

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

MARCH 18th, 2019
13th Floor Conference Room
County – City Building
South Bend, IN 46601

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Gelfman called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Members of the Public Present:

Therena Hoover, 1334 East Jackson Road
Victor Lopez, 1110 Lincoln Way West
Stan Molenda, City of South Bend Department of Code Enforcement, 13th Floor
Por Thach, 657 Brent Lawn Trail, Bolingbrook, IL

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Michele Gelfman, President; Tom Gordon, Asst. Secretary; Joseph Molnar, Treasurer; Velvet Canada

Members Not in Attendance: Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Greta Fisher, Architectural Historian / Secretary

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

Staff Not in Attendance: Steve Szaday, Historic Preservation Inspector

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. 420 LaMonte Terrace COA# 2019-0125 #9574-05 Chapin Park Local and National Historic District

Representation: Stan Molenda, City of South Bend Code Enforcement (227 W Jefferson)

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

Date: February 13, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0125

Property Location: 420 LaMonte Terrace

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Center Gable / Remodeled 1907

Property Owner: Alvin B. Wylie, deceased

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

Rating: N/A – Not included in survey

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: Two-story rectangular structure with aluminum siding on a brick foundation. Aluminum storm windows and doors. Windows are 1/1 double hung. Asphalt shingles on the roof, gable on north side, and a one story shed-roof addition on south. Structure is set back from the street and is visible between the adjacent properties. Long, narrow brick pathway to leads to the front entry of the property between 418 and 424 LaMonte Terrace.

Believed to be part of the Chapin / Fassnacht estate, perhaps one of the agricultural buildings. The 1866 lithograph of South Bend shows large barn structures in this vicinity.

ALTERATIONS: Sanborn maps indicate that the structure was either moved or built at this location prior to 1917. A different configuration of structure was present at this site prior to that time. COA 2011-0727A allowed for the installation of 4' high gothic picket fence.

APPLICATION ITEMS: "Demolition of house structure."

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: The applicant (Civil City of South Bend Code Enforcement) seeks approval for the *DEMOLITION* of the structure, to be bid out to final contractor at a later date.

On January 26, 2018, Civil City of South Bend Code Enforcement notified the property owner that "a recent inspection revealed that your property is in disrepair or may be a public safety hazard." Specific problems areas listed in the Code Violation included 1) "Gutters are pulled away due to rotted fascia boards; there is unfinished fascia at several areas", 2) "The top of the chimney is crumbling with bricks falling away", and 3) "Door and window frames need to be painted."

On April 30, 2018, property owner of record Alvin B. Wylie passed away.

Inspector Steve Meadows visited the site on July 9, 2018 and photographed the condition for Code Enforcement records. Later in the month of July a fire consumed portions of the first and second stories primarily on the south side of the structure. Code Enforcement Inspector Steve Meadows visited the site repeatedly (8/1/2018, 9/24/2018), taking photographs and documenting the condition of the structure.

Civil City of South Bend Code Enforcement held public hearings (in accordance with open door policy) regarding this property on August 2, 2018 and September 25, 2018. At the latter meeting, the hearing office affirmed the Demolition Order for the structure.

HPC Staff executed a Section 106 Review of the proposed demolition, indicating that a Certificate of Appropriateness would be required to move forward, and returned this paperwork on 1/8/2019. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding will be utilized for this project.

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT:

This report is a follow-up to a visit that took place on August 13, 2018. I was accompanied by Steve Meadows of Code Enforcement. Several neighbors from Lamonte Terrace approached us while on site to express their concerns with regards to the property and the recent fire. The property was due for a code hearing following violations being found at the property. Both Steve Meadows and I had been at the property the week prior to the fire.

The fire started in the rear of the structure, the fire hollowed out the first and second story at the rear then continued along the first story toward the front of the structure. Photographs will show scorch marks above the front first story windows. This structure is a long but shallow so damage is from front to back.

The building was secure and the scene was still under investigation at that time, so we did not have access to the interior. The second floor was and still is exposed to the elements which has no doubt assessed even greater damage to the interior of the structure.

Steve Szaday
Preservation Inspector

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.

[...]

V. GENERAL

A. Buildings in the district should not be demolished except where a building poses a threat to the public safety, and demolition is the only alternative. Documentation of interior and exterior features of the original buildings, especially homes rated as historically significant, is encouraged. Measured drawings and photographs may be submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission for safekeeping and future reference.

B. A Certificate of Appropriateness is required before moving any building or structure. The moving of a building within, out of or into the district is discouraged; however, moving is preferred to demolition. Buildings incompatible with existing structures in the historic district shall be prohibited.

[...]

VI. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

[...]

This ordinance, however, does not prevent the ordinary maintenance and repair of any building or structure which does not involve a change in any exterior feature, nor does it prevent the reconstruction, alteration, demolition or moving of any building or structure which the Building Commissioner or other official has determined to be a hazard to public safety.

[...]

In making its determination, the Historic Preservation Commission shall consider three factors: first, the appropriateness of the proposed work to the preservation of the building and district; second, the detriment to the public welfare if the proposed work is permitted even though it is not deemed appropriate; third, the potential hardship that the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness would cause the applicant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the demolition of this structure, as it is currently uninhabitable and has been under continuous enforcement as a problem property by the City of South Bend Department of Code Enforcement.

Written by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

Approved by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

Commissioner Gordon: How long before the citation on the doors had the fascia and gutters...[how long] had the house been in this kind of condition?

Inspector Molenda: "Probably it was in the deteriorated condition prior, but the City [of South Bend] had started its first action in July of last year in relation to requesting repairs to the structure; contacting the owner, and holding a hearing – the owner did not attend that hearing."

Commissioner Molnar: Do we know who the owner is now? Because, the gentleman passed away?

Inspector Molenda: That appears to be all the information we have. That the owner, prior to the fire, passed away. The[re was a] fire, this is a vacant house, the owner is deceased. Essentially that is part of what brought it to the Department of Code Enforcement's concern – that is, we have a vacant and abandoned house that obviously attracted that particular level of nuisance as you can see from the evidence presented. It wasn't simply a trash-can fire back by the alley. It wasn't simply something by the garage. It was interior, I would guess – only from my experience, although I am not the Fire Department – somebody broke-in, set the fire in the center of the house. Usually, when something happens like that, the intent is to destroy the entire structure.

Commissioner Gordon: Would the house have come under demolition without the fire happening, with just the other violations?

Inspector Molenda: No.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Gordon: There's nothing left of the house. We have no owner. We don't know who the owner is. [It is] not going to get renovated to a 'saved' condition. The other violations are not getting repaired. So, ... I don't see much saving in this house.

Commissioner Molnar: It's a shame – obviously for the historical aspects – but also because this neighborhood – of the historic districts – is one where it could have been saved before the fire. It also, it's such a weird lot, because it doesn't have any street frontage.

Commissioner Gelfman – Because it's tucked back...

Commissioner Molnar: So that would make it even harder for someone to buy it and renovate it. Were this a more normal 'facing the street' house, it may be easier to find an owner to put work into it. I don't know if that would attract an investor, being such a weird set-up.

Commissioner Gelfman – Let me just encapsulate that: we have a vacant house that has had a fire since July of 2018. Property owner has died. Code Enforcement affirmed the demo order for it. It is tucked back behind other houses. And HPC is not opposed – the staff – given their recommendation, is not opposed to the demolition.

Public Discussion: N/A

Commissioner Gordon made a motion to approve COA #2019-0125. Seconded by Commissioner Molnar.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0 Motion to approve COA#2019-0125 is passed.

2. 1168 Lincoln Way East COA# 2019-0219A #7343-84 Lincoln Way East Local Historic District

Representation: Por Thach, 657 Brent Lawn Trail, Bolingbrook, IL

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

Date: March 11, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0219A

Property Location: 1168 Lincoln Way East

Architectural Style/Date/Architect/Builder: American Foursquare/Prairie/1922

Property Owner: Por Thach

Landmark or District Designation: Lincoln Way East Local Historic District,
Ordinance #7343-84

Rating: *Notable*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: A two story house set upon a brick foundation. Hip roof with hip roof dormer has asphalt shingles. Walls are common bond brick. Enclosed front porch features brick piers with stone prairie style deco windows and has a brick wall/balustrade. Porch entry is single leaf with wide sidelights. Windows are original wood double hung with divided lite upper sashes and stone sills.

ALTERATIONS: RME 2007-0730 approved in kind replacement of 3 sides of roof with matching shingles to current and soffit and fascia repair in kind as necessary. AA 2019-0104 approved replacement of asphalt roof with new asphalt 3-tab; install new aluminum gutters and downspouts throughout; repair soffit and fascia, in-kind, using wood and aluminum. AA 2019-0219 approved deconstruction of front entry brick knee walls with concrete cap and rebuild in-kind using same brick and brick salvaged from garage; new concrete caps on knee walls; new concrete steps and sidewalk.

APPLICATION ITEMS: "Complete garage demolition NOT rebuilding. Remove concrete on front porch replacing w/ wood steps"

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: The applicant seeks approval to demolish the garage in the rear yard. The property is the subject of an active Code Enforcement violation. Administrative Approvals have already been issued for the roof and front steps as the owner progresses toward compliance. The front section of the garage structure is the oldest, showing up in the 1945 Sanborn. The rear section is newer construction. Both the front and rear sections have collapsed roof portions and are significantly deteriorated posing a threat to public safety.

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT:

February 18, 2019

RE: 1168 Lincoln Way East

This morning I visited the property located at 1168 LWE in the Lincoln Way East Historic District. I met with the owner's brother as the owner was running late from out of state. I photographed the house and the garage as well as the landscaping of the property.

House

-The front steps to the house is missing a knee wall and the steps themselves are out of skew.

-Most of the soffit material is gone. There is still aluminum soffit present along the majority of the east side of the structure. Due to its extended overhang I would suggest ample ventilation is added to the soffit when it is replaced on both the main roof and the porches soffits.

-The majority of the windows on the house are original wood with aluminum storms. I did not enter the structure to inspect the condition of the windows. The porch windows are original wood and appear stationary. They are in need of paint and some repair in places where glass is missing.

-The roof has holes in the deck. Most notably in the rear and in the western corners.

-The chimney will also need some masonry repairs

Garage

-The garage is in two parts. The older cement block structure and then a wooden addition. The roof in its entirety is mostly down and has left mainly trusses. The front addition is mobile to the touch. It moves with very little effort and is unsafe. The rear original structure has severe separation at the walls and slab. The south wall has two large fissures and have separated from the remainder of the structure. Two sections of the original garage have the same brick as the house and that brick should be retained in order to make repairs at either the front steps or other areas of the main structure where they are needed.

-The floor of the garage has dips with some large cracks running through the pad.

-It is of my opinion, that a rope with two or three people could bring the garages down in a heap. The walls are not in a repairable condition and would most likely have to be disassembled, the foundation leveled, then rebuilt. The absence of the garage would aid in the ability of the owner to facilitate the use of dumpsters and tree trimming equipment.

Landscaping

-There are several large trees along the East property line next to the garage. These have overgrown and even have some dead branches. The branches should be cut back or the trees possibly removed as they pose a threat to the house or garage if it to remain or be rebuilt.

Steve Szaday

Preservation Inspector

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: LINCOLN WAY EAST

V. GENERAL

A. Buildings in the district should not be demolished except where a building poses a threat to the public safety, and demolition is the only alternative. Documentation of interior and exterior features of the original buildings, especially homes rated as historically significant, is encouraged. Measured drawings and photographs may be submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission for safekeeping and future reference.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval to demolish the garage with the condition that any useable building material such as bricks matching the main house be salvaged.

Written by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

Mr. Thach stated that he plans to build a new garage sometime in the future.

Commissioner Gelfman informed him that a Certificate of Appropriateness would be required for that reconstruction.

Commissioner Gordon: How long have you been living here?

Mr. Thach: I live in Chicago.

Commissioner Gordon: So this is a rental house?

Mr. Thach: I am going to move here after I finish the project.

Commissioner Gordon: How long have you owned the house?

Mr. Thach: Two months.

Commissioner Gelfman requested that the applicant state their current address, where they are living right now.

Mr. Thach: I live at 657 Brent Lawn Trail, Bolingbrook, IL, 60492.

Commissioner Gordon: From the look of the pictures, this is pretty much the same scenario as the [previous COA] house – it’s gone. There’s no rebuilding that garage. Just tear-down and put [up] a new.

Commissioner Gelfman: Both sections have collapsed. The roof [has collapsed]. HPC Staff is not opposed to the demolition.

Public Discussion: N/A

Commissioner Molnar made a motion to approve COA #2019-0219A. Seconded by Commissioner Gordon.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0 Motion to approve COA#2019-0219A is passed.

3. 509-511 Harrison COA# 2019-0227 #8021-1989 Local Landmark
Representation: Victor Lopez, 1110 Lincoln Way West
Terena Hoover, 1334 East Jackson Road

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

Date: March 13, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0227
Property Location: 509 – 511 Harrison
Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: 1921/Palmer Apartments
Property Owner: Victor Lopez
Landmark or District Designation: Local Landmark, ordinance #8021-1989
Rating: not listed in 2007 Sites and Structures Inventory

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: This two-story structure with rectangular plan sits upon a cement foundation. The walls are brick, and the very low hip roof has wide overhanging eaves. A two-story porch with three brick support pillars and two balconies spans the front side. The second story balcony was covered by a roof shingle type of material.

This structure was included in the legal description for Landmark Ordinance #8021-1989. The structure to the rear on the lot – 513 Harrison – was the primary reason for this landmarking because of its unique concrete block construction.

ALTERATIONS: COA 2002-0618 approved removal and replacement of asphalt roof shingles. COA 2016-1031A approved replacement in-kind of asphalt roof shingles and installation of new gutters. Vinyl windows have been installed to enclose the second-floor front porch, and second story balcony shingles have been replaced with vinyl siding, both without a COA or building permit.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “Install 10 Andersen Silverline double hung windows (vinyl). Install vinyl siding. See previous application (2017-0623).”

COA 2017-0623, as applied: “Add new double hung vinyl windows in framed area of porch and replace dilapidated siding. Code enforcement was pressuring me to complete work.”

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Owner is seeking approval of Andersen Silver Line Standard vinyl windows installed to enclose second floor front porch, as well as Market Square double 4” vinyl siding which has been installed to replace existing deteriorated balcony asphalt shingles, and triple 4” vented and unvented vinyl siding which has been installed to replace existing unvented soffit. Owner seeks to prevent further damage to second-floor decking by installation of windows to prevent exposure to weather. All work has been done without a COA or building permit.

Applicant retroactively applied for the above project in 2017. The Commission reviewed the project and denied the application. Demolition permits were issued by the Building Department to allow for the removal of the windows in both July and December of 2017, the latter of which was issued with the caveat that the permit was only for six months, and if no work was executed, fines were to be issued. No demolition occurred on the site.

With no response from the property owner, the Building Department submitted the property to the City of South Bend Legal Department. City of South Bend Legal filed a 'NOTICE OF CLAIM SUMMONS' (Case No. 71D07-1901-SC-000104) with the St. Joseph County Clerk on January 2, 2019 for a judgement of \$1,500. Upon receiving this judgement, the property owner re-initiated contact with the Historic Preservation Commission staff to seek to rectify the situation.

Staff met with the applicant on February 12, 2019 and again on February 27, 2019 to review this project and assist in the application process. Staff appraised the applicant of similar projects where windows that were installed without Commission approval were later removed (most notably at 620 West Washington, 'Tippecanoe Place').

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT: n/a

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: Group B

Definitions

Shall—Defined as an expression of something that is mandatory or must be done.

Should—Defined as an expression of obligation, something that ought to be done but that is open to compromise.

Required—Defined as work which shall be done in a restoration or rehabilitation project in order to restore or maintain the original or existing character of the structure or site.

Recommended—Defined as work which should be done to help restore or maintain the original or existing character of the structure or site.

Prohibited—Defined as work which shall not be permitted in a restoration or rehabilitation project because it may have a negative impact on the original or existing character of the structure or site.

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

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: Group B Standards, section A, state "*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.*" Prevention of second-floor porch deck deterioration could be accomplished in a manner that is sympathetic to the historic structure and in compliance with the Standards for Local Landmarks. Staff would prefer to see the windows removed and the porch returned to an opened state.

When the project was reviewed in 2017, Staff believed that the soffit and siding material should be replaced with more appropriate materials, as Section C, item 2 states, "*Additions and improvements involving any new material in the landmark should be of the same material as the original.*" The Group B Standards and Guidelines define *should* as "*an expression of obligation, something that ought to be done but that is open to compromise.*" Asphalt shingles were previously installed on the exterior of the porch. As such, staff would entertain allowing the siding to remain.

Staff recommends that the Commission pursue:

1. Removal of the windows,
2. Approval of the siding/soffit, with the caveats that the applicant:
 - A) confirm that the installed soffit is properly vented and
 - B) confirm that an appropriate material is extended across the ceiling of the to-be-opened porch.

Report compiled by
Adam Toering, Historic Preservation Specialist

Approved by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

Petitioner Comment:

Mr. Lopez stated: I have a problem every time that it rains, [that's why I put] the windows there, the siding. Code Enforcement, they pushed me fix it, because the shingles had fallen, and I had to fix it no matter what. So, what I've tried to do is save the place, the water damage inside, every time it rains or snows, it goes straight to the porch.

Commissioner Gelfman: Were you aware that you needed a Certificate of Appropriateness?

Mr. Lopez: Yes. Which is the CofA?

Ms. Hoover: That you needed their approval before the work – you didn't know that until after. It was after he completed the work that we found out that it was a historic Landmark. We did not know that ahead of time. Code Enforcement kept sending letters and that he had a deadline so we went off of the Code Enforcement letter he had received. I am Mr. Lopez's property manager. We went off of the information we received from Code Enforcement. Once it was repaired, according to the picture on the left – which looks very beautiful, and you can see from Lincoln Way West as you drive down – then we received a letter from Historic Commission.

Commissioner Gelfman: Just to refresh your mind, June 13th 2017, a letter was sent by the Building Department. It did state that "due to the Historic Preservation Commission's denial of your

recent application for a Certificate of Appropriateness” – so that did come to them – “the property continues to have the following violations,” which are in this letter. It’s obvious to me that there has been a serious breach on the part of the owner not following the protocol, and you obviously knew about it because it says so, in the letter. And that’s been almost two years.

Ms. Hoover: He received the letter after he completed the work. He didn’t realize that – he had already completed the work before we received the letter from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Gelfman: Back in 2017?

Commissioner Gordon: Yes.

Ms. Hoover: Yes, the work was already complete.

Commissioner Gelfman: So why didn’t you come to the Commission then?

Ms. Hoover: We did.

Mr. Lopez: We came here.

Commissioner Gelfman: And it was denied.

Commissioner Gordon: June 23rd, 2017.

Commissioner Gelfman: And we denied it.

Commissioner Gordon: Correct.

Commissioner Gelfman: So why hasn’t it been corrected since then?

Mr. Lopez: So that is why I am trying to see how we can fix it. Because I would like to save the place, there’s a lot of water and rain that gets in there, you can see how it was before, and how it is now. If they let me have the windows there, I’ll take the siding off, put on different siding – I spent a lot of money there to fix it, especially the windows. If you guys, ... Another options, I have to take everything out, leave it how it was before, but Code Enforcement is going to come back again. So, what am I going to do?

Commissioner Gordon: Did you get a building permit to put the windows in?

Mr. Lopez: No, that is my mistake.

Commissioner Gordon: Yeah.

Mr. Lopez: I bought this place from my uncle.

Commissioner Gordon: That started the problem – if you had gone to them, you would have known that for a building permit, they would have told you before you do any work, you have to come to us. Then they wouldn’t have been put in, and you wouldn’t be out the money, and us be where we are today.

Mr. Lopez: I’m trying, if we can work something out. I am going to take everything down and be done with it. But when Code Enforcement comes to me, what am I going to do?

Commissioner Gordon: Is this the only rental house that you own in a historic district or landmark, but you’ve done other renovations to houses in South Bend? Did you get a building permit for them?

Mr. Lopez: Yes, I’ve got other houses. I got a permit for the roof.

Commissioner Gordon: But you didn’t think to get one for this house?

Mr. Lopez: I didn’t know it was historic. I got a permit for the roof.

Commissioner Gordon: Even if its not historic, you would have to get a building permit.

Mr. Lopez: Well, when I got the permits for the roof I thought – I didn’t know if – the inspector was going to send me letters, you’ve got so much time...

Commissioner Gordon: So, you went and got a building permit for the roof?

Mr. Lopez: Right.

Commissioner Gordon: And the Building Department didn’t tell you that this was a Landmark and that you have to come before the Commission? They didn’t tell you that?

Mr. Lopez: I didn’t know that if I had to change the windows that the front end of the porch, that the Code Enforcement would come and –

Commissioner Gordon: Not the windows. When you went and got a Building Permit for the roof, did the Building Department tell you that you had a Landmark house and you would have to get a –

Mr. Lopez: Yes, they told me.

Commissioner Gordon: Did you come here for the roof?

Mr. Lopez: I did the roof, I never thought that I’d have to [with] the porch.

Commissioner Gordon: Did he come here? Did I miss it? Did he come here for a C. of A. for the roof?

Administrator Feasel: We approved a CofA in 2016 – in October of 2016 – for replacement of in-kind asphalt roof shingles and new gutters. I would conclude, that yes.

Mr. Lopez: I thought it was all in one, all in the same permit. That is my mistake to check that. You can see the difference, how it was before, and how it is.

Commissioner Gordon: I see it five times a week, at least. Its not bad looking. However, our mission is not to go by if its good looking, although that could come into play, or bad looking, its more if we are following the guidelines of a landmark or a district. That is what we are charged to do. Personally I don't think it looks bad, but that doesn't satisfy the conditions.

Ms. Hoover: That whole area is not – am I correct – it is not historic, as a bunch of new properties are being built...

Commissioner Gordon: It is not a historic district, this particular house is a landmark.

Ms. Hoover: Right. Wouldn't it be more so for the house that is behind it? This was kind of like, I don't want to say servant's house, but...

Commissioner Gordon: If its not in a district, it has to be submitted individually to become a landmark. And if no one does that, or, if the homeowner doesn't agree to become a landmark, then it doesn't become a landmark.

Ms. Hoover: Right. What I am saying is that there are two houses on this lot. The back house is actually a very unique structure and I can absolutely see why that is designated a landmark. It has built-in engravings on the exterior of the property and other things like that. The front building here is a very basic square brick building.

Commissioner Gordon: Both buildings are landmarks on the property?

Specialist Toering: The landmark ordinance was originally written to be the rear 40' of the lot and it was adjusted through deliberation amongst the commission members to include the entirety of the lot and it was passed, so it includes both houses.

Commissioner Gordon: And this structure was not even on the site listing in 2007?

Specialist Toering: Correct.

Commissioner Gordon: So it has no rating whatsoever?

Specialist Toering: Correct.

Commissioner Molnar: Does the other house front a...

Specialist Toering: It fronts an alley. My understanding of the history of the property is that a mason built the house in the back. It is really unique, it's a pretty special building. And then he built the property in the front as a rental property, and so this one –

Commissioner Gordon: Its right across from Colfax School.

Specialist Toering: It's basic, but it's a pretty substantial building. It's brick, which for a rental property, is pretty good. But we have virtually nothing on this structure.

Commissioner Molnar: I mean, I like this. I guess, you said you are willing to work with vinyl?

Mr. Lopez: Yes, if they wanted, I would be willing to change the siding, a different kind. I really don't like to change the windows because the water, the rain, the snow.

Commissioner Molnar: So it was always an open air porch? You put in a lot of windows, which I appreciate.

Commissioner Gordon: It's not bad looking, at all.

Mr. Lopez: The inspector, Code Enforcement, they are so happy [because of] what I did, later on they sent me the letter. I didn't know, I'm sorry. I really don't want to take everything down, it'll look ugly.

Commissioner Molnar: What would staff recommend? You guys talk about materials in your recommendation. What would staff recommend in front of the vinyl, the siding.

Specialist Toering: It was an asphalt shingle siding, I don't know that you could, you maybe be able to find that today. That wasn't original. That was something that had been added in the 70's.

Administrator Feasel: We are actually recommending the siding remain.

Specialist Toering: I don't have much issue with the siding. I could maybe make an argument regarding the color of it, but we're not dealing with color. That's more of an aesthetic concern, from an individual standpoint, but that doesn't really matter to me, at all.

Administrator Feasel: For instance, the J-channel is white, as if it were an architectural accent, and then the vinyl siding is yellow. Color wise, if these two aspects were to be the same, so that the J-channel doesn't stand out as a trim, that's neither here nor there.

Specialist Toering: We don't know what's underneath.

Administrator Feasel: It's covering a non-original material. If we were to go back and have some input before it was installed, we might have recommended some sort of a shingle to mimic a cedar shingle, or even add in a cedar shingle to mimic the asphalt shingle that was there. On the picture on the right, the framework that is there was what Code Enforcement honed-in on as being an unfinished porch. We don't know why those were there, maybe for screens at one point? On the top. It might have had screens on it at one point. This was intended to be an open porch.

Specialist Toering: In their defense, its not very visible here, there's a little PVC pipe that was a drain from the porch because they were having water issues. I would agree with the applicant, moisture gets in there. As it was in whatever year this was, there was no drainage. Water got in there and just stayed, which is bad.

Commissioner Gelfman: So staff is recommending to keep the soffits and make sure they are properly vented, but recommend that the vinyl siding stays, but then to remove the windows back to the way it was.

Commissioner Molnar: That's what the staff recommended, that's not what we decided.

Commissioner Gelfman: I understand that, I am just reiterating so he just understands that.

Specialist Toering: And that is in accordance with the previous recommendation from staff two years ago, this is a hybrid of these two.

Administrator Feasel: It is probably helpful for you to know, as it is not visible from this picture, that the windows on the rest of the house are original wood, one-over-one, double-hung. The windows that are installed in the porch right now are six-over-six vinyl double-hung. If we were to be designing this from scratch and we were in favor of enclosing a porch, at the very least we would have recommended that they select a one-over-one window pattern and look towards at least an aluminum-clad material and steer clear of vinyl altogether, at least as far as windows are concerned.

Commissioner Molnar: Elicia, and I know you can't say officially, but – so it wasn't listed in the 2007 survey, what would you have guessed it would have been rated?

Administrator Feasel: Before the windows were added, I would say it was – *Outstanding* is the highest rating. It probably would have rated at *Notable*, or just under that at *Contributing*, at the very least. Because, it has the majority of its original integrity. Without the alterations, the only integrity that has been compromised are the asphalt shingles added to the front porch, the frame work, all aspects that are reversible. Probably *Notable*, as for a brick apartment building, it does have two different brick colors, and original windows, and some original details on the front porch. I don't think the door is original. *Notable* to *Contributing*. Definitely would have rated.

Commissioner Canada: What material did you use around the windows, when you installed the windows?

Mr. Lopez: The material? It's a vinyl. The windows are a Silverline.

Specialist Toering: This material right here?

Commissioner Gordon: That's vinyl?

Mr. Lopez: That's aluminum.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Gordon: If it had no rating at all, prior to even a site guard that Elicia had just alluded to. I would probably not vote against these windows this time, even though I did the first time.

Commissioner Gelfman: Why is that, Tom?

Commissioner Gordon: Why is that? I don't think it's a detraction from the historic landmark, the integrity of the house. It was not nominated to be a landmark to begin with. The house behind it was, it got included because it was on the property. It's aesthetically way better looking than it was. I wish there wasn't already two materials on the window, vinyl and aluminum. I wish that he'd put in wood windows. I wish that he would have been notified when he would have come to do it, and get a building permit prior. All of those things. I'm not saying that I'm making a

motion to approve, I'm just saying I don't feel the same way, I don't think now the same way that I did in 2017, in terms of change that was made in the character of this house. There was a change, but I don't feel that it's a large enough change to have these windows torn out, continue with fines – I don't think I do. I don't think it's a big detriment to that particular house at that particular location, its not in a district, and it's way better than it was. Most of the house is there. You know where the house is? Side street west of the Colfax School.

Commissioner Annis: If the windows come out, then we have a drainage issue in there. Right? Now there's a PVC pipe that's been removed?

Mr. Lopez: No, we took it out when we put the siding in.

Commissioner Gordon: No, the only alternative is he comes back with a CofA with a different window material and style. And even if the style was the same as the rest it would make it somewhat more palatable. But they are not even the same as the rest of the house.

Commissioner Canada: One of the clear things is that you can definitely tell what is new and what is old. So there is definitely...

Commissioner Gordon: Yeah, when you drive by you can definitely tell it's new.

Commissioner Molnar: It's rough. I work for an enforcement bureau, so I work with Code Enforcement regularly, and it's sometimes – I wish, and this was before HPC was moved into the City? Correct, 2017?

Administrator Feasel: Yes.

Commissioner Molnar: I think now, if there was a letter saying 'you have 30 days to repair' I would assume that the letter would say you have to go to HPC. Right in that first letter?

Administrator Feasel: In the code notification?

Commissioner Molnar: Right, because we now have...

Specialist Toering: We're working on it, I don't know if its there now, but...

Commissioner Molnar: That's an issue I've had with the City and the County...

Commissioner Gordon: We know for sure it wasn't that way before.

Commissioner Molnar: I know, there wasn't, so I have –

Legal Counsel Kennedy: The Code letter does say you need a building permit.

Commissioner Molnar: It does say, yes, I know.

Commissioner Gordon: It does say Building Permit.

Commissioner Molnar: And if, we could have solved it, but... I don't mind as much the enclosing of the porch. I know it's not preferred. But if there would be persistent drainage issues. That's an issue always with second floor porches, as much as I think they are cool. Like you said, it does look better than it was.

Commissioner Gordon: What about a change in the siding color, the trim color, to be darker so it didn't stand out so blatantly new? How would people feel about that?

Administrator Feasel: I also wonder about the window in the smaller bay, the pair that are together. If the siding that surrounds it takes that horizontal pattern up around that, or we get a proper trim width around it, I'm not really sure. But I think the difference with the siding being aluminum and the vinyl.

Commissioner Gordon: Not good.

Administrator Feasel: Yeah, that's part of the issue.

Commissioner Molnar: You are talking about this?

Administrator Feasel: Yes. I don't know, I'm just throwing out. If you –

Commissioner Gordon: That and the siding below it, that's kind of that yellow, it wraps all the way around the side.

Administrator Feasel: Well, the other two bays of windows extend all the way to the side where it looks like a typical trim width. But that one, because you can't fit three windows in there, you have an exaggerated trim. It's an exaggerated trim, really.

Commissioner Gelfman: The other concern that I have is that the windows don't match the rest of the house. You have a six-over-six instead of a one-over-one. I think that really detracts from the house itself; plus the fact that the siding below it, which used to be like a shake, of some kind, a darker shake siding on the bottom of the windows – its not even close to what is up there now.

Commissioner Molnar: I'll be completely honest, it's hard for me. I don't like to always go – this is not where I go first or second or even third – but I do try to note the neighborhood, and there is a lot of vacant lots in the neighborhood, a lot of deteriorated homes in the neighborhood. I think its nice that you put money into the house at all.

Mr. Lopez: I fixed it, because, they built new houses there. My house looked so bad.

Commissioner Gordon: And they are all vinyl.

Mr. Lopez: Code Enforcement came to me, “hey, you got new houses around you, so. You need to fix your porch.” So I said, ‘Ok!’

Commissioner Gelfman: We are in Commission discussion right now.

Commissioner Molnar: It being not listed on the site lets me be a little more open minded about than if it had actually had a rating. I don't know why it had been missed, but it was.

Specialist Toering: I will say that we do have a Survey Card, there is just no rating.

Administrator Feasel: Ratings are working document, too. It's not like a house is rated and it never changes. We are obligated by a Certified Local Government to update the State Preservation Office if it changes. Because this one is not rated, we would be obligated to place a rating on the house by/for the state in the next survey.

Commissioner Canada: I think what really altered the look of it was when it comes to the height of the windows. This line in the original was maintained, and now we've gone below that with that window. And so that took away it looking like a balcony here. I think that's my only, as far as architecturally looking at it.

Commissioner Gelfman: It's about a foot, is that about right?

Commissioner Canada: And so that took the proportions of the front, and –

Commissioner Gordon: It's at least the width of that column divider and one brick more, two bricks more.

Commissioner Molnar: I assume the windows open?

Specialist Toering: I think the white line, it was added. This line right here?

Mr. Lopez: That was totally like—they put it, the aluminum, so the water, it won't rust. It's a 2x6 there. And at the top, to cover the water...

Administrator Feasel: The siding is coming off right here, it needs to be repaired.

Commissioner Gordon: That's a good opportunity to change it then. It sticks out horribly that its new. There's no doubt that it's new. But its horribly better than what it was before. You know what I mean? You are kind of stuck in the middle. I am.

Commissioner Gelfman: I'm not stuck with this at all.

Commissioner Gordon: Good for you, you are a better person than I.

Commissioner Gelfman: It's not about being a better person, it's about the aesthetics of the building.

Commissioner Gordon: Even with the color change? Darker to match more with the house, so vinyl doesn't match so horribly?

Commissioner Annis: You can't get a really dark vinyl. Vinyl is always going to look like vinyl. You might get a medium brown, but you are never going to get the color you have with those shingles.

Commissioner Gordon: But you will have closer than white, though, in terms of the surrounding color. I don't know about that at all.

Commissioner Canada: I think this one is a tough one – just because, it's already been done. I'm trying to go off of what we've done previously, so if it wasn't done, what would I agree to, or think should be done. I think the way they prepared the porch and now they have downspouts and stuff like that – that's helpful, with the drainage.

Commissioner Gordon: If it was coming as a new project this would not be approved.

Commissioner Canada: Right – he's put this time and money into it. And it's better than it was, but... I don't know if ripping out the windows if that really helps anything. If that's going to make it any better than it already is.

Commissioner Gordon: Can we ask the applicant a question?

Commissioner Gelfman: Technically, no.

Commissioner Gordon: I like to be technically correct.

Commissioner Canada: And I mean, the six-over-six, he could go in and buy panels that could replace that. That's still fairly costly, that'd be around \$100-\$200 per panel, each. But I don't know that it makes that much of a difference, really.

Commissioner Gelfman: What if the cross-bars could be removed in the windows?

Commissioner Canada: The grid lines? The grid lines can. Although the way that Silverline works, they are in them, you'd have to replace the entire glass piece of all those windows. I don't know that its worth the – I don't know that it changes it significantly to not – that's what I'm saying, it's probably \$200 a window – that's \$2000 just to change ... I don't know that that is solving anything, honestly.

Administrator Feasel: Do you know how other open porches would deal with their drainage?

Commissioner Canada: Typically what they end up doing is having a slope. So you'd go in, take the slope away on the porch away from it, and you'd have to put in drains on the sides to take it away from the home. But it's doable.

Commissioner Annis: It's somewhat of a – it requires a sophisticated solution.

Commissioner Canada: The overhang is good, but it's still a fairly deep porch.

Commissioner Molnar: I think that we want these buildings to last for a very, very long time. Fixing the drainage issue helps preserve the building. The vinyl – both the windows, and the siding – will not last as long as the building itself (the brick). In an ideal world, when they start to fail and need to be replaced, that would be the time when HPC can step in and make sure that what is put back in is something that is more in tune with the historical nature of the building. There's a lot of empty lots in that neighborhood, and it's a stand-alone landmark, and as a stand-alone landmark, it's a silo, but it's also – its good that the house is not deteriorating further, because that neighborhood may not support it to stay there in a perfect state forever. So the fact that its not deteriorating is a plus from the HPC side, and hopefully, maybe, when it came time for the vinyl to be replaced the neighborhood will have rebounded to a place where it makes economic sense to replace all the windows again. It puts us in a hard spot, I get that, but it is there now. As much as I like to be looking at fresh designs, we're not. That's my thing.

Administrator Feasel: So typically when Adam and I review non-original details for their replacement, they've deteriorated – like a replacement window needs a new replacement windows – Staff considers that an administratively approvable thing, as we are not changing an original detail. So I guess, if what I'm hearing, if you are heading in the direction of approving this, it be a conditional approval stating that when it is time to replace either the siding or the windows, that it either, not be staff approvable, so that it would come back to the Commission for another design could be made...

Commissioner Molnar: Could you put the condition that it could not be an administrative approval, is that what you are saying?

Administrator Feasel: Yeah – this may be something that would be more appropriate for [Legal Counsel] to comment on, but as a way to protect you in the future from the future staff from saying, "well, it looks like this now, we are able to approve this for this new replacement."

Commissioner Molnar: So that house is now ninety-eight years old.

Administrator Feasel: The vinyl ... it's already failing, so if this is approved you will need to go up there and do maintenance to it. And the windows? They will last, twenty years is their warranty, and we're already a couple years into it – so best guess, you'll be lucky to get eighteen more out of them, so... when these have to be replaced, because that will happen, that it be removed from staff's hands so that whatever is proposed by Mr. Lopez, or the next owner, would come before the Commission.

Commissioner Molnar: So you can make a big flag in the file?

Administrator Feasel: I don't know how we will do it in the file, but it will show up in the file, and it will show up in the Building Department for the same thing. But just so that future HPC staff members think, "well, it was replaced this way, we can approve it to be replaced in kind" – we wouldn't want to.

Commissioner Gelfman: I just think we are setting a terrible precedent with this. I think that – looking twenty years down the road, or what, when I'm in a nursing home, or something like that –

Commissioner Gordon: I'm hoping for twenty.

Commissioner Gelfman: I'm looking for it, but I don't know. I think that whoever is in charge of it, sees that this is what we have approved, even if it is conditionally, and then they say, "like in-kind, lets go like in-kind." I think we're setting a terrible precedence – and the bottom part, where the siding is needs to be replaced with – they have vinyl, help me here – cedar shake.

Administrator Feasel: And there's also cedar shake.

Commissioner Gelfman: And there's also cedar shake. But I also don't know what the price comparison is with the two of those.

Administrator Feasel: Vinyl is probably more, because it's an artificial material.

Commissioner Gelfman: Then we go to a cedar shake. And that could be stained to that dark color.

Commissioner Molnar: I know timelines are always a question here. Could we continue this, and the applicant could go and get more information – as I know you said you were willing to work with the vinyl...

Commissioner Gordon: --the siding.

Commissioner Molnar: Could postpone it to next month and he could come back with other options of what it could look like.

Commissioner Gordon: For the siding, and your thoughts on the windows?

Commissioner Molnar: We could continue the whole thing with the intention of at least coming back with some siding material.

Commissioner Gordon: That could be helpful.

Commissioner Gelfman: That'll help that part, with me. But not with the other part.

Specialist Toering: I want to say we don't know what was there before.

Commissioner Gelfman: What do you mean?

Commissioner Gordon: We don't know what is under vinyl.

Specialist Toering: We don't know what is under the vinyl, we know that the asphalt siding was there, the asphalt shingles. But we don't know what was originally there, what was there.

Commissioner Molnar: I understand, but we can try to hide the newness.

Commissioner Gelfman: There's such a perverse difference between the old and the new – it doesn't blend, at all. Not even close.

Commissioner Gordon: It stands out like crazy. That's why I wanted to know if he's taken down the siding we could get something dark, maybe change the color of the aluminum around the windows, if it could possibly be more acceptable. The window change design is not going to happen unless you take out those windows and put in new windows. There's no covering that up. Other than taking the sheet glass out and putting in different as Commission Canada suggested. That would have to be the remedy.

Administrator Feasel: Tippecanoe Place did that. They did the exact same thing. We denied that, they had a previous approved enclosed porch, and they put vinyl window in without permission, and they were similar to these, and they were denied by the Commission, and they came up with a custom wood frame solution to where the windows filled the entire opening so the windows looked like picture windows, so it gives the appearance of –

Commissioner Gordon: And it is fantastic looking, although this house is not Tippecanoe Place, nor the financial resources of Tippecanoe Place.

Administrator Feasel: But, this is an income producing property, this is not a single-family home, this generates revenue for the owner.

Commissioner Molnar: But its not a National Landmark.

Administrator Feasel: You could reinvest some of that in the structure.

Commissioner Gordon: Yes, I wouldn't disagree with that. You'd recoup it, sooner or later.

Public Discussion:

Eric Stalheim, 902 E Washington – The one thing that I will contribute is that it would not be uncommon for a house of this period to have a shingle type of material for the edge of the porch.

Commissioner Gordon: Under the windows?

Mr. Stalheim: If it was an open porch, it would not be uncommon for it to be a cedar shake, or something to be out there.
Commissioner Gordon: Would it be uncommon for this age of a house to have the upper porch enclosed? It wouldn't, would it?
Mr. Stalheim: It probably would have been screens, because it would have been used as a sleeping porch.

Commissioner Molnar made a motion to continue COA #2019-0227, with the request on the Commission's behalf that the applicant to look into different siding material for below the windows, exploring a couple different options, with the intent of bringing them back to the Commission for review. It doesn't mean we have to approve them, it doesn't mean we can't approve what is there, but just so that we can see some other options. Investigate what can be done to hide or change the aluminum on either side of the window. Investigate what would the cost would be to put in new windows or to change the windows to 1-over-1, so we can get an idea as to what it would cost, so we can make a better informed decision on that. Seconded by Commissioner Gordon.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0 Motion to continue COA#2019-0227 is approved.

Ms. Hoover: We have a very dark brown – we can get a very dark brown, we can special order a very deep brown vinyl siding that's like that, or, we can bring a sample of that. But if you are specifically wanting cedar shake, we kind of have to know that... as well.

Commissioner Molnar: You don't have to bring in the physical – if you could, that'd be awesome. But it's just that photos...

Ms. Hoover: A sample?

Commissioner Gordon: And the white aluminum trip around the windows? It wouldn't stand out so much, the new – it's not really the issue, but it contributes.

Mr. Lopez: They have a brown.

Commissioner Gordon: That could be helpful, I don't know, but it could be helpful.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 4th, 2019

Commissioner Molnar made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Canada.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve the minutes as submitted is passed.

B. STAFF REPORTS

1. Administrative Approval Reports – Distributed.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. LEAD PAINT GUIDELINES

Administrator Feasel brought and introduced two Lead Paint Guidelines:

1. HUD-Lead Based Paint-Historic Preservation

2. National Park Service_Preservation Brief 37 _ Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. 508 AND 510 S ST JOSEPH – SITE VISIT INVITATION

B. Commissioner Gordon informed the Commission that this will be his last meeting with the Commission. His term is ending and he is looking forward to devoting more time at the Veterans Affairs Facility.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Molnar made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote 5 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 6:49 pm.

Attest:



Greta Fisher, Secretary





Date

