

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OF SOUTH BEND AND ST. JOSEPH COUNTY

October 21st, 2019
13th Floor Conference Room
County – City Building
South Bend, IN 46601

I. CALL TO ORDER

Commission Vice President Hertel called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Members of the Public Present:

Woodrow Bowers, 25375 Yankee Street, Edwardsburg, MI 49112
Joan Downs-Krostenko, 849 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Jeff McKelvey, 2119 Portage Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Mary McKelvey, 2119 Portage Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Ben Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614
Carrie Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614
Mark Modlin, 519 Benton St, Mishawaka, IN 46545
Daryn Pobanz, 708 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Kristen Pobanz, 708 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Sarah Ponder, Secretary; Eric Stalheim; Mary Brazinsky.

Members Not in Attendance: Michele Gelfman, President; Lesley Annis, Assistant Secretary.

Staff Present: Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator; Adam Toering, Historic Preservation Specialist; Sandra Kennedy, Legal Counsel.

Staff Not in Attendance: N/A

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Commissioner Stalheim made a motion to shift the public discussion for each discussed project to before the closed Commission discussion. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky. Motion to approve the rearrange the order of the agenda is approved.

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Public discussion is moved to in front of closed Commission Discussion on each project.

- | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1. 708 Forest Avenue | #2019-0923A | #9574-05 | Chapin Park |
| Local and National Register of Historic Places | | | |
| Representation: | Daryn Pobanz, 708 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Kristan Pobanz, 708 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616 | | |

STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Date: October 1, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0923A

Property Location: 708 Forest Avenue

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Queen Anne / Free Classic / 1905-1906 – “Wilhelm House”, R. K. Schutt, Architect

Property Owner: Daryn and Kristan Pobanz

Landmark or District Designation: Chapin Park Local (Ordinance #9574-05) and National Historic District

Rating: *Notable*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: Two and a half story Queen Anne (irregular plan) on a rough faced concrete block foundation. A single chimney punctuates the roof line. The exterior is wood clapboard with square shingles in the gables. The asphalt shingle roof is cross-gabled with cornice returns and a very wide rake; frieze and moulded cornice. One-over-one double-hung windows with moulded entablatures throughout; third-story gable has both nine-over-one and six-over-one double-hung windows. Two front doors lead onto the full-width front porch with grouped Doric columns and balustrades; the moulded cornice has wood brackets at either end of the porch fascia that are spiraled.

ALTERATIONS: A garage built sometime after 1917 for this structure stood behind 435 W Lamonte Terrace; this was torn down sometime prior to 1998. Multiple alterations to the rear of the structure have enclosed and reconfigured the rear entrance/porches. The bases of some of the front porch columns have been replaced. A wooden front stair railing replaced what appears to be a metal railing sometime after 1987 and before 2003. Administrative Approval #2019-0930 allowed for the repair of the chimney flashing, roof, soffit, porch roof, and cedar shingle siding, as well as the reinstallation of gutters as needed.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “See attached: ~~1. Chimney Flashing 2. Roof repair 3. Soffit repair 4. Gutters 5. Wood siding & window 6. Landscaping 7. Porch roof repair 8. Cedar shingle repair and replacement 9. Replace exterior doors 10. Exterior lights.~~”

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes on the structure:

1. Resizing of second story rear window (at northeast corner). The current window receives constant moisture contact from the adjacent roof, leading to accelerated deterioration. Applicant seeks to decrease the overall size of the window enclosure to ‘raise up’ the window sill above the adjacent exterior roof line.
 - a. Window Configuration
 - i. The existing sashes have been retained and appear in decent / restorable condition. These could be cut down in size to accommodate the new window size. The frame of the window has been removed and appears to have deteriorated and would need to be reconstructed. This new framing would require skilled carpentry work. Staff would prefer to see original material (that is in good condition) be re-used in the future window enclosure.
 - ii. In lieu of using the original window sashes, staff would consider appropriate window replacement, but no product proposal has been submitted.
 - b. Exterior siding:
 - i. New wood material would be used to replicate the existing siding.
2. The existing rear door would be replaced with a door as indicated in the imagery. New framing will be constructed as needed.

SITE VISIT REPORT: Preservation Specialist Toering visited the site on Monday, September 30th, 2019 to discuss the proposed project and photograph the project areas. Windows and doors described as being re-used are in good/stable condition and would make excellent candidates for transfer to the new locations. Specialist Toering took the opportunity to give an introduction to the construction and repair of original wood windows with the Pobanz.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: CHAPIN PARK

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

A. BUILDING MATERIALS

Original exterior building materials in the district include brick, stucco, clapboard, wood shingles, and brick or stone masonry. In some instances, vinyl, composite and aluminum siding have been applied over the original material.

Required

Original exterior building materials shall be retained when possible. Deterioration of wood materials shall be prevented through repair, cleaning and painting. The existing architectural detail around windows, porches, doors and eaves shall be retained or replaced by replicas of the same design when deteriorated beyond repair.

Masonry, including brick and stucco structures, shall be maintained, and properly cleaned only when necessary to halt deterioration or to remove stains and shall be done in a method acceptable for the preservation of the surface: i.e. low-pressure water and soft natural bristle brushes. Brick or masonry mortar joints should be repointed only when there is evidence of

moisture problems, or when sufficient mortar is missing to allow water to stand in the mortar joint. Existing mortar shall be duplicated in composition, color, texture, joint size, method of application and joint profile.

When repairing stucco, stucco mixture shall be used. A professional shall make a study of the old stucco, to determine the exact mixture and underlayment used in the original work. Some repair methods are not compatible with the original techniques and may cause early disintegration of the repair work and the original work.

Ample ventilation must be afforded the structure when siding is installed, in order to prevent increased deterioration of the structure from moisture and insects.

Recommended

Whenever possible, the original building materials should be restored. When maintaining or repairing original siding is not feasible, aluminum, vinyl or composite siding may be used. When used over wood surfaces, this siding should be the same size and style as the original wood. Every effort should be made to retain the original trim around windows, doors, cornices gables, eaves and other architectural features.

Property owners should contact the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County prior to initiating any restoration or rehabilitation effort. [Address and contact information is listed in the front of the Guidebook.] The Commission is an invaluable source of information about all facets of rehabilitation and restoration – materials, methods, contractors and the like.

Prohibited

Wood siding shall not be resurfaced with new materials that is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was constructed, such as artificial stone, brick veneer, asbestos or asphalt shingles.

Sandblasting or the use of harsh detergents shall not be used on masonry including brick, stucco, limestone, flagstone and sandstone. This method of cleaning erodes the surface material and accelerates deterioration.

Repointing shall not be done with a mortar of high Portland cement content which can often create a bond that is stronger than the building material. Usage of Portland cement can cause deterioration as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and porosity of the historic masonry unit and the mortar. This most often results in serious damage to adjacent brick.

Unpainted masonry surfaces shall not be painted unless they had been painted originally. Paint shall not be removed from masonry surfaces by any means that damage the surface.

Not Recommended

Waterproof or water repellent coatings or surface consolidation treatments should not be used on masonry surfaces unless required to solve a specific problem that has been studied and identified. Coatings are frequently unnecessary and expensive, and can accelerate deterioration of the masonry. Mortar joints, which do not need repointing, should not be repointed. Wood siding should not be power-washed.

B. ROOFS AND ROOFING

Roof shapes in the district encompass all the various designs found in residential structures: hipped, gabled, gambrel, flat and combinations of these. Roofs are covered with a variety of materials such as asphalt, asbestos, wood and slate shingles as well as clay tiles. Residences in most cases have wood fascias with gutters and downspouts. The fascias of some vinyl- and aluminum-sided houses are covered with the same materials.

Required

The existing shape and type of materials of the roof shall be retained. All architectural features, which give the roof its essential character, shall be retained, including dormer windows, cupolas, cornices, brackets, chimneys, cresting and weather vanes.

Recommended

The original shape and materials of the roof should be restored. Particular effort should be made to retain materials such as slate, tile and other unique materials not commonly found in new construction. Roof covering which is deteriorated beyond repair should be replaced with new material that matches as closely as possible the original in composition, size, shape, color and texture. Gutters and downspouts are often a necessary adjunct in order to prevent deterioration of the structure; they should be maintained whenever possible or replaced with a style comparable and suitable to the architectural period.

Prohibited

Nothing shall be done to change the essential character of the roof as viewed from a street by adding architectural features or large unsightly fixtures, or by using materials inappropriate to the style of the house. The roof shall not be stripped of architectural features important to its character.

Not Recommended

Overhanging eaves, soffit, brackets and gables should not be covered or enclosed when adding siding to a building.

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Window and door frames are in most cases wood and vary depending upon the style of the home. Many are double-hung windows with wood trim and sills. Brick structures have stone sills and brick lintels. In some cases where aluminum siding has been applied, the window and door trim has been covered. About half of the structures in the district have aluminum storm windows; the other half have wood storm windows.

Required

Original windows and doors shall be retained including sashes, lintels, sills, shutters, decorative glass, pediments, hoods and hardware. When deteriorated beyond repair, they shall be replaced with units and trim resembling the original.

Recommended

Wood storm windows and doors painted or finished to match the original should be used but should not damage existing frames. If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design and hardware should be used.

When metal storm doors are used, they should be painted, anodized or coated to match the existing. When awnings are used, they should be of canvas material.

D. ENTRANCES, PORCHES AND STEPS

Most houses in the district have either an open or enclosed porch across the front. Most porches have either hip or gabled roofs or are covered by the main roof of the house.

Required

When deteriorated beyond repair, existing or original porches, stoops, patios and steps, including handrails, balusters, columns, brackets, tiles and roof decorations, shall be retained or replaced by replicas of the same design or by a design more in keeping with the historic period of the structure.

Porches and additions reflecting later architectural styles and which are important to the building's historical integrity shall be retained.

Recommended

When enclosing porches for heat conservation or for other reasons, it should be done in a manner that does not alter the architectural or historical character of the building.

Not Recommended

Original porch details should not be replaced with materials representing a different period or style from the original.

III. NEW CONSTRUCTION

New construction includes any new building or structure built within the boundaries of the historic district, or any new addition to an existing building. New construction should be designed considering the appearance, scale, styles and setbacks of the other buildings in the neighborhood. New work may be contemporary or may suggest motifs from historic buildings in the district.

A. HEIGHT AND PROPORTION

The majority of the structures in the district are two stories in height and have square or rectangular plans. There are several houses that have L- or T- shaped or rambling ground plans. There are a few single-story cottages and one- and one-and-a-half story bungalows. The most prevalent façade proportions are between a 1:1 and 1:2 height to width ratio.

Required

The height of a new structure and its height to width proportions shall be consistent with adjacent buildings in the district. The building height shall be no greater than that of the tallest existing structure and no less than that of the lowest existing structure in the same block. Façade proportion shall be established by permitting no structure with a façade wider or narrower than those existing in the same block. Additions to the existing buildings shall be related in height and proportion to the existing structure.

Recommended

Design of new construction should be compatible in character and mood to the building or neighborhood.

Prohibited

Additions that would add new height or change the existing façade of a building, and change its scale and architectural character shall not be considered.

Not Recommended

New stories should not be added nor existing stories be removed which would destroy important architectural details, features and spaces of the building. Any style or period of architecture that is incompatible with the existing should not be permitted in the new additions.

B. BUILDING MATERIALS

Wall materials in the district range from brick, stucco and wood clapboard and shingles, to aluminum, vinyl and fiberboard / composite siding.

Required

Exterior materials used on a new structure shall be compatible in scale, texture and color (as pertains to masonry) with adjacent structures. Materials used on an addition to an existing structure shall be related to the existing or original materials of that structure. Also, as much of the original structure as possible shall be retained so that the addition could be removed without damage to the basic structure and appearance of the building.

Recommended

Alternative or composite siding may be used when it is the only feasible alternative. This siding should be compatible with the original size and style and with the materials of other buildings in the district.

Prohibited

Inappropriate materials such as asbestos, asphalt, cast stone or artificial brick shall not be used.

Not Recommended

Glass blocks should not be used. Concrete block should not be used for anything other than the foundations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted. Staff would like the original sashes to be resized and reconfigured in the new smaller window opening.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Pobanz stated that they believed that instead of resizing the window that they believe they could move it away from the roof line.

Ms. Pobanz clarified that the sashes are fine, but the frame is rotted. They won't have to resize or replace the sashes.

Commissioner Hertel thanked for the applicants for buying the house, as it has a lot of potential.

Mr. Pobanz stated that they won't be able to get to finishing the window this winter, so they have installed a temporary window covering in the interim until it can be fixed.

Commissioner Hertel clarified that the Commission's motion should include this temporary window, with a condition related to the time frame of its replacement.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hertel stated it is very obvious that this is a bad window. Commissioner Hertel then asked if they had considered installing a downspout from the to-be-installed gutter to draw water away from the sill of the window.

Ms. Pobanz explained that part of the problem is that the gutter above had failed and needed to be replaced, that it should help to draw the water away from window.

Commissioner Stalheim stated he would support the resizing the window to allow for better flashing.

Ms. Pobanz stated that moving the window will allow for additional flashing height, that they would be moving the window 18". That the siding would be replaced with new wood cedar siding.

Commissioner Hertel asked for more information about the door being installed at the rear.

Ms. Pobanz stated that it is an interior door, that they hoped to install a storm door on the outside. The new door would be taller than the existing door by approximately a foot. The light would be moved above the door to accommodate this newer size.

REOPENED PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Dr. Joan Downs-Krostenko, 849 Forest Avenue: The door is very beautiful interior door, it is very weird to put an interior door on the outside of the house. You would have never seen a door of that format on the exterior of the house. I think it is going to look funny. I think it is a beautiful door, and I can see why you would like to have a door with plenty of glass in it; but the exterior door for the back of the house should not be that door.

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to approve the 1) resizing or moving the second story rear window, 2) temporary window installation for the duration of the Certificate's approval, 3) replacement of wood siding with new cedar siding as needed, and 4) replacement of the rear door with the supplied wood door with the storm door remanded to staff. Seconded by Commissioner Stalheim.

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Motion to remand COA #2019-0923A to staff is passed.

2. 60649 Hickory Road	#2019-1007A	#127-78	Local
Landmark			
Representation:	Ben Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614		
	Carrie Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614		

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Date: October 8, 2019

Application Number: 2019-1007A

Property Location: 60649 Hickory Road

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Gabled-Ell/Stick / 1869 / "Gerry Battles Farm"

Property Owner: Ben and Carrie Modlin

Landmark or District Designation: Historic Landmark (Ordinance #127-78)

Rating: *Notable*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: 2-1/2 story Gabled-Ell/Stick style on a rough dressed stone foundation. Roof is cross plan with gable front and jerkin head side gable. Front porch has a single turned post, rear porch is slightly projecting with turned posts and a concrete stoop. The walls are original wood weatherboard shiplap siding with corner boards. Front windows have a wood, raised head with labels where other windows have plain labels. There is a two-story bay window with scrolled brackets. The side bay has a jerkin head roof with art nouveau scrolled decorations on the fascia. Front gable end has an ornate scrollwork decorative fascia, with pendants. There are two front doors with transoms, one with a full light.

ALTERATIONS: The St. Joseph County ordinance in 1978 designating and establishing the Historic Landmark originally included 80 acres. The parcel has since been subdivided and was annexed to the City of South Bend in 1989. While the farm mostly retains the plan of its original buildings, changes to the property without COA are evidenced on aerial maps including the removal of a silo, removal of a small outbuilding to the southwest corner, and removal/modern replacement of the upper portion of the bank barn, retaining the foundation.

COA 1988-0512 approved tear off roofing, redeck with plywood; apply new shingles with fiberglass Owens-Corning 3-in-1 type. COA 2011-0310 approved tear off and re-roof with 3 & 1 shingle and new decking-felt paper ice shield.

Windows are noted on the 1999 survey card as mostly 2/2 light but have since been replaced with 1/1 vinyl double hung (no COA on record) as evidenced in photos dating back to 2011.

Current owners have removed the original wood weatherboard shiplap siding on the south and west sides, installing new artificial siding without COA.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *"Removal of decayed existing siding, animal feces, bat habitat exclusion, beehives, mold, waterlogged and damaged material, removal of wet cellulose insulation from within the wall cavity. Installation of new fiberglass batt insulation, new exterior grade sheathing, Tyvek house wrap, new flashings, new Celect Cellular Composite PVC Wood simulated siding and architectural trim material. Construction methods to follow the manufacturer's written specifications. Please see supporting documentation."*

See additional written description of project.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a *retroactive* Certificate of Appropriateness for changes on the structure:

3. Remove original wood weatherboard shiplap siding on house,
 - a. Completed on south and west sides
4. Install Celect Cellular Composite PVC Wood simulated siding and architectural trim material
 - a. Completed on south and west sides

Prior to the current owners, the property had a long history of deferred maintenance and vacancy, including a 2009 staff memo in the file noting the siding as "rotting". In 2012, Commission staff met with new owner Ben Modlin to go over the scope of work, including "exterior routine maintenance and repair", although no Certificate of Appropriateness applications are on file. In May 2017, Commission staff mailed a Minimum Maintenance Standards letter to the Modlin's, commending their efforts to maintain and preserve the historic character of the property that included a reminder that any project that affects the exterior of the building, site, outbuildings, grounds, or landscaping will require review, and a completed COA application, with a reference to the Standards.

The siding replacement without COA or Building Permit was discovered by Historic Preservation staff during St Joseph County Historic Landmark site visits on 8/27/19 and reported to the Building Department. The Building Department posted a cease and desist on 8/30/19, followed by a Violation letter 9/18/19.

The original wood weatherboard shiplap siding, corner boards, and wood, raised head labels at windows are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. As evidenced by the owner's description and supporting photographs, the original siding demonstrates an advanced state of deterioration and has become permeable to water. Furthermore, the discoveries made inside the wall cavities provides reasonable cause for removing the original siding to remediate the materials

in the wall cavities. While the original siding may have the ability to be repaired and made impermeable, it likely will not withstand removal to clean the wall cavities and reinstallation. Staff accepts that the original siding is deteriorated beyond repair.

Group B Standards discourage the covering or alteration of original materials with additional siding. If the historic material cannot be repaired because of the extent of deterioration or damage, the preferred treatment is replacement in kind with the same material, wood shiplap in this case. Because this approach is not always feasible, provisions are made in Group B Standards to consider the use of a substitute material if it is of the same material as the original, in the same size and texture. The Standard does provide for an alternative material if it duplicates the original, however, the proposed PVC wood simulated siding is not of the same material as the original, is not in the same size (width of the clapboards is scaled up without a shiplap edge) or texture (embossed wood graining, intended to simulate the texture of wood, is not characteristic of real wood siding and is visually inappropriate). The proposed PVC product is not a familiar replacement product; this may in fact be the first application before this Commission. There is precedent for engineered wood products such as HardiePlank and LP SmartSide, as well as traditional vinyl siding, all having a shiplap style option.

Applicants have submitted comparison quotes for Celect, cedar siding, vinyl siding, original siding repair, and another for new wood. Below is a summary of the costs for the materials and for painting (where applicable).

Celect PVC siding	cedar siding	vinyl siding – Big C	repair original siding – Kimmel	tongue & groove siding - Mastercraft
\$11,230	\$60,970	\$2,796.55	\$23,000	\$16,170

Staff has requested more detail about the plan to repair/replace the trim around the windows and at the roof gable to “closely match the original” – specifically which architectural details and what the material will be.

The National Park Service Preservation Brief #8 *Aluminum and Vinyl Siding on Historic Buildings: The Appropriateness of Substitute Materials for Resurfacing Historic Wood Frame Buildings* was consulted for this staff report.

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: Group B

The Commission has the authority to determine the architectural merits and the extent of any proposed treatment, renovation, or addition to a historic landmark. The commission will require drawings, plans, specifications, and/or samples where appropriate.

A. Maintenance

The maintenance of any historical structure or site shall in no way involve any direct physical change except for the general cleaning and upkeep of the landmark. The Commission shall encourage the proper maintenance of all structure or sites.

B. Treatment

Treatment shall be defined as any change of surface materials that will not alter the style or original form. Such improvements include re-roofing, glazing, or landscaping lawns and may involve a change that can potentially enhance or detract from the character of the landmark. A treatment change of any surface whether on the landmark or in its environment may require a Certificate of Appropriateness if it significantly alters the appearance of the landmark. Although these kinds of changes may not require a Building Permit, a Certificate of Appropriateness may be necessary. The commission should review the proposed treatment for character and style consistency with the original surfaces.

C. Renovation and Additions

Renovation is the modification of a structure, which does not alter the general massing while an addition, is a change in mass. A modification, which involves the removal of a part of the landmark, should be considered under demolition (see demolition). Additions to landmarks should not detract from the original form and unity of the landmark and should not cover singular examples of architectural detail. Additions to landmarks should be added in a manner that does not disrupt the visible unity of overall appearance of the site. The proportions, materials and ratios of the existing structures should be carried through in the additions. Care should be taken not to change or alter the following:

1. **Structure**—Necessary structural improvements, where safety demands should be accomplished in such a way as to cause minimal visual change to the original style and construction.
2. **Material**—Additions and improvements involving any new material in the landmark should be of the same material as the original. It should be the same size and texture. An alternative material may be allowed if it duplicates the original.
 - a. **wood**—all wood trim should conform with existing trim in shape and size.
 - b. **siding materials**—the Commission discourages the covering or alteration of original materials with additional siding. Structures already sided with incompatible materials should be returned to a siding similar to the original when renovation is considered.

D. Demolition

Historic landmarks shall not be demolished. When a landmark poses a threat to the public safety, and demolition is the only alternative, documentation by way of photographs, measured drawings, or other descriptive methods should be made of both the

exterior and interior of the landmark. The person or agency responsible for demolition of the landmark shall be responsible for this documentation.

E. Moving

The moving of landmarks is discouraged, however, moving is preferred to demolition. When moving is necessary, the owner of the landmark must apply to the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

F. Signs

No neon or flashing signs will be permitted unless they are original to the structure. Billboards and super-graphics will also be disallowed. Only one appropriate identifying sign will be permitted per business.

G. Building Site and Landscaping

(These standards apply to both A and B)

1. Required

Major landscaping items, trees, fencing, walkways, private yard lights, signs (house numbers) and benches which reflect the property's history and development shall be retained. Dominant land contours shall be retained. Structures such as: gazebos, patio decks, fixed barbecue pits, swimming pools, tennis courts, green houses, new walls, fountains, fixed garden furniture, trellises, and other similar structures shall be compatible to the historic character of the site and neighborhood and inconspicuous when viewed from a public way.

2. Recommended

New site work should be based upon actual knowledge of the past appearance of the property found in photographs, drawings, and newspapers. Plant materials and trees in close proximity to the building that are causing deterioration to the buildings historic fabric should be removed. However, trees and plant materials that must be removed should be immediately replaced by suitable flora. Front yard areas should not be fenced except in cases where historic documentation would indicate such fencing appropriate. Fencing should be in character with the buildings style, materials, and scale.

3. Prohibited

No changes may be made to the appearance of the site by removing major landscaping items, trees, fencing, walkways, outbuildings, and other elements before evaluating their importance to the property's history and development. Front yard areas shall not be transformed into parking lots nor paved nor blacktopped. The installation of unsightly devices such as TV reception dishes and solar collectors shall not be permitted in areas where they can be viewed from public thoroughfares.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends allowing for the replacement of original siding. Staff does not recommend the proposed replacement siding because it does not conform to Group B Standards with additional consideration for the *Notable* rating of the property. Staff recommends a replacement siding that more closely resembles the original in style, size, and texture, preferably wood shiplap. Staff recommends that all trim around the windows, the roof gable, and the brackets replicate the original.

Prepared by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

and

Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Modlin stated that the costs as summarized in the staff report were incorrect. The cedar siding was \$40,000 for \$70,000 plus, and that more detailed information was requested. Mr. Modlin estimated that it would cost \$17,500 to paint. Mr. Modlin had Danny Kimmel estimated that it would cost \$23,000 to paint the cedar siding. From the tongue-and-groove estimate was for labor and installation, and that was a \$43,000 estimation from Mastercraft construction. Total for wood siding would be \$117,000 or so.

Commissioner Hertel asked for clarification, as she believed that Mr. Modlin had been doing the installation.

Mr. Modlin confirmed, yes, that they were asked to give more of an estimate if they were to hire the project out. Mr. Modlin estimated that it would take 350 man hours to paint, at a value of approximately \$17,500; Danny Kimmel estimated it would cost \$23,000 to paint. To install the siding, Mr. Modlin estimated \$40,000, Mastercraft estimated \$43,000. The painting estimate did not include tax.

Commissioner Stalheim asked if the vapor barrier was included in the cost.

Mr. Modlin confirmed that vapor barrier was included, but it does not include the mesh underlayment layer. The reason wood was included was to show the massive cost difference. Just the wood alone is a financial hardship. They cannot afford the wood, they cannot afford to have it installed, they cannot afford to have it painted.

Commissioner Hertel asked if Mr. Modlin is updating his application.

Legal Counsel Kennedy clarified that they were not updating the application, they were clarifying that there were three cost estimate options and not five.

Commissioner Hertel clarified that the three options are 1) select PVC siding at \$11,230, 2) the Cedar siding at \$40,470 plus painting and labor, and 3) vinyl siding.

Administrator Feasel clarified her interpretation of the Kimmel quote (which read "scrape and paint") as having been to rehabilitate the original siding, it was clarified that this was to paint all of the new material to be installed and the old trim and eave details material.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Mr. Mark Modlin, 519 Benton Street, Mishawaka – the father of the applicant. Mr. Modlin spoke of how the project "was going to be a big undertaking, and that they were able to get the house but they were probably the last best hope for the house. The house was vacant and in ruin for a long time. It had a lot of ongoing deterioration, but I think he made a pretty good purchase with a good effort to make it a home. And I think in making it a home, they are heading in the right direction. The costs for replication of a lot of the products are prohibitive, a homeowner who is just getting started. It is a beautiful home, and I think it could be a very long term home for these kids."

Joan Downs-Krostenko, 849 Forest Avenue – "I have restored nine houses, and have put lots of new wood siding where original wood siding was damaged or had been rotted out, so I'm familiar with that. And I've painted all of these houses, so I am familiar with that. My question with this is – is every piece of siding on that house rotten? Is your bid to take it all off and replace it? Every bit of wood on the house is rotten?"

Mr. Modlin stated every bit of siding is rotten.

Ms. Downs-Krostenko stated: "So every bit of siding is rotten. [Specialist Toering], is that accurate?"

Commissioner Hertel stated that there were two areas that have already been replaced.

Administrator Feasel stated that staff has not conducted a site visit to determine the condition of the structure.

Ms. Downs-Krostenko stated that she had never seen a house where all of the wood was rotten. In most cases, you need to replace 10-15% of the wood. This could be the exception, but mostly you do not see that all of the wood needs to be replaced. In her experience, she has never heard of any case where all of the wood is fully rotten. Finally, the holy grail of historic preservation is to avoid vinyl siding, plastic siding, metal siding, all the kinds of replacement siding that do not replicate the material, texture, reveal of the original siding, and often times ruin the trim. That is the entire point of what we do here, and I do appreciate the cost of what you are doing here, because I have confronted it exactly like you have. Many, many times. I have always been able to salvage most of that original wood. Scraping, priming, all of that is expensive, but I have found ways to do that inexpensively, in pieces where I can afford to do it, a little bit at a time.

Mr. Modlin stated that there were significant amounts of bat feces.

Mr. Modlin, Sr. stated that there was also rot, and mice feces. It's a health hazard.

Ms. Downs-Krostenko reiterated that the agenda of historic preservation is to replace with in kind materials, and that can be done over time. When you do open the door for alternative materials, then you might have a really big project that has all of these problems, but then the next project comes in and it's smaller, and the applicant says "but you let these people do it, you let them put up vinyl." Then we are in a real big giant pile of bad stuff.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hertel stated that, if this this was a new project, the 'things underneath', we would not know. In those other projects, as those things are revealed, they would be addressed. So the bees, the cellulose insulation would be addressed as it is found to make the home habitable.

Commissioner Stalheim stated that Commission would support that action.

Commissioner Hertel explained that the applicant has lived in the house for multiple years, that they have known the COA process (as noted in the letter that is included in your packet dated 2017). That the applicant received glowing statements regarding the preservation of the structure at that time, "we are thrilled to see the condition of your home and commend your efforts to preserve your historic property."

Commissioner Ponder asked about the alternative materials that had been mentioned.

Administrator Feasel explained that staff included those materials as they had been previously approved by the Commission, that it was unknown what those materials would cost, and that staff would prefer an in-kind replacement with wood ship-lap siding.

Commissioner Stalheim stated they may be offered, but they be more expensive because this is an atypical mill pattern.

Administrator Feasel stated that she had interpreted the Kimmel quote as a quote for rehabilitation of the existing siding, and that Staff has not seen the material, nor has an estimate has been received. The house is more than likely balloon-frame construction, so an expert may know of a way to open up the walls to remove the insulation material.

Commissioner Brazinksy stated that she had owned a similar house in Wisconsin and that they removed the bottom boards and removed the insulation. She then stripped and painted the siding. The house was not a (designated) historic home.

Administrator Feasel stated that were this a proactive application, that would have been the first thing that Staff would have suggested to the applicant, what is the cost of doing that. Because this project is partially retroactive, it's taken us a bit off guard. Were it proactive, that's how we would have addressed this project. I think that's missing from this project application.

Mr. Modlin stated that there is no vapor barrier, and that they'd have to remove it all. That doing all wood is prohibitively expensive.

Commissioner Hertel explained her opposition to PVC and vinyl siding and expressed that it is a responsibility to uphold the historic integrity of these homes, especially ones like this one, which were here long before much of anything else in the area.

Commissioner Stalheim inquired as to what the plan was as to the decorative elements on the roof and over the windows.

Mr. Modlin stated that he is in the process of repairing those, and that some have gone missing, and he's going to have to re-mill them as close as possible, with marine grade plywood, CNC'd out.

Commissioner Stalheim asked if all would be replaced.

Ms. Modlin stated that that would depend on the condition of the remaining pieces and indicated in the imagery on the projector that some of the pieces are hanging dangerously off the house.

Mr. Modlin stated that he thought the new material looks good from the street.

Commissioner Hertel expressed that she believes you can tell the difference between PVC, vinyl, and wood. She further stated that she agreed with Dr. Downs-Krostenko that it seems impossible that all the siding is bad, and that the replacement material should have the proper look. That there is evidence of long-term neglect. That she is hesitant to make a quick judgement. That she would like to see a better estimate as to the current siding condition. That replacing some of the material would be cheaper than replacing all of the material.

Commissioner Brazinsky asked how long of a continuance would be needed to get an estimate.

Administrator Feasel stated that it would be on the applicant to talk with restoration experts to determine the cost and time of that kind of project. That staff's role at this point would be negligible, as we have already determined the siding to be deteriorated beyond repair.

Commissioner Brazinsky reiterated that the siding looked identical to what she had in Wisconsin, that had insects and bees nests. Commissioner Brazinsky stated that she was between outright denial and continuing for more information.

Commissioner Hertel explained that the Commission could deny the application as it currently exists, which would require the applicant to reapply for the exterior changes again. The Commission could offer a continuance where you could get additional information that the Commission is requesting and come back at the next meeting with that information (without paying additional application fees). Commissioner Hertel asked the applicant what they would like to do.

Mr. Modlin asked if they could discuss the options.

Commissioner Hertel stated that the meeting could not be postponed.

Mr. Modlin asked what they should do in the interim regarding the health concerns related to the condition of the house.

Commissioner Hertel stated that they should get with their contractor immediately, but that these conditions don't appear to be new problems. As homeowners they should be combatting any mold or other biological concerns with the appropriate bleach mixture.

Mr. Modlin stated that they've tried and that they are this point, and that they believe the house exterior is beyond repair. When they were sitting in the basement when the tornado came through and they saw bat feces raining down from the wall because the rain was coming in, it was actionable. The only way that was feasible was to take the old off and put the new on.

Commissioner Hertel reiterated that they are still at the same point as five minutes ago: the Commission can deny the application, or give a continuance to find additional information.

Mr. Modlin Sr. interjected that you have to have the money to be able to do the work.

Mr. Modlin asked clarified that the options are continuation or denial.

Commissioner Hertel explained that the Commission's feelings are apparent, and that the Commission wants to empower you to make the house better.

Ms. Modlin asked what the time frame of the continuation would be.

Legal Counsel Kennedy explained that the next meeting would within the time frame of the current application.

Commissioner Stalheim expressed concerns regarding the weather.

Administrator Feasel expressed that any additional information would need to be received by the COA deadline date.

Mr. Modlin asked what the status of the Red Tag from the Building Department would be.

Administrator Feasel explained that Staff would contact the Building Department to inform them that the project was still under review and more information would be available in late November.

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to continue COA#2019-1007A and request the applicant get additional information about restoration of the exterior siding (with information about the amount of salvageable material), with the date of November 12th for more information. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1007A is passed.

**3. 2119 Portage Avenue
Landmark**

#2019-1011A

#7020-82

Local

Representation: Woodrow Bowers, 25375 Yankee Street, Edwardsburg, MI
49112

Jeff McKelvey, 2119 Portage Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616
Mary McKelvey, 2119 Portage Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616

**STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Date: October 17, 2019

Application Number: 2019-1011A

Property Location: 2119 Portage Avenue

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Greek Revival / 1865 – “Isaac Marble House”

Property Owner: Jeff and Mary McKelvey

Landmark or District Designation: Local Landmark, Ordinance #7020-82

Rating: *Outstanding*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: Two story Greek Revival (with ancillary one story wings) on brick foundation. Two chimneys and a later heater exhaust punctuate the roof line. Exterior is brick with a stretcher bond, stone sills and lintels. The roof is a shallow gable with short eave overhang and large frieze. The soffit was enclosed prior to landmarking. Two wings were added flanking the original structure, later windows were installed in those additions. Windows are double-hung 6-over-6 on the second story and double-hung 6-over-9 on the first story. Some fixed windows are found in the original structure. Casements exist in the later additions. A front porch spans the original structure, a side entrance has a stepped stoop.

ALTERATIONS: Two wing additions were added sometime in the 20th century (sometime after 1946?). COA #1986-0903 allowed for the construction of an addition to the west side of the garage, as well as reroofing of the south addition. COA #1986-1008 allowed for re-roofing and aluminum soffits on the south wing addition. A ‘cabana’ was constructed attached to the garage without COA in 1987. COA #1987-0807 allowed for the construction of the front porch. COA #1990-0606 allowed for reconstruction of the deteriorated chimney with new bricks. COA #1997-0829 allowed for masonry repairs to the main chimney. COA #1996-0912 allowed for additional repairs and modifications to the masonry of the main chimney. COA #2001-0417 allowed for the repair/replacement-in-kind of the split-rail fence on the property, landscaping, tree trimming. COA #2003-0929 allowed for the removal and replacement of exterior storm doors and entrance doors. COA #2006-0329-1 allowed for the re-roofing of portions of the garage, as well as repair of the damages to the main roof. COA #2006-0720A allowed for the re-roof of the main structure and garage with Tamko Heritage 30-year shingles, as well as the replacement of the static air vents.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “*Overlay metal on shingles, remove stove vent. (Standing-seam horizontal roof by Central States Manufacturing, Inc.)*”

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes on the structure:

1. Installation of a Horizon-Lock (produced by Central States Manufacturing, Inc.) standing seam, textured painted steel roof over the existing asphalt shingles,
 - a. Panels are 16”, fabricated in varying lengths to accommodate different roof sections.
 - b. 13” ridge cap (painted)
2. Remove the stove vent on the southern wing addition.

The proposed material is a departure from the existing material. Metal was a common roofing material in the 19th century, although no record of it being used on this structure can be found. The 1932 Assessor Card Indicates that wood shingles were in use in the early part of the 20th century (this is indicated by ‘W.SH’ on the assessor card). Standing seam metal roofs enjoy a long lifespan, if installed properly (by comparison, the current shingles are believed to be thirteen years old).

Staff expresses one point of concern: if the new material is laid on top of the existing shingles, the flashing of the new metal roof will come into conflict with the existing stone window sills, specifically at the front porch and at the rear second story window (where the window air conditioning unit is located in the supplied photographs). The front porch design (when originally submitted in 1987) was modified to ensure the second floor window sills would not be impacted by the roof line.

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: Local Landmark “Group B”

The Commission has the authority to determine the architectural merits and the extent of any proposed treatment, renovation, or addition to a historic landmark. The commission will require drawings, plans, specifications, and/or samples where appropriate.

A. Maintenance

The maintenance of any historical structure or site shall in no way involve any direct physical change except for the general cleaning and upkeep of the landmark. The Commission shall encourage the proper maintenance of all structure or sites.

B. Treatment

Treatment shall be defined as any change of surface materials that will not alter the style or original form. Such improvements include re-roofing, glazing, or landscaping lawns and may involve a change that can potentially enhance or detract from the character of the landmark. A treatment change of any surface whether on the landmark or in its environment may require a Certificate of Appropriateness if it significantly alters the appearance of the landmark. Although these kinds of changes may not require a Building Permit, a Certificate of Appropriateness may be necessary. The commission should review the proposed treatment for character and style consistency with the original surfaces.

C. Renovation and Additions

Renovation is the modification of a structure, which does not alter the general massing while an addition, is a change in mass. A modification, which involves the removal of a part of the landmark, should be considered under demolition (see demolition).

Additions to landmarks should not detract from the original form and unity of the landmark and should not cover singular examples of architectural detail. Additions to landmarks should be added in a manner that does not disrupt the visible unity of overall appearance of the site. The proportions, materials and ratios of the existing structures should be carried through in the additions. Care should be taken not to change or alter the following:

1. **Structure**—Necessary structural improvements, where safety demands should be accomplished in such a way as to cause minimal visual change to the original style and construction.

2. **Material**—Additions and improvements involving any new material in the landmark should be of the same material as the original. It should be the same size and texture. An alternative material may be allowed if it duplicates the original.

a. wood—all wood trim should conform with existing trim in shape and size.

b. siding materials—the Commission discourages the covering or alteration of original materials with additional siding. Structures already sided with incompatible materials should be returned to a siding similar to the original when renovation is considered.

D. Demolition

Historic landmarks shall not be demolished. When a landmark poses a threat to the public safety, and demolition is the only alternative, documentation by way of photographs, measured drawings, or other descriptive methods should be made of both the exterior and interior of the landmark. The person or agency responsible for demolition of the landmark shall be responsible for this documentation.

E. Moving

The moving of landmarks is discouraged, however, moving is preferred to demolition. When moving is necessary, the owner of the landmark must apply to the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

F. Signs

No neon or flashing signs will be permitted unless they are original to the structure. Billboards and super-graphics will also be disallowed. Only one appropriate identifying sign will be permitted per business.

G. Building Site and Landscaping (These standards apply to both A and B)

1. Required

Major landscaping items, trees, fencing, walkways, private yard lights, signs (house numbers) and benches which reflect the property's history and development shall be retained. Dominant land contours shall be retained. Structures such as: gazebos, patio decks, fixed barbecue pits, swimming pools, tennis courts, green houses, new walls, fountains, fixed garden furniture, trellises, and other similar structures shall be compatible to the historic character of the site and neighborhood and inconspicuous when viewed from a public way.

2. Recommended

New site work should be based upon actual knowledge of the past appearance of the property found in photographs, drawings, and newspapers. Plant materials and trees in close proximity to the building that are causing deterioration to the buildings historic fabric should be removed. However, trees and plant materials that must be removed should be immediately replaced by suitable flora. Front yard areas should not be fenced except in cases where historic documentation would indicate such fencing appropriate. Fencing should be in character with the buildings style, materials, and scale.

3. Prohibited

No changes may be made to the appearance of the site by removing major landscaping items, trees, fencing, walkways, outbuildings, and other elements before evaluating their importance to the property's history and development. Front yard areas shall not be transformed into parking lots nor paved nor blacktopped. The installation of unsightly devices such as TV reception dishes and solar collectors shall not be permitted in areas where they can be viewed from public thoroughfares.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted, with the expressed concern that the stone window sill should not be adversely impacted by the addition of the metal roof material.

Prepared by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

Recommendation by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Bowers explained that the window sill in the back is already blocked by the existing roof line, and that in the front the new roof may impact the sills at the seam locations. He then supplied additional pictures regarding the proposed installation of the roof material. He further explained previous examples that he had installed that were similar to this project.

Ms. McKelvey stated that she wanted to bring it back to a historic condition, and that she didn't paint it.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Downs-Krostenko stated that standing-seam metal roofs were not installed in this area north of the Ohio River valley. Does the Commission have any discussion or concerns of color as to metal roofs? She expressed concern that color should be looked into by the Commission going forward.

Mr. Bowers responded that he had seen tins roofs installed.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Stalheim stated that fortunately they want a dark colored roof.

Commissioner Hertel stated that there is concern about color going forward. Commissioner Hertel also expressed concern regarding the front windows.

Commissioner Stalheim asked how the flashing is installed into and beneath the windows.

Mr. Bowers expressed that they would not adversely impact the windows.

Commissioner Hertel expressed that the Commission wants the homeowner to have a long-term roof solution, so is protective on behalf of the applicant. Commissioner Hertel expressed concern regarding moisture infiltration into the existing shingles that could cause other problems.

Mr. Bowers explained the various layers that are installed beneath the roof material to both protect the roof material, as well as to create moisture barrier, where it runs the moisture out. Mr. Bowers further discussed historic barn structures that have metal roofs that have lasted one hundred years.

Commissioner Stalheim confirmed that laying metal roof over existing shingles is common.

Mr. Bowers expressed that these advances have helped measurably.

Commissioner Stalheim asked about the widths of the panels themselves.

Mr. Bowers explained that the residential width is 16". Commercial widths are 18".

Commissioner Ponder asked about the gutters and soffits.

Mr. Bowers explained that no change would be made to the gutters or soffits.

Commissioner Stalheim mentioned the removal of the stovepipe.

Mr. McKelvey joked that he would not be cutting wood.

**Commissioner Ponder made a motion to approve COA#2019-1011A. Seconded by
Commissioner Brazinsky.**

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1011A is passed.

Commissioner Hertel explained that she hoped that the property owners feel comfortable contacting the Staff if they have any questions regarding their historic property.

Administrator Feasel stated that Staff may have information about efficient ways of removing paint from the exterior brick.

Commissioner Hertel explained that when the homeowners are ready for that, Staff is ready and willing to help.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- i. Commissioner Stalheim made a motion to approve the August meeting minutes as circulated.** Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Motion to approve the minutes passes.

B. STAFF REPORTS

i. Administrative Approvals

1. Commissioner Hertel stated thanks and admiration to the staff for taking care of the administrative approvals.
2. Administrator Feasel expressed that Staff is uploading the Administrative Approvals as they are created.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets

1. N/A

ii. Standards Update

1. Administrator Feasel stated that Indiana Landmarks has secured funding for the creation of a model standard for their commissions, statewide.
2. Indiana Landmarks has invited Commissioner Stalheim to apply for the paid standards update position.

Legal Counsel Kennedy expressed concern that quorum is necessary at the November meeting regarding the Hickory Farmhouse project.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. Common Council Appointees

1. Administrator Feasel explained that former Inspector Szaday was denied regarding the vacant Common Council HPC positions. The response indicated that other applicants were received, and the vacancies had been filled.
2. Commissioner Hertel requested that Staff contact the Common Council regarding potential appointees.

B. Architectural Historian

1. Administrator Feasel explained filling the position, and the process, and that former Inspector Szaday could be considered for that position.
2. Commissioner Hertel expressed her interest in seeing Dr. Joan Downs-Krostenko as a potential applicant regarding the Architectural Historian position.
3. Commissioner Stalheim expressed concern that we should be selective as opposed to be hasty with filling that position.

C. Commissioner Ponder expressed concern regarding the residence at the NW corner of Eddy and Jefferson, 1031 E Jefferson.

1. Specialist Toering explained that all work is happening on site and is seemingly done to the highest standards.
2. Commissioner Hertel requested that we contact the property owner to attain a valid Certificate of Appropriateness.

D. Commissioner Ponder asked about the circumstances of the Pierre Navarre Cabin

1. Specialist Toering explained that Staff has written The History Museum regarding the moving the structure, and no response has been received.

2. Commissioner Hertel expressed interest of the Historic Preservation Commission in making a formal position statement.
 3. Administrator Feasel stated that the Commission's official position would be an eventual approval or denial of an application.
 4. Specialist Toering expressed that the financial implications of losing the National Register designation that being in Leeper Park affords the cabin.
- E.** Commissioner Hertel asked about the Leeper Park swimming area excavation.
1. Administrator Feasel expressed that no additional information has been received.
 2. Legal Counsel Kennedy expressed that Venues, Parks & Arts – and other city entities – should draft contracts that stipulate that construction should stop in the event of archaeological sites are unearthed.
 3. Commissioner Hertel expressed interest in seeing something formal by the end of the year.
- F.** Commissioner Ponder asked about 720 Lincoln Way East
1. No update from Staff, no additional work has been seen.
- G.** Commissioner Ponder asked about the United Auto Workers Building, 740 S Michigan Street
1. Commissioner Ponder expressed concern for the building, considering the demise of the Fat Daddy's Block.
 2. Specialist Toering expressed concern for that entire area.

Administrator Feasel left the proceedings at 6:55pm.

3. Legal Counsel Kennedy disclosed that the Department of Community Investment and the City of South Bend has purchased property in that area.
- H.** Commissioner Ponder asked about the Monarch Printing Building, 516-518 South Michigan
1. Specialist Toering disclosed that the Monarch Printing Building is a Local Landmark and had been for sale recently for \$39,000. No activity has been seen at this time.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 7:06 pm.

Attest:



Sarah Ponder, Secretary

12-16-19

Date

