

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

Showers City Hall, McCloskey Room

Thursday September 26, 2019

MINUTES

Meeting was called to order by Jeff Goldin @ 5:01 pm

ROLL CALL

Commissioners

Present

Leslie Abshier
Sam DeSollar
Susan Dyer
Jeff Goldin
Deb Hutton
Lee Sandweiss
John Saunders
Chris Sturbaum

Absent

Doug Bruce

Advisory members

Absent

Duncan Campbell

Ernesto Casteneda

Jenny Southern

Derek Richey

Staff

Conor Herterich, HAND

Philippa Guthrie, Legal

Angela Van Rooy, HAND

Guests

Bret Pafford

David Howard

Subin Pafford

BJ Ferrand, NWS

Alan Balkeman, NWSNA

Elizabeth Roberge, COA

Keith Pierrard

Marian Shaabon

Barbara Moss, NWS

Robert Meadows, NWS

Stephanie Bruce, NWS

Jennifer Stephens, NWS

Karen Duffy, NWS

Timothy Waters, NWS

Noah Rogers, Samira

Anwar Naderpool, Samira

Michelle Henderson, NWS

Kevin Stearns-Bruner

Patricia Cole

Betty Bridgewater

Bill Baus

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

John Saunders made a motion to approve September 12th, 2019 Minutes with the deletion of an editing statement after the motion for COA 19-48, **Sam DeSollar** seconded.

Motion carried 5-0-3 (Yes-No-Abstain)

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Staff Review

A. COA 19-55

806 W 4th Street (Greater Prospect Hill Historic District)

Petitioner: Alice Young

Replace original double hung wood windows with Marvin Integrity Ultrex fiberglass windows. Replacement windows will maintain the size, shape, and pane configuration of the originals. Storm windows will be removed.

Conor Herterich—Project meets guidelines. Staff approved.

Commission Review

A. COA 19-54

507 S. Jordan Avenue (Elm Heights Historic District)

Petitioner: Elizabeth Roberge

Replacing roof, gutters, and soffits. Replace wooden shutters with vinyl.

Conor Herterich gave presentation (see packet for further details). Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Questions

Chris Sturbaum—Why does Staff think shutters not original? **Conor Herterich**—House is 92 years old, and considering the condition of the shutters, it's not likely that they are original.

Leslie Abshier—Are vinyl shutters approved in the guidelines? **Conor Herterich**—there are vinyl shutters all over the neighborhood and the guidelines don't prohibit those. **Leslie Abshier**—Any neighborhood feedback? **Conor Herterich**—no.

Sam DeSoller—Have you considered eliminating shutters? May have been added later. **Petitioner**—Have considered it. Internet research of homes from this era show many with shutters, so plan has been to replace them. **Sam DeSoller**—Soffit looks to be is slender. **Petitioner**—It is slender and wooden. Plan to replace with aluminum offers longevity and color (tuxedo gray). **Sam DeSoller**—Is soffit flat or angled? Are you replacing it around the entire house? Where is it exposed? Will the aluminum surface be textured like wood? **Petitioner**—Soffit will be replaced in its entirety. It is flat and more visible on the sides; don't see much of it from the street. Unsure as to whether the aluminum is textured or smooth.

Chris Sturbaum—What is soffit color? **Petitioner**—Tuxedo grey, same as gutters. This is a dark color and will be more subtle. Wood areas or porch will be painted a lighter color to highlight it.

Deb Hutton—Have you imagined your house without shutters? **Petitioner**—Not opposed to removing shutters and tabling the decision to put them back up.

Comments

Chris Sturbaum—HPC approved the old library with an aluminum soffit, so it should be fine here. It may be more historically authentic to leave shutters off. But we'll leave it up to you.

Sam DeSoller—I advise that you take shutters off and see what it looks like before ordering new ones. Aluminum soffit should be smooth, not wood-textured.

Chris Sturbaum made a motion to approve COA 19-54, 507 S. Jordan Avenue. **Leslie Abshier** seconded. **Motion carried 8-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

B. COA 19-56

115 S. Walnut Street (Courthouse Square Historic District)

Petitioner: Bailey & Weiler Design

Lay General Shale's Chestnut brick over existing painted plywood which covers middle section of the exterior wall in the covered entryway.

Conor Herterich gave presentation (see packet for further details). Staff defers to HPC, has no recommendation.

Petitioner—It is currently painted plywood over cinderblock, looks unattractive. Want to improve the look. Considered brick veneer, limestone.

Commissioner Questions

Chris Sturbaum—Do you know how that happened? Was something removed when the neighboring building went up? **Petitioner**—Entrance may have been open to the side, and was blocked off when neighboring building was built, thus the newer materials. **Chris Sturbaum**—Is the goal to make it more attractive? **Petitioner**—Yes. Property owner likes idea of brick veneer (natural brick, cut thin, and with mortar). **Chris Sturbaum**—Have you considered tongue and groove wood? **Petitioner**—Not opposed to that. Want something appropriate and historic. Open to suggestions.

Deb Hutton—Is current plywood in good condition top to bottom? **Petitioner**—Yes it's well protected.

Deb Hutton—Will you replace it before covering with veneer? **Petitioner**—Will replace if we decide to go with wood, otherwise we would veneer over it.

Philippa Guthrie—Guidelines re:entrances state, "The placement and architectural treatment of the front

entrances shall differentiate the primary retail entrance from the secondary access to the upper floors.” It’s saying that the primary access should be differentiated not from the upper level, but from whatever other access you have upstairs. **Petitioner**—Externally there is only one entrance.

Commissioner Comments

Chris Sturbaum—Brick will call attention to itself and look artificial, I recommend something paintable, e.g vertical tongue-and-groove wood.

John Saunders—Brick is not objectionable.

Leslie Abshier—Guidelines don’t give direction about what you cannot do. My opinion is that limestone or something the same color would look better than exposed brick.

Deb Hutton—Caution against using limestone, as it would look like part of the building next door. Brick or wooden paneling would be preferable.

Lee Sandweiss—Agree with Deb and Chris. A paintable surface is preferable to brick. Brick will look new. But it’s the owner’s call.

Sam DeSoller—Do what you want, but my opinion is to not add another element to the building that will be a distraction. If you do limestone, don’t copy the neighboring building. A paintable surface would look historically appropriate.

Susan Dyer—Leslie is right, HPC doesn’t have purview.

Jeff Goldin—Brick would be fine as it will age over time.

Conor Herterich—My opinion is that we do have purview over this. It concerns the materials on the primary entrance of a storefront on the courthouse square. **Leslie Abshier**—To clarify, we do have purview, but guidelines don’t give direction regarding what materials to use.

Chris Sturbaum made a motion to approve COA 19-56, 115 S. Walnut St., with a paintable panelized concept to match the façade on the front of the building, per Staff approval. **John Saunders** seconded. **Motion carried 8-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

C. COA 19-57

100 W. 6th Street (Courthouse Square Historic District)

Petitioner: Noah Rogers

Replace three windows on south elevation (6th Street) and two windows on east elevation (Walnut Street).

Install nine windows on east elevation that are currently boarded up. Windows will be double hung, aluminum clad wood.

Conor Herterich gave presentation (see packet for further details). Staff recommends approval with the condition that the tops of the arched windows be opened and the windows extend to the full frame.

Petitioner—Agreed.

Commissioner Questions

Deb Hutton—Have you looked under the façade on south-facing and east-facing sides to see if original window frames are there? **Petitioner**—there may be an original window on the alley side, the rest are lost.

Commissioner Comments

Chris Sturbaum—Is the siding on the east side of the building brick covered over with metal?

Petitioner—yes.

John Saunders—It would be nice if you could restore the front of building. **Petitioner**—Owner plans to restore the building exterior, also renovating interior to add apartments above.

Leslie Abshier—Glad to hear its being restored and renovated.

Deb Hutton—Agree with LA

Lee Sandweiss—This is a prominent corner, great to have the windows opened up. Will no longer be an eyesore.

Sam DeSollar—Happy to bring more residential to the square. This is a great 1st step.

Susan Dyer—Agree it's a good project.

Jeff Goldin—Agree with other Commissioners' comments.

Deb Hutton made a motion to approve COA 19-57, 100 W. 6th Street, with Staff suggestion for full-frame arched windows. **Lee Sandweiss** seconded.

Motion carried 8-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain).

D. COA 19-58

1119 E. 1st Street (Elm Heights Historic District)

Petitioner: Fionnuala Thinnis

Removal of mature tree in front yard.

Petitioner was unable to be present or to send a proxy, so COA 19-58 is tabled to the October 10th meeting of the HPC.

DEMOLITION DELAY

Commission Review

A. Demo Delay 19-15

1301 S. Walnut Street

Petitioner: David Howard

Full Demolition

Conor Herterich—Structure is non-contributing. Staff recommends releasing the Demo Delay.

John Saunders **made a motion to waive the demolition delay waiting period for Demo Delay 19-15.**

Susan Dyer seconded. **Motion carried 8-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

B. Demo Delay 19-16

520 E. 2nd Street

Petitioner: Tariq Khan

Substantial Demolition

Conor Herterich gave presentation (see packet for further details). The petitioner will be fined, since the work has gone beyond the scope of the building permit. Structure is not historic. Staff recommends release.

Commissioner Comments

Sam DeSollar—Petitioner appears to have pulled a permit so that he could avoid review by HPC. Original wood lap siding was removed and discarded. Original windows have been replaced. Owner was contacted by Staff prior to removal of original material with explicit condition that he not remove original material.

Jeff Goldin—this is complicated by the fact that this is a demo delay. We have to consider what the house looked like before and determine whether HPC would we have recommended designation?

Conor Herterich—Normally that would be the case, but it's also important to recognize that the building permit was false.

Philippa Guthrie—We are fining the owner for not applying for a different permit.

Sam DeSollar—Owner was told by staff not to remove original materials, but he did so.

Conor Herterich—Owner altered the size of the windows, which he indicated he would not do.

Jeff Goldin—This is a legal Planning issue, not an HPC issue. No matter what the owner did or why he did it, our only issue is whether we would have recommended designation.

Sam DeSollar—We have two duties: (1) report owner's actions to legal, and (2) decide whether to release the

demo delay.

Jeff Goldin—I agree with that.

Leslie Abshier—The first part of that will impact the fine, correct?

Philippa Guthrie—Fines are assessed by Planning.

Conor Herterich—Level of fine will depend upon... **Philippa Guthrie** —the nature of the violation

Sam DeSollar—I recommend we split this into two motions: (1) the Demo Delay, and (2) recommendation to legal regarding the owner’s non-compliance with a request from HPC Staff to not remove original material without contacting the City.

Philippa Guthrie—I don’t think we can fine the owner for not complying with Staff’s directions. You can recommend that the fine be enhanced.

Chris Sturbaum—This is a precedent. We don’t want to establish an easy path around the HPC.

Jeff Goldin—I’m struggling with what HPC can do. This is a planning thing.

Conor Herterich—We need to do two things: (1) our finding is that the owner has altered the size of a window and has removed original material, and (2) release the demo delay. The first finding will enhance his fine.

Sam DeSollar made a motion for finding of fact that the owner of 520 E. 2nd Street did remove substantial amounts original material from the building, and did change original window sizes in contravention to explicit direction from HPC Staff. **Chris Sturbaum** seconded. **Motion carried 8-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

John Saunders made a motion to waive the demolition delay waiting period for Demo Delay 19-16. **Sam DeSollar** seconded. **Motion carried 8-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain).

C. Demo Delay 19-17

401 E. 1st Street

Petitioner: Matt Murphy

Substantial Demolition

Conor Herterich gave presentation (see packet for further details). Retroactive demo delay. Staff finds designation not warranted

Commissioner Questions

Leslie Abshier—There is no historical significance, Conor? **Conor Herterich**—No.

Lee Sandweiss—What does it mean, “due to an erroneous review of the building permit back in July”? **Conor Herterich**—Planning reviewed the building permit and made a mistake. They didn’t send it the HPC for Demo Delay.

Chris Sturbaum—Any neighborhood feedback? **Conor Herterich**—not for demo delay.

Commissioner Comments

John Saunders—Sad to see substantial alteration of the building.

Sam DeSollar—This is a cute little house that’s in terrible shape. We would not designate it, but plans are not scaled to the neighborhood. Project is under-scaled for the level of density that you might want this proximate to the downtown.

John Saunders made a motion to waive the demolition delay waiting period for Demo Delay 19-17.

Chris Sturbaum seconded. **Motion carried 7-0-0** (Yes-No-Abstain). (Leslie Abshier stepped out and did not cast a vote.)

NEW BUSINESS

A. Courtesy Review

1313 S. Madison

Kevin Stearns-Bruner

Conor Herterich—McDoal Historic District. House is non-contributing, but guidelines require that HPC review additions even to non-contributing structures. Therefore, a COA is needed. Owner is here to get guidance from Commissioners regarding an addition to side of his house.

Owner—The house is small, want to make more space. Want to expand living room area, which is at the front of the house. Adding on to the back of the house would mean passing through four rooms to get to the addition. Doesn't change basic structure to house. Stucco siding on new addition will differentiate it from the original house.

Commissioner Questions/Comments

Chris Sturbaum—Why distinguish it from rest of house? **Owner**—Thought stucco was cool, but open to other recommendations. **Chris Sturbaum**—I recommend you not distinguish old and new too much.

John Saunders—What will the ceiling height be? **Owner**—8 foot ceilings in old and new.

Leslie Abshier—Side addition is not problem.

Deb Hutton—Will the foundation match the current concrete block? **Owner**—yes

Sam DeSollar—McDoal Gardens Guidelines, Section 6 says additions should be placed where visibility from the street is minimized. Owner should talk to his Neighborhood Association to see what they say; if they are ok with it, HPC likely will be too. Slope of roof is also in the guidelines—must be compatible with the slope of the existing house.

Jeff Goldin—I'm not crazy about look from front. But non-contributing house, so I would be more flexible with this project.

Conor Herterich—I was more concerned about the addition to the side and the material being stucco.

Chris Sturbaum—Does the internal flow not work if the addition is further back? **Owner**—I'm flexible on that.

B. Review of Near West Side Conservation District Application.

Conor Herterich—Thank you to the Near Westside Designation Committee (Esp. Karen Duffy and Elizabeth Dorfman) for all of their hard work. All properties in this proposed conservation district are already part of National Register of Historic Places (since 1997), but this does not give the structures protection. Local designation does have an element of protection via the design review. Referendum among property owners in the district. Voted overwhelmingly in favor of submitting application for *conservation* district. Properties excluded on the map are already designated locally.

Please see packet for details regarding criteria for designation. Staff recommends forwarding to Council.

Jeff Goldin—Why is Fairview school in the district?

Conor Herterich—Council can eliminate sections if it wants to.

Public comment

The following individuals spoke in favor of designation:

Karen Duffy, NWS Committee Chair

Alan Balkeman, NWS Neighborhood Association President

Bill Baus, NWS Neighborhood Association Treasurer

Jenny Stevens

Betty Bridgewater

Michelle Henderson

Chris Bomba

The following individual raised concern about designation:

Unknown man—Why does Criterion 1A apply? **Conor Herterich**—People who worked in economic engine of city lived in NWS. **Man**—1A is more tenuous than other criteria. Uncomfortable with idea that we can use designation to avoid the UDO density.

Commissioner Comments

Chris Sturbaum—Large number of contributing, helps us to understand the value of what a contributing structure is. Largely intact area with a density of little houses. The historic structure is the entire neighborhood and all of its components. Preserving for the future and from a threat. Sister neighborhood to Greater Prospect Hill. Thrilled and pleased that we can give this gift to the future and to the city that may not make it without our action.

John Saunders—Agree

Leslie Abshier—Are guidelines created before or after Council designation? **Conor Herterich**—Guidelines will be developed after City Council approval. **Leslie Abshier**—I live in Greater Prospect Hill. We started as a conservation district and were elevated to a historic district without neighborhood buy-in. Will that happen here? What percentage of property owners voted? Protection should be balanced with property rights. I encourage you to write your guidelines carefully. **Conor Herterich**—Difference between *conservation* and *historic* was discussed at length in NWS public meetings to make property owners aware of the difference and possibility of elevation in status in the future. **Karen Duffy**—37% of owners (some own >1 prop) voted.

Deb Hutton—Agree with Chris and Leslie. Commend you and your committee.

Lee Sandweiss—Great. Thanks for your hard work.

Sam DeSoller—Residents passionate and involved. This is the first step. YOU are writing these guidelines. Take care with guidelines. Don't make them punitive, uphold what you love.

Susan Dyer—Excited about this. Thank you for your hard work. HPC will follow *your* guidelines.

Jeff Goldin—I'm in favor of this, though I have some concerns about lines of the district, especially the Kirkwood commercial corridor. Also MCCSC should be taken out.

Bill Baus—NWS has draft guidelines (available online), based on GPH guidelines.

Deb Hutton made a motion to forward to the Common Council recommendation for designation of the Near Westside District as a conservation district. **Lee Sandweiss** seconded.

Motion carried 8-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain).

C. Recommend BRI Resurvey for Council adoption as the “Bloomington Historic Sites and Structures Survey”.

Conor Herterich—HPC needs to formally recommend the Survey to Council for adoption. This will not make it onto the Council agenda until 2020.

Deb Hutton —I suggest we add the year, 2018, to the title of the survey.

Deb Hutton made a motion to forward to the Common Council for adoption the BRI Resurvey, “2018 Bloomington Historic Sites and Structures Survey”. **Lee Sandweiss** seconded.

Motion carried 7-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain). (John Saunders stepped out and did not cast a vote.)

D. HPC Annual Retreat.

Conor Herterich—Typically hold annual retreat in October. Would Farmer House be an acceptable location? Please think about topics for the agenda and email me.

There was a general consensus that early November is better than October. Conor and Angela will communicate a firm date with Commissioners.

OLD BUSINESS

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chris Sturbaum—Have some concern about adopting the Survey in 2020. Had a good discussion with

Conor Herterich and Doris Sims and everyone is committed to adopting it. No political shenanigans, so I was reassured and I wanted to reassure everybody else.

John Saunders—There is an architectural tour of historic homes in Indianapolis tomorrow.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Meeting adjourned by Jeff Goldin @ 7:05 p.m.

END OF MINUTES