

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

November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
13<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
County – City Building  
South Bend, IN 46601

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Commission President Michele Gelfman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Members of the Public Present:**

Joan Downs-Krostenko, 849 Forest Avenue, South Bend, IN 46616  
Ben Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614  
Carrie Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614  
Ricardo Nevarez, 21913 Mishawaka Avenue, South Bend, IN 46615

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** : Michele Gelfman, President; Lesley Annis, Assistant Secretary  
Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Sarah Ponder, Secretary; Eric Stalheim; Patrick Deegan;  
Joan Downs-Krostenko, Architectural Historian.

**Members Not in Attendance:** Mary Brazinsky; John Tiffany.

**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**

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to amend the agenda and vote for the architectural historian prior to the Public Hearing.** Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Five in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to amend the agenda to amend the agenda and vote for the Architectural Historian prior to the Public Hearing is passed.**

Commissioner Hertel read Ms. Joan Downs-Krostenko's letter of interest in the Architectural Historian position into the record:

Dear Ms. Feasel,

October 31, 2019

Thank you for the offer to join the Historic Preservation Commission. I am honored and would like to accept. Please see the attached resume for information on my professional and community work.

I must remind you that although I am an art historian who works both on architecture and on urban design and landscape history specifically, my formal training is in the study of the ancient and medieval world.

I hope this does not disqualify me because as you know, I am a preservationist at heart and a perpetual student. I have made my business and volunteer work in historic preservation in South Bend a vocation in which I am constantly educating myself. My art historical and architectural training has made me a quick study in the field of local 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture. My inclinations and work as an archaeologist were entirely in the realm of preservation and research.

I hope to be a contributing member of the commission and intend to continue my education in local history and architecture so as to provide accurate perspective when it is called for in discussion and decision-making.

Sincerely,

Joan Downs-Krostenko

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to accept Ms. Downs-Krostenko's interest in the Architectural Historian position.** Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Five in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to accept Ms. Downs-Krostenko's application and appoint her to the Historic Preservation Commission is passed.**

Architectural Historian Joan Downs-Krostenko joined the Commission.

#### A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

<b>1. 60649 Hickory Road Landmark</b>	<b>#2019-1007A</b>	<b>#127-78</b>	<b>Local</b>
Representation:	Ben Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614 Carrie Modlin, 60649 Hickory Road, South Bend, IN 46614		

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

Date: November 12, 2019

**Application Number:** 2019-1007A conitnued  
**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:

1. Remove original wood weatherboard shiplap siding on house,
  - a. Completed on south and west sides
  
2. 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 (application item), cedar siding, vinyl siding, and original siding repair. A summary (by staff) of the costs for the materials and for painting (where applicable) has been redacted from this report.

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.

Results of the October 21 Historic Preservation Commission public hearing are:

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to continue application #2019-1007A until the November 18th meeting. This continuance is to allow the applicant time to research and provide additional information about restoration of the existing wood siding, including: removing the bottom shiplap to allow for the removal of debris, ascertaining an estimate as to the amount of siding material that could be considered salvageable, estimates as to the cost of the restoration of that salvageable material. This information is requested by Tuesday, November 12th. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Four in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 4 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1007A until the November 18th meeting is passed.

Applicants have submitted two additional proposals, see: Clayton Hoover and Sons for salvaging remaining siding and mill new siding and Mignery & Son Contracting for vinyl siding.

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

Commissioner Patrick Deegan joined the proceedings at 5:34 pm.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

N/A

#### **COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Stalheim: Agree that the siding should be replaced, that, from the material that is apparent, that little could be saved. That the Commission should consider allowing the replacement, but consider approval and focus more on retaining the bigger details that you see from the street: the fascia boards, the window trim, and focus on keeping those as accurate as possible, and forgo the cove detail of the shiplap for replacement siding, even though it is retroactive, with the stipulation in the approval so it doesn't become a precedent. That they retain any salvageable material, and keep it in good order, and since we know that plastic materials fail prematurely compared to other options – when this has to be replaced there's a stipulation in the approval that they come forward and it becomes a

requirement for it to be more appropriate to the original house since we do have it documented in photographs. I do agree that the insulation and the innards of the wall need to be properly replaced.

Commissioner Ponder: The estimates were worrisome: 1) one estimate showed the contractor wasn't going to remove the material in the wall, 2) there were differing opinions as to what was salvageable.

Commissioner Gelfman asked the Commission as to the details of the work as it was proposed the previous month, and that there seemed to be some discrepancies with how the work could be completed.

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern that, were the Commission to approve the vinyl, and mandate a better product when the vinyl fails, that there wouldn't be compliance in the future.

Commissioner Stalheim clarified that he believes that the purpose is to save the structure as a whole, a discussion should be had on what components are most valuable.

Commissioner Hertel agreed with Commissioner Stalheim and stated that the insulation and the animals – those should be addressed. Options were discussed for ways that that could be executed.

Commissioner Stalheim stated that it again appears beyond repair.

Commissioner Annis stated that two sides had already been completed.

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern as to whether minimum maintenance was executed.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko expressed that these problems did not just come up immediately, that they were evident from when the structure was purchased in 2012; that “if you postpone making a plan, and suddenly it is an emergency, and it is too expensive to do the right thing” and not follow the Standards.

Commissioner Annis expressed that she agreed with Commissioner Stalheim, that financial hardship is a consideration and the Commission should attempt to control what happens next.

Commissioner Gelfman expressed that this was not a comparison of apples to apples, and that the estimates are hard to compare.

Commissioner Deegan expressed that he agreed, that a lived-in building is better than a degrading building. Commissioner Deegan expressed that he supported this position based upon the distance from the street, the seemingly imperceptible difference in the siding is not perceptible at that distance, the maintenance of the property up until 2012 was spotty at best, and that worse things were installed, that the summation of all these things is not ideal, that wood siding would be preferred, but lived-in, with a family is preferable to the alternative.

Commissioner Gelfman noted that the structure is rated as *Notable*, expressed that finding a solution that is like-in-kind is what the Standards and Guidelines require. Commissioner Gelfman expressed dissatisfaction with the estimates and had hoped that the cost would be broken down by the projects. Further, the salvageable estimate discrepancies complicate the discussion.

Commissioner Stalheim noted that the Hoover proposal did not include sheathing, which either means it is included, or it is an additional cost.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko exclaimed that in her experience, removing wet insulation from the walls is manageable to do by property owner themselves. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko further stated that she felt that problem areas are usually easily identified, and that the proposals are somewhat of a ‘blank check’ to fix those problems. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko referenced historic preservationist Bob Yapp’s position that removing vinyl or aluminum siding typically results in less than 15% material that needs to be replaced.

Commissioner Stalheim clarified that half the house has already been resided, and that only half the house still has the original siding.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the proposed material to be installed could be installed by the property owner, whereas wood siding may require more of a craftsman to install.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that she had never installed vinyl siding, so she was not aware of how hard it was to install by comparison.

#### **PUBLIC DISCUSSION:**

N/A

Commissioner Gelfman asked the applicants to further explain their position:

Mr. Modlin stated that they called the contractors on the list provided by HPC Staff and the quotes were received were the only two contractors who responded. They were not happy with the estimates that they received, as they did not quote as how Mr. Modlin had hoped to quote to satisfy the Commission’s concerns. The quote in question ended up being for labor only.

Commissioner Hertel asked for clarification regarding the quoted cost for “chimney demolition.”

Mr. Modlin stated that it was added in the quote.

Legal Counsel Kennedy clarified that the Modlins are not changing their application to include chimney demolition.

Administrator Feasel clarified that the contractors did not do what the Modlins had wanted them to do. Administrator Feasel further clarified that the contractor list supplied by the HPC Staff is not curated and was inherited.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko expressed concern as to the one contractor’s estimate that included siding over the wet detritus and insulation. This would not be ideal.

Mr. Modlin stated they requested to get quotes, these two contractors responded, that they provided them. Mr. Modlin stated that installing wood siding can be cantankerous at times, and that “90% of all wood siding warranty issues are derived from improper installation.” This quote is from ‘Buffalo’, the manufacturer of the wood siding.

Commissioner Annis clarified that that when a warranty issue were to come up, it was not the product, but the way it was installed.

Specialist Toering clarified that he believed that this was true for roofs or other construction products; improper installation results in more failures for any product – its typically not the product itself.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that it is not that hard to install wood siding.

Commissioner Gelfman asked that, if wood siding were acquired, what the installation costs would be.

Mr. Modlin stated that they were instructed to quotes for cost for installing the different materials, and that the supplied quotes are what was provided.

Commissioner Deegan asked if other alternative materials were investigated, for example, Hardee Board.

Mr. Modlin stated that in conversations with North Coast, the representative did not support installing cement board on the house, allegedly due to the loss of lawsuits. Regarding other wood quotes, he could not find many.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked if they had considered doing the house one side at a time.

Mr. Modlin expressed that he had considered it, but that it would be a five-year project of work in the summers.

Ms. Modlin stated that this option would subject their children to years with whatever material is in the walls.

Commissioner Hertel expressed that the Commission fully supports removing the material from the wall cavities in the pursuit of creating a healthy environment for their family.

Mr. Modlin explained that removing the cellulose material from the inside, it would remove the lathe and plaster, and that the siding is already in a deteriorated condition, and that removing the siding would be easier.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko agreed that doing it from the outside is easier, and that you would not have to remove all the siding to do it.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the estimate would come to about \$22,000 (and that includes taking off the 7% tax) and would not include her labor.

Mr. Modlin produced the proposed siding and demonstrated how it worked together.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko inquired about the size difference between the proposed siding and the original siding.

Mr. Modlin indicated that of the \$11,000 for the Celect PVC, half of that cost is already installed on the house.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko suggest that a motion regarding the preservation of the architectural details as a separate piece from the replacement of the siding.

Commissioner Stalheim asked the applicant about the lifespan of the material in direct sunlight.

Mr. Modlin stated that Royal makes a lot of products.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko indicated the average lifespan of vinyl siding is about 25 years. The average lifespan of original wood, if properly maintained, is about 160 years; it cost more upfront, but has a longer lifespan. The vinyl will go into the landfill sooner.

Mr. Modlin stated they did not plan on going anywhere any time soon.

Ms. Modlin stated they were invested in the property.

Commissioner Stalheim asked about how the material is joined together.

Mr. Modlin explained that it is connected by PVC glue.

Commissioner Gelfman asked for a motion to break the project into two portions.

**Commissioner Stalheim made a motion to divide COA #2019-1007A-Continued into two components, 1) the treatment and the preservation of the architectural details, 2) replacement of the siding. Commissioner Annis seconded the motion.**

Seven in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 7 – 0. Motion to separate COA #2019-1007A into two components passes.**

Commissioner Stalheim stated that the treatment of the architectural details should be maintained ‘in-kind.’

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked to clarify what architectural details would be covered in the motion: does it include corner boards, window sills, trim, fascia.

Mr. Modlin stated that the inside corner boards and the outside corner boards would be of PVC.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked if that would impact the fascia, soffit, and sills.

Mr. Modlin stated that it would end at the frieze board.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the windows were already replaced.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked for staff’s sentiment as to how this should be separated.

Administrator Fasel stated that separating projects does occur, that the Commission has not typically wanted to see windows wrapped with aluminum or other materials, but the interplay of original wood with the plastic material is unknown.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that it could be determined at staff’s discretion after investigation of the cases. That attaching the vinyl material to the wood could cause problems.

Mr. Modlin stated that there is transitional board that would come up to the frieze board and stop.

Commissioner Hertel stated that, when the Commission is discussing the maintenance of original ‘architectural details’, that the original wood shiplap is an architectural detail.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that this is the classic Historic Preservation problem: that it is expensive to do it 'right.' That this is why the Commission is here for. That if the argument becomes, 'its too expensive to do it right,' then the Commission might as well go home, because that is one of the reasons why it exists.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked if the original boards would be removed, or if the new material would be installed over the old boards.

Mr. Modlin stated that they would remove the old material, and that new sheathing would be installed, and fire stop, and vapor barrier.

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA#2019-1007A-Continued, that all the architectural details including the trim around the windows, the roof gable, the brackets, are replicated in the original style and material (this does not include the siding). Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.**

Seven in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 7 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-1007A-Continued, section one, regarding “the treatment and preservation of the Architectural details” is passed.**

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA#2019-1007A-Continued, that the siding to be replaced should be wood in nature, with final approval of the product details remanded to staff. Seconded by Commissioner Downs-Krostenko.**

Six in favor, one opposed.

**Vote: 6 – 1. Motion to approve COA #2019-1007A, section two with wood siding, with final product details remanded to staff, is approved.**

Legal Counsel Kennedy clarified that the approved motion is a denial of the original application, and that Commissioners should state their reasons for denial. Roll was called.

**Commissioner Downs-Krostenko (AYE):** I vote to deny because, the holy grail of our business is the exterior preservation of these buildings, and changing the material and the dimensions of the material does radically change the appearance of the house, it also involves demolishing the existing wood siding, and once you do something like that to the house, you can pretty much guarantee that it probably will never come back. If the wood stays underneath there, someone may come along and say, 'oh, I'm going to make arrangements to take off the nasty vinyl siding and repair the woodwork and the carpentry and make it beautiful again. Once you remove it, you pretty much put a stake through the heart of the building in terms of its integrity and value in the exterior.

**Commissioner Annis (AYE):** I vote to deny, as the product is outside of the recommendation of the standards. Our job is to uphold the Standards.

**Commissioner Deegan (NAY):**

**Commissioner Hertel (AYE):** I vote to deny, as the product is outside of the standards and guidelines of what would be appropriate for the house of that historic time.

**Commissioner Gelfman (AYE):** I vote to deny, due to the fact that, 1) this farmstead is notable, which is critical in St. Joseph County and the City as well. 2) If we are to keep the integrity of historical preservation that exists for hundreds and hundreds of years, we have to look at the standards and the guidelines that have been set, and we need to follow them as best we can. I understand that this is a difficult situation because of the cost of it, unfortunately one of the things that comes along with a historical home, which I think all of us own, is that – the cost of the renovations of it. One of the things that Dr. [Krostenko-] Downs did recommend that might be helpful to you is to just do it a section at a time, over so many years. I understand that is difficult as well,



but if you are doing this yourself, then that lessens the amount, not just for the wood itself, but for the labor and everything else that is involved with it.

**Commissioner Ponder (AYE):** I vote to deny for the reasons already stated based in the guidelines, as well as for the precedence that it sets. If we allow you to do it – and yes, I understand the financial hardship – if someone else comes with a smaller project, then they will use this as leverage to say, ‘hey, you let them do it, why can’t you let us do it?’ Again, we must follow the guidelines that have been laid out.

**Commissioner Stalheim (AYE):** I vote to deny based upon all of the reasons previously stated.

**Application to install vinyl siding is denied.**

**2. 619 Cushing #2019-1023A #8142-90 Local**  
**Landmark**  
Representation: Ricardo Nevarez, 21913 Mishawaka Avenue, South Bend, IN 46615

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

**Date:** November 13, 2019

**Application Number:** 2019-1023A  
**Property Location:** 617-619 North Cushing  
**Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder:** Gabled-ell/Stick / 1892  
**Property Owner:** Dito’s Investments, LLC  
**Landmark or District Designation:** Local Landmark, Ordinance #8142-90  
**Rating:** *Outstanding*

**DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE:** Main structure is a two-story irregular plan Gabled-ell house in the stick style on a brick foundation (that was previously covered in stucco). Wood clapboard siding with decorative square panels and jigsaw shingles. Asphalt shingle roof with centrally mounted brick chimney. Gabled dormers with decorated rakeboards, molded wood eaves and rake, and a plain frieze. The front entry porch adds distinctive styling, the side entrance has a unique canopy with fan-decorated semicircular brackets. Windows were originally 1-over-1 double hung with plain wood jambs and sills and decorated wood entablatures; many windows are now vinyl replacements.

617 Cushing stands to the rear of the main house closer to the alley and was possibly originally an outbuilding. It is a one and a half story structure with a brick foundation and a centrally mounted chimney. Originally sided in wood, it is now covered in vinyl. Windows are a mix of original wood one-over-one double hung, casements, and replacement vinyl windows.

**ALTERATIONS:** Both properties have been extensively modified over the course over the last century. Windows have been replaced in both structures (without COA); 617 Cushing had vinyl siding installed over the original siding. AA 2019-0517 approved a number of projects on the exterior of both structures which have not been completed (removal and reconstruction of chimneys, foundation work, tree removal, landscaping improvements, and the removal of the exterior stair well). AA 2019-1023 allowed for the removal and re-roofing of the asphalt shingle roof, as well as the installation of new gutters and downspouts.

**APPLICATION ITEMS:** *“Install new shingles roof, install gutters and downspouts, cancel two entry doors and fix wood siding, paint all exterior siding and trim-casting.”*

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

3. Removal of exterior doors, filling in of the former door cavities, and siding over with LP Smart Side PPG Prefinished™ 3/8 x 6 x 16’ Knight’s Armor Textured Strand Lap Siding.
  - a. The front façade of the structure currently has three entrances:
    - i. An ancillary entrance facing east, TO BE REMOVED
    - ii. A primary entrance on the front porch facing east,
    - iii. A secondary entrance onto the front porch, facing south, TO BE REMOVED

Staff believes the LP Smartside is intended to be used just to fill in the removed doors. Staff has not interpreted this application as seeking to re-side the entirety of the structure.

Late 19<sup>th</sup> century structures often had multiple front entrances (leading to some being labeled as ‘coffin doors’ or ‘funeral doors’ as they were supposedly installed to allow coffins to be brought into and removed from a house without navigating tight turns or corners). Historic record indicates this structure has long existed as a multi-family house with multiple units, necessitating multiple entrances. This is reflected in the property history and 1932 Assessor Cards.

Staff is not immediately against the removal of additional non-essential doors but would prefer they are replaced with new windows. Recent projects reviewed and approved by the Commission include the following examples where doors were removed and replaced with new windows include:

1. COA 2018-0403 for 908 Leland in the Chapin Park Local Historic District,
  - a. An ancillary door opening onto the front porch was removed and replaced with a specially constructed window,
2. COA 2018-1107 for 916 Riverside Drive in the Riverside Drive Local Historic District,
  - a. A secondary porch entrance was shifted from one wall to another, the former door space was replaced with a new window.

**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 supports the removal of the secondary doors. However, staff would prefer:

1. the doors were replaced with appropriately sized windows with matching trim,
2. wood siding (matching the existing) is installed in lieu of LP Smartside.

Prepared and recommended by  
Adam Toering  
Historic Preservation Specialist

Approved by  
Elicia Feasel  
Historic Preservation Administrator

**PETITIONER COMMENTS:**

Mr. Nevarez stated that there was a mistake regarding the proposed siding, and that the proposed siding to be replaced would be wood matching the existing wood in both shape and reveal. Replicating the existing siding would be no problem. The house has five entrance doors – it was a multi-unit house, with two doors in the front, one on the side, one on the back, and one on the back side.

**COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that she understood removing the northern extra door but removing the side door where the decorative porch is causes some concern. The bracketed, decorated porch would look strange were you to remove the entrance there, especially if it were a blank wall, but also would look weird if you put in a window.

Commissioner Gelfin asked whether the present door was original to the house.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that she didn't think the door was original, but that this was the location of a door to the house originally. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko reiterated that she had concerns about removing the door entirely, or replacing it with a window, as it would look strange.

Commissioner Hertel asked for clarification on which doors would be removed.

Commissioner Ponder expressed concerns regarding the other administrative approvals that had been approved for the property, specifically that the new property owners have initiated any of those projects yet and looked forward to asking the property owner about that information.

Commissioner Annis stated she would ask about clarification as to how the siding would be installed with the trim but stated she would ask the property owner in open discussion.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko clarified that you would remove the frame, and then 'feather' the boards in so that they are different length.

Commissioner Stalheim stated that he would only want windows to be installed if there was evidence that a window existed in that space before.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that it depends on the building, and that in examples that she knows of, the blank wall would have looked out of place had a window not been installed.

Commissioner Hertel asked staff if there was any evidence of window existing in any of these openings before.

Specialist Toering clarified that the 1932 Assessor Card referenced that the property was already subdivided at that time. The Historic Sites and Survey Card indicates in the 'history' section that the family that constructed the house had long used it as a multi-family dwelling. The earliest example of the Sanborn fire insurance maps indicate that it is a multiple unit house. Staff believes that the house was originally constructed to be a multi-unit house.

Commissioner Gelfman indicated that she would guess that the windows existed on the left side of the porch, but that the right side of the porch was probably not a window.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko indicated that there did not appear to be much objection on the part of the Commission members regarding the removal of the door that is facing to the south on the front porch.

Specialist Toering stated that “as early as 1906, Nathaniel O. Troyer, clerk at Studebaker, and his wife are listed living at the address with the Zollers [who built the house].” The history goes on to indicate that Mr. Zoller had served in the Civil War and had been a sailor on a sailing ship.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko clarified that removing the door, the siding should be feathered in, and the side porch poses different questions.

Mr. Nevarez stated that the house had multiple units, and the side door was an entrance to provide access via a stairwell to the upstairs unit. He further stated that the area where that stairwell was previously (the interior has been gutted, including removing the stairwell) will be where the kitchen of the house will be constructed, and that having openings on the kitchen walls poses layout problems. Mr. Nevarez stated that he is converting the house into a single-family home. The three different units are being eliminated and the floor plan is being extensively altered.

Commissioner Annis stated that you could ‘fur’ the wall on the inside to create a solid surface but keep the exterior door for cosmetic reasons on the outside.

Commissioner Gelfman asked Commissioner Annis to clarify why the door should be left.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that the exterior door (and attached porch) are important to the aesthetics of the house.

Commissioner Annis stated that it is important to the form of the house and if you take the door out and leave the wall, it would look strange.

Mr. Nevarez stated that the porch area was an addition, and he would like to remove it and improve the look of that side of the house.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that she did not feel comfortable making a judgement on the side porch door, as she was lacking information about the back of the house, how many phases or what additions were there, and she could not assess what this porch was doing, if it is original, or what it is doing, unless she visited the property.

Mr. Nevarez stated the he believed the door was made to provide an entrance to the upstairs unit.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked if the house was built as a single-family home.

Specialist Toering stated that the house was at least a duplex when first constructed.

Mr. Nevarez reiterated that the house was possibly a triplex, and even a quadplex at some point in time.

Commissioner Hertel discussed the rear addition and how it was attached to the structure, and how the construction of that addition may have led to the construction of the other door.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that perhaps there was already an addition, and it was expanded into the present larger addition; evidence of this can be found in that the trim on those additions matches the trim elsewhere on the house. There’s a lot going on with the house and she would feel more comfortable deciding having more information.

Commissioner Gelfman suggested that the Commission table the door until the next meeting so that Commissioners could come to the property and see, to allow the Commission to make an educated decision. Commissioner Gelfman stated that the Commission could, at this time, review the front entrance door removal projects.

Mr. Nevarez mentioned he would also like to remove one of the rear doors.

Commissioner Stalheim indicated that the application specifically mentioned removing the front two doors but does not mention the rear doors.

Specialist Toering stated he understood that the application was for the removal of two of the front doors on the street facing façade.

Mr. Nevarez apologized.

Commissioner Gelfman commented on one of the pictures of the structure included in the packet that showed the property a few years ago.

Commissioner Hertel asked Mr. Nevarez if they planned to make the house look like it used to look.

Mr. Nevarez indicated that the color palette would change, that the primary colors of the house would be green, light blue, and dark blue.

Specialist Toering showcased the Sanborn Fire insurance map from 1899 that show the house in its current overall configuration. That if the Sanborn map is to be trusted, then the additions happened within the first four years of the structure’s construction. Specialist Toering indicated that he believed that the structure was built as a multi-unit house in the overall configuration you see today. The history of the property indicates that the rear structure – sometimes referenced as an outbuilding – that building’s footprint changes a lot. There are two houses on this lot.

Mr. Nevarez asked if the rear structure was ‘historic.’

Specialist Toering indicated that, from a legal perspective, both structures on the parcel are protected historic structures.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko indicated that Mr. Nevarez should return with another application to remove the door at the rear of the structure, and that the Commission would probably favorably approve that when it was received for review.

Commissioner Hertel recommended that when Mr. Nevarez comes back with his next Certificate of Appropriateness application, that the fee is waived.

Commissioner Gelfman agreed.

## **PUBLIC DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Hertel clarified that the applicant has changed materials – instead of using the LP Smartside, the applicant is going to use wood siding.

**Commissioner Downs-Krostenko made a motion on COA#2019-1023A be accepted with the following conditions: 1) that the south facing front façade door be allowed to be removed and filled with wood siding of the same size and reveal as the original siding, and that the wood be feathered in; 2) and that the second door of the application be tabled until the next meeting; 3) that the application will be waived for the continuation; 4) that Commission members shall visit the site, to determine the rear additions.** Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Seven in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 7 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1023A with conditions is passed, including continued.**

Commissioner Hertel informed the applicant that should contact Historic Preservation Staff if they had any questions, as the Staff is very helpful and here to help.

Mr. Nevarez stated that he recently bought the property, he came to staff immediately, and that he intends to convert it back to a single-family occupancy, and then put it back on the market.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that it wasn't that long ago that the house was beautiful, and that the work should be manageable to get it back to that condition.

Commissioner Gelfman asked about the status of the previously approved Certificates of Appropriateness associated with this address.

Specialist Toering indicated that they were issued for the previous property owner.

Commissioner Hertel asked if Mr. Nevarez needed to get a new approval as the new property owner.

Legal Counsel Kennedy stated that the approved Certificates of Appropriateness 'stay with the property.'

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that approvals are only good for a year.

Specialist Toering stated that the approvals were issued this summer.

Mr. Nevarez stated that he would honor those previous applications and approvals.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the reason for the concern was that Commissioner Ponder was wondering about the priorities for the project.

Mr. Nevarez stated that the priority was the roof and was concerned about what was previous approved for that aspect of the structure.

Specialist Toering stated that the chimney had major structural issues, that former Inspector Szaday had completed a site visit, that the previous property owner had proposed taking the chimney down and rebuilding it, that the reconstructed chimney would not be a structural chimney, it would not be functional.

Mr. Nevarez indicated that he would like to take the chimney down but not rebuild it.

Specialist Toering stated that the chimney reconstruction was only approved because of the stated reconstruction.

Mr. Nevarez stated that he understood.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that he could apply to demolish the chimney in a separate document.

Mr. Nevarez stated that he planned to start with the roof.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the chimney has existed and that it should remain, even if it just for looks. Commissioner Gelfman asked when the foundation will be addressed.

Mr. Nevarez stated that the plan was to do the roof, siding, and then the foundation.

Commissioner Gelfman asked about the main issues of the foundation.

Mr. Nevarez stated that the foundation currently has an exterior access, and that the previous owners had requested permission to remove that entrance, and that was administratively approved. The foundation itself is sound.

#### **IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

#### **V. REGULAR BUSINESS**

##### **A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

###### **i. N/A**

##### **B. STAFF REPORTS**

###### **i. Administrative Approvals**

- 1. 730 Park Avenue – Hershberger Masonry applied for and received an Administrative Approval for the reconstruction of the masonry foundation of the veranda.**

Commissioner Hertel left the proceedings at 6:57pm.  
Commissioner Hertel rejoined the proceedings at 7:00pm

### **C. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### **i. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets**

1. N/A

#### **ii. Standards Update**

1. Indiana Landmarks is funding of a development of a 'model guideline', and HPC is a partner.
  - a. Commissioner Eric Stalheim has been hired to be a consultant on that 'model guideline.' This alters the timeline somewhat.
  - b. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko inquired about a committee that would be working on this project.
  - c. Administrator Feasel stated that she would like to have Todd Zeiger to come in and speak to the Commission regarding what the model guideline would be.
2. Two additional grants will be used to present this process to the public
  - a. National Trust for Historic Preservation Grant
  - b. Indiana Humanities – Historic Preservation Education Grant
3. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stressed that Staff are intimately aware of where the issues are within the Standards and Guidelines. She asked for clarification as to what specific categories cause problems that could be updated
  - a. Administrator Feasel stressed that there are nine different Standards; they are similar but have nuances in language. The goal is to consolidate those standards into one Standard, with addenda as necessary (to keep that unique character for specific neighborhoods).
  - b. Lead paint is not covered as extensively in the guidelines.
4. Commissioner Hertel stressed that we could make the guidelines more stringent, and that a guideline change could result in a legal precedence.
  - a. Legal Counsel Kennedy stated that – if there is homeowner input, and the neighborhood charettes – that you are starting with a clean slate.
  - b. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stressed that previous staff left the guidelines purposefully ambiguous so that projects could be reviewed by staff in Chapin Park, and that has left the door open for bad decision making. It is important to review these changes and the guidelines and ensure that they cannot be used against the tenets of historic preservation.
  - c. Specialist Toering stressed that the nine historic districts have robust standards in comparison to the Group B Standards, which allow for a considerable amount of ambiguity. In some ways this allows for room for the Commission to negotiate and maneuver, and in other ways it allows for the applicant to do things that are very strange. Group B has the widest range and extremes of style that are covered in the least amount of text. If you are going to make the district guidelines tighter, you must have the buy-in from the people from the neighborhoods.
5. Commissioner Hertel asked about the idea that Indiana Landmarks had previously discussed a rating system, and that we do our community a disservice if we only meet the minimum requirement.

- a. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko discussed the adoption of the Chapin Park district, that the consensus was that you didn't have to change anything as it currently exists, but as soon as you do want to change something, it needs to change for the better. This has led to some people arguing that they want to keep things they way they are.

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN**
- B. PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT**

Legal Counsel Kennedy explained the circumstances of the Programmatic Agreement between the Historic Preservation Commission and the Department of Community Investment allowing for the execution of certain duties by Historic Preservation Commission staff, specifically Section 106 Review. Staff conducts Section 106 review for projects including HUD grant disbursement; for example, Lead remediation grant projects and Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). The agreement is currently in draft form because there are three Native American Tribes that want to party to it, and they have asked for more time to review the document. The document is still being reviewed by the other parties, and any comments would need to be received on the current draft. The Historic Preservation Commission will empower President Gelfman to sign on behalf of the Commission. Administrator Feasel stated that continuing education regarding Section 106 Review opportunities are available at the 2020 Historic Preservation Conference that will be hosted in South Bend.

**Commissioner Annis made a motion to authorize Commission President Michele Gelfman to serve as signatory to the Programmatic Agreement.** Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Seven in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 7 – 0. Motion to authorize Commission President Michele Gelfman as signatory to the Programmatic Agreement passes.**

## **VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**

- A.** 821 Ashland in the Chapin Park Local Historic District has suffered a catastrophic fire. Staff is monitoring the situation; no demolition application has been received.
- B.** Navarre Cabin – Staff has made contact with The History Museum staff regarding the reported movement of the Navarre Cabin to the museum campus. Staff expects to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness application to move the cabin sometime in the spring in advance of a desired summer move. The Navarre Cabin originally stood on the north bank of the St. Joseph River roughly in the West North Shore Drive neighborhood. It has stood in Leeper Park for over a century.
- C.** New Commissioners:
  - i.** Patrick Deegan, a resident of East Wayne Street Local Historic District. Mr. Deegan works for the University of Notre Dame with a background in Art History related to contemporary Asian art.
  - ii.** John Tiffany, although not present, works in real estate.
- D.** 1636 Lincoln Way West has a new owner, Jason Miller, who owns a property within the Lincoln Way East Local Historic District. He has applied for and received administrative approvals related to the roof and gutters and is working on an application regarding masonry repair. It is believed that the structure will be mixed-use.
- E.** Preserving Historic Places – Statewide Preservation Conference
  - i.** April 14 – 17, 2020.

- ii. The conference is not free.
  - iii. Indiana Landmarks in Partnership with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology; Indiana University-South Bend is a sponsor, as well.
  - iv. Scottish Rite is the planned main site for the Conference
  - v. Staff from Indiana Landmarks and Indiana DNR-HPA are the planners.
  - vi. Means and methods 'to get the word out' for the conference to encourage attendance was discussed (mailers, e-mails, scholarships)
- F. 1031 E Jefferson Boulevard
- i. Staff plans to engage with the property owner to ensure that they are Certificate of Appropriateness compliant for stripping paint and restoring the wood.
- G. Inspector Hiring
- i. Role has been expanded / combined with the Zoning Inspector position for the city's Zoning team.
- H. Contractor List
- i. Commissioner Hertel expressed concern regarding the Contractor List
  - ii. Engineering provides a list of all licensed contractors.
  - iii. Commissioner Annis expressed frustration with Indiana Landmark's inability to provide contractor lists.
  - iv. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko stated that there is a distinct lack of qualified contractors.
  - v. Administrator Feasel expressed that she has attempted to curate the contractor list (by removing dead / inactive contractors).
  - vi. Commissioner Downs-Krostenko expressed dissatisfaction with the contractor response for the Modlin project.
  - vii. Commissioner Annis requested the Contractor List be distributed to the Commission.
  - viii. Commissioners discussed the legality of their communication with historic property owners.

V. ADJOURNMENT

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to adjourn.** Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Seven in favor, none opposed.

**Vote: 7 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.**

Attest:



Sarah Ponder, Secretary



Date