—is it correct that these are not indicative of this house and style?

Chris Sturbaum: Concept of restoring an historic house is not about adding details to the façade that did not exist originally, especially on the front and sides. It's about restoring the structure to what it originally was. **Jaime Galvan:** To add light to south & east gable, are light tunnels approved for use? **Chris Sturbaum:** light tunnels at back of house are preferable for adding light without changing the architecture. **Jeff Goldin:** Light tunnels are reversible. That type of change is more acceptable. **Jaime Galvan:** I could do light tunnels and put original siding that is underneath the gables.

Conor Herterich: When working on a house like this you want documented evidence that features were there before. You don't want to add features that never existed. Would like to remind the Commissioners that if we're going to make defensible decisions they need to be based on guidelines and standards, not on subjective likes/dislikes. **Jaime Galvan:** That gives me guidelines to base my decisions upon.

Susan Dyer: I appreciate the petitioner's willingness to break the project into chunks. Will be easier for everyone to process.

Jeff Goldin: This is John Nichols house, which is important to the community. This home is in the original Prospect Hill Neighborhood. Front facades should be kept as original as possible. When you come back to the HPC with your proposal, keep in mind the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the original structure. I'm flexible about the back, but I do not think the 3rd floor balcony should be there.

John Saunders made a motion to deny COA 19-45, 324 S. Rogers Street. **Susan Dyer** seconded. **Motion carried 6-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

C. COA 19-47

1113 E. 1st Street (Elm Heights Historic District)

Petitioner: Emily Black

Replace steel casement window on front of the home with Pella Lifestyle casement window.

Conor Herterich gave presentation. See packet for details. Staff recommends approval. HPC approved this project back in 2012, but petitioner didn't have the work done at that time.

Emily Black, Petitioner: This is a simple home, but we want to maintain original look of home.

No Commissioner Questions

No Commissioner Comments

John Saunders made a motion to approve COA 19-47, 1113 E. 1st Street. **Lee Sandweiss** seconded. **Motion carried 6-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

DEMOLITION DELAY

Staff Review

A. Demo-Delay 19-12

1301 S. Washington Street

Petitioner: Tucker Jarrol (Loren Wood Builders)

Partial demolition: Creation of a new window or door opening.

Conor Herterich gave presentation. See packet for details. As partial demolition, staff has authority and did release the Demolition Delay.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Near Westside Historic District

Conor Herterich: Neighborhood voted 70-48 in favor of submitting an application to designate. Neighborhood voted I believe 51-48 in favor of a *conservation* district rather than an historic district.

B. Changes to Demolition Delay in New UDO

Conor Herterich: In conversation with the administration, these are the changes we're proposing for Demolition Delay. At this point the Planning Dept and City Council are only groups that can change UDO as proposed.

- Common Council will use only the BRI 2018 Survey for Demolition Delay.
- Changes to Demolition Delay:
 - **Contributing:** Partial demolition or substantial removal (defined as "*Alteration, pulling down, destruction, or removal of a portion of a structure which jeopardizes its individual eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places*") will not trigger demo delay on Contributing buildings. Partial demolition will still trigger demolition delay on notable or outstanding buildings but not on Contributing. Substantial demolition or full demolition will trigger Demo Delay for Contributing buildings.

Chris Sturbaum: I misunderstood that portion of the proposed UDO. It's not good.

Derek Ritchey: Agree. Proposed change represents a real difference from what the HPC currently does.

Conor Herterich: Key word is "individual eligibility for listing on the national register". Contributing buildings are not individually eligible for the National Register. You're not losing any potential Nationally Registered buildings. Substantial Demolition is considered "Razing of a building, including the removal or enclosure of 50% or more of the structure."

Jeff Goldin: More than 50% demo triggers demo delay, less than 50% does not trigger demo delay.

Chris Sturbaum: You may be losing a potential historic district. That's what a contributing structure does, it contributes to a district. If buildings get picked off one at a time, a district is too damaged. There are still opportunities to comment on the UDO: Plan Commission and Council meetings.

Conor Herterich: Can I just ask this question? How many times has the HPC, on a partial demolition of a contributing structure, nominated that for historic designation?

Jeff Goldin: I doesn't mean that we're not going to. This is the final opportunity for us to save important buildings. It may be more work for staff and for HPC, but it's important that we still have the ability to catch those buildings.

Chris Sturbaum: What the survey does when it lists a building as contributing, its looking at a potential district and some of them are from the sixties. They could start to get torn down and the district may speak up and say we care. If they get picked off one at a time then the district would be too far damaged.

Derek Ritchey: At the very least staff should have discretion to bring a partial demolition or substantial removal proposal to the HPC if they think the rating would change. The proposed UDO takes that away completely.

Lee Sandweiss: Last meeting we voted to table a demo delay in order to find out more about the area because we thought there might be a potential district there. If a contributing structure is gone, it weakens the argument for the district.

Eric Sader: Full demo still triggers demo delay.

Chris Sturbaum: Losing one house can destroy a district. Importance of a contributing structure is the district. We want the opportunity to think about it before letting it go.

Deb Hutton: Who determines if a proposal is partial demo, substantial demo, etc.?

Conor Herterich: Staff makes the determination. Demo delay applies only to structures outside of historic districts. I think historic districts should come from the neighborhood, not from HPC. We shouldn't designate people's homes and put restrictions on them that they don't want.

Chris Sturbaum / Jeff Goldin: HPC would never designate a district without neighbors buy in.

Eric Sader: Is there language in packet to define staff review? **Conor Herterich:** Yes, in the ordinance it is written that staff has the discretion to bring partial/substantial demolition proposals to the HPC for demolition delay.

Jeff Goldin: UDO can still be changed. It's imperative that we make our opinions known.

Chris Sturbaum: Staff cannot suggest UDO changes to Planning Commission or Common Council, but commission members can.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Historic Designation Review Proceedings (523 W. 7th)

Conor Herterich: Sent notice to adjacent property owners that HPC would discuss Staff Report (see packet for details) and the merits of historic designation, and that HPC would make a motion on whether to forward 523 W 7th to the Common Council for designation.

Public Comments

Barb Lund (520 W 6th): Backyard neighbor for 43 years. I believe it's an historically significant house. It has been remodeled significantly. I would like owners to sell to someone who cares and will save it.

Commissioners Questions/Comments:

General consensus to move forward with designation.

Conor Herterich: presentation of 3 criteria for designation—see packet

John Saunders made the following motion: "Today the HPC declares that the property at 523 W. 7th St meets the following criteria for local designation referred to in the staff report: 2a, 2e, and 2g. Consequently, the HPC recommends its historic designation under Title 8 of the BMC to the Common Council with the attached map. **Chris Sturbaum** seconded the motion.

Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain).

B. Demolition Delay 19-12 (521 N. Dunn)

Conor Herterich: Cannot find more info about this house in terms of who owned it. Cannot find historic photos. We have 90 days, do not need to make decision now.

Derek Ritchey: Also unable to find further information.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Derek Ritchey: If you care about architecture in this town, pay attention to p. 57 of the UDO. A building that is larger than one lot still requires modulation to make one large building to look like multiple small buildings (different heights, different facing materials, etc.). Looks like Dr. Suess.

Chris Sturbaum: We don't have a design review committee. Rules we have make architects do something they wouldn't otherwise do.

John Saunders: What's going on east side of square? **Jeff Goldin:** HPC reviewed that.

Jenny Southern: Atwater houses have had windows replaced. **Conor Herterich:** IU owned.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

none

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned by **Jeff Goldin** @ 6:58 pm.

END OF MINUTES