

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

June 17th, 2019
13th Floor Conference Room
County – City Building
South Bend, IN 46601

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members of the Public Present:

Barbara Brook, 1402 E Wayne Street, South Bend, IN
Scot Hires, 632 Farneman Street, South Bend, IN
Dylan Risser, Quality Window and Doors, 27888 Co Rd 32, Elkhart, IN
Wendell Simmons, 124 N 2nd Street, Cassopolis, Michigan
Mike Stockrahm, 1120 E Wayne, South Bend, IN
Peter Wallace, 417 W Navarre, South Bend, IN
Virginia Wallace, 417 W Navarre, South Bend, IN

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Michelle Gelfman, President; Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Greta Fisher, Architectural Historian / Secretary; Joseph Molnar, Treasurer; Sarah Ponder; Lesley Annis.

Members Not in Attendance: Eric Stalheim.

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

Staff Not in Attendance: N/A

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. 1120 E Wayne District **COA# 2019-0530** **#7796-87 East Wayne Local and**

Representation: Michael Stockrahm, 1120 E Wayne, South Bend, IN
Scot Hires, 632 Farneman Street, South Bend, IN

STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Date: June 5, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0530

Property Location: 1120 East Wayne Street

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Colonial Revival/1935/Naus House

Property Owner: Patty and Mike Stockrahm

Landmark or District Designation: East Wayne Street, Ordinance #7796-87

Rating: *Contributing*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: Two story frame house with irregular plan. Roof is side gable with returns. Roof material appears to be the original slate. Windows are primarily 6/6 double hung with ornamental louvered shutters. Façade is

wood shingle on the second story and brick on the first story. Entry door is off center with an entablature supported by fluted pilasters. A rear addition connects to the garage.

ALTERATIONS: COA 2003-0224 approved installation of new gutters and repair of molding. COA 2002-0827 approved restoration of deteriorated shingles/boards from second story. COA 2002-0822 approved replacement windows on the condition that the replacement sashes retain the same appearance as the original windows. The rear additions connecting the original house to the rear garage occurred sometime after 1960 (but prior to the establishment of the district).

APPLICATION ITEMS: *"Re roof – tear off. Install ice shield, repair decking where need. Shingle with architectural shingle."*

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Contractor has applied to remove the existing roofing and install new asphalt architectural shingles. The original structure has a slate tile roof that has deteriorated. The later rear additions have existing asphalt shingles. The applicant has supplied multiple previous quotes for the restoration / replacement of the existing slate tile from previous years. The applicant has elected to apply to remove the asphalt 3-tab shingles at the rear as well as the slate roofing and replace with Oakridge by Atlas architectural asphalt shingles on the entire roof. Photographs provided by the applicant indicate that the underlayment is compromised, leading to water infiltration in the attic and main living space. Staff would prefer to see all examples of slate tile preserved and restored on designated properties. In lieu of maintaining original slate, staff would prefer synthetic slate materials. The rear additions of this property create an interplay between two materials: original slate and later asphalt. An ideal circumstance would see the same material conveyed across all roof portions.

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: EAST WAYNE STREET

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

B. ROOFS AND ROOFING

Roof shapes in the district encompass most of the various designs found in residential structures. **Roofs are covered with a variety of materials such as asphalt, asbestos, wood, and slate shingles, as well as clay tiles.** Residences in most cases have wood fascias with gutters and downspouts. The facias of some vinyl or metal sided houses are covered with the same material.

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

[...]

In making its determination, the Historic Preservation Commission shall consider three factors: first, 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 concedes that both sections of roof are deteriorated and would recommend approval of the proposed application.

COMMISSIONER MOLNAR ARRIVED AT 5:33PM

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Hires explained that the roof was deteriorated and that the existing slate would be reused in a later project.
Mr. Stockrahm explained that the landscaping could not happen until the roof was completed, that the major storms had brought an oak tree down on the his neighbor's house and car.
Mr. Hires explained that the contractor who had been doing the repairs was unable at this point to do further repairs. Mr. Hires explained that in his experience architectural shingles are a suitable replacement to cedar shake shingles.
Commissioner Hertel asked for an example of the roof (material and style).
Commissioner Gelfman asked for clarification: "are you saying that there is cedar shake underneath the slate?"
Mr. Hires responded that no, there is not cedar shake beneath, but rather that cedar was a common and appropriate material used at the time of construction.
Commissioner Gelfman asked whether synthetic slate was considered.
Mr. Hires responded that he believed synthetic slate looked strange, but that it was an option.
Commissioner Hertel asked whether gutters and downspouts were to be considered in this project.
Mr. Stockrahm responded that the primary project was the roof, and they weren't yet discussing the downspouts.
Staff confirmed that aluminum k-style gutters are currently in place.
Commissioner Hertel explained that she would feel comfortable remanding the matter of the gutters to staff.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Fisher asked for clarification regarding the Staff recommendation.
Administrator Feasel explained that the staff recommendation was for the owner and the contractor to consider, that Staff does approve what was applied for, but that these other options would be preferred, if possible.
Commissioner Fisher agreed that cedar shake is found on similar homes, that the slate was deteriorated, that having a uniform roof material over the entire roof would be preferred, and that she is unsure of the synthetic slate's lifespan and appearance. Given all of those points, she could support this project.
Commissioner Hertel asked for clarification regarding the use of asphalt shingles in historic properties.
Administrator Feasel explained that this is a common material, and that staff would prefer to move away from 3-tab shingles in favor of architectural shingles, as applied.
Commissioner Hertel asked about this property within the context of the neighborhood.
Administrator Feasel explained that this is a *contributing* property, it is not one of the *notable* or *outstanding* properties which would necessitate additional scrutiny regarding the retention of the slate.
Commissioner Fisher asked about reuse of the material.
Mr. Stockrahm explained that he knew of a couple of people who would purchase the slate, but he would prefer to use it on site, perhaps in his kitchen remodel which will be happening in the near future; to keep the material on the property.
Commissioner Annis concurred with the previous statements of the other Commissioners.
Commissioner Ponder is comfortable with this project, having seen the pictures of the interior damage and wanting the roof to match.

Commissioner Fisher made a motion to approve COA #2019-0530 with the condition that gutters and downspout approval be remanded staff. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Six in favor, none opposed.

VOTE: 6 – 0. Motion to approve application #2019-0530 with conditions is approved.

**2. 933 Riverside Drive COA# 2019-0530A #7469-85 Riverside Drive Local
Historic District
Representation: Scott Hires, 632 Farneman Street, South Bend, IN**

**STAFF REPORT
CONCERNING APPLICATION FOR A**

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Date: June 5, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0530A

Property Location: 933 Riverside Drive

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Side gabled/1900/Peck House

Property Owner: Dave and Julia Lincicum

Landmark or District Designation: Riverside Drive, ordinance #7469-85

Rating: *Contributing*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: One and a half story, irregular plan structure on a concrete foundation. Roof is cross gable with flat roof dormers. Siding is wood clapboard. There is a small open porch with wood clapboard covered piers and walls. Windows are original wood 6/1 double hung. Roof is asphalt shingle.

ALTERATIONS: RME 2013-0506 approved rebuilding foundation corners using existing brick, repointing foundation, and replacement of broken and missing brick with antique brick. COA 2011-0404 approved returning front and rear lawns to original character with removal of multiple flower beds, complete north portion of rear yard with 8' wood privacy fence, convert front sidewalk to brick pavers, move main entry sidewalk from Riverside Drive to Park for safety reasons, remove dying tree in Park Avenue tree lawn. RME 2009-0721 approved tear off and reroof, install in-kind asphalt shingles, repair of damaged decking, and install ice and water shield/drip ledge while keeping original gutters. RME 2004-0827 approved replacement of rotted wood fence with new wood fence n same location as existing.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *"Remove old "lean to" porch & build a larger, more useful porch designed like front porch. Remove "lean to" style storage shed and replace with a smaller storage building that also has an outside room concept that opens to a pergola."*

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: The application proposes to:

1. Reconstruct the rear 'lean-to' entrance porch to be more in keeping with the stylist cues of the front of the structure, extending the existing roof line from the structure;
2. Demolish the existing 23' x 10'9" ancillary shed building;
3. Construct a new shed building, 12' x 10' with the following features, sided and finished the same as the main structure:
 - a. 48" dormer on the south roof,
 - b. 6' double door on the east face,
 - c. 36" man door on the south face
4. Construction of a pergola beside the shed

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES:

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

A. BUILDING MATERIALS

Original exterior wall materials in the district include limestone, flagstone, stucco, clapboard, wood shingles, sandstone and masonry block. In some instances, vinyl or aluminum siding has been applied over the original surface.

Required

Original exterior building materials shall be retained. Deterioration of wood materials shall be prevented through repair, cleaning and painting. The existing or original architectural detail around windows, porches, doors and eaves should be retained or replaced by replicas of the same design and materials when deteriorated beyond repair. Masonry including brick, limestone, flagstone, sandstone and stucco shall be cleaned only when necessary to halt deterioration or to remove stains, and shall be done with a method acceptable for the preservation of the surface: i.e. low pressure water and soft natural bristle brushes. When repairing stucco, stucco mixture compatible in composition, color and texture shall be used.

Recommended

Whenever possible, the original building materials should be restored. Metal or vinyl siding may be used when it is the only alternative to maintaining or replacing the original surface material. 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. Ample ventilation must be afforded the structure when metal or vinyl siding has been installed in order to prevent increased deterioration of the structure from moisture and/or insects. Mortar joints should be repointed only when there is little 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. It is emphasized that, prior to initiating any restoration or rehabilitation effort, the property owner should contact the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County which is located in the County/City Building of South Bend. The Commission is an invaluable source of information about all facets of rehabilitation and restoration.

Prohibited

Wood siding shall not be resurfaced with new material which is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was constructed, such as artificial stone, brick veneer, asbestos, or asphalt shingles. Sandblasting or the use of harsh detergents shall not be used on masonry including brick, stucco, limestone, flagstone, and sandstone. This method of cleaning erodes the surface material and accelerates deterioration. Brick surfaces shall not be painted unless they had been painted originally. Repointing shall not be done with a mortar of high Portland cement content which can often create a bond that is stronger than the building material. This can cause deterioration as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar which can result in serious damage to adjacent brick. Paint shall not be removed from masonry surfaces indiscriminately.

Not Recommended

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

B. ROOFS AND ROOFING

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

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Window and door frames are in most cases wood. Brick structures have stone sills and brick lintels. In some cases where aluminum siding has been applied window trim has been covered. About half of the structures in the district have aluminum storm windows, the other half wood windows.

Required

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

Recommended

Wood frame storm windows and doors painted to match the original should be used should not damage existing frames. If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design, and hardware should be used. When metal storm doors are used, they should be painted, anodized or coated to match the existing. When awnings are used they should be of canvas material.

Prohibited

Original doors, windows, and hardware shall not be discarded when they can be restored and reused in place. New window and door openings which would alter the scale and proportion of the building shall not be introduced. Inappropriate new window and door features, such as aluminum insulating glass combinations that require removal of the original windows and doors, shall not be installed.

Not Recommended

Awnings, hoods, and fake shutters made of metal, vinyl, or fiberglass should not be used if they would detract from the existing character or appearance of the building.

D. ENTRANCES, PORCHES AND STEPS

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

Required

Existing or original porches, stoops, patios, and steps, including handrails, balusters, columns, brackets, tiles and roof decorations, shall be retained or replaced by replica of the same design and materials when deteriorated beyond repair. Porches and additions reflecting later architectural styles and which are important to the building's historical integrity, shall be retained.

Recommended

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

Prohibited

Front porches, stoops, patios, and steps that are important to the building's style and development shall not be altered or removed.

Not Recommended

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

Exterior electrical and telephone cables should not be attached to the street elevations of the buildings.

III. NEW CONSTRUCTION

New construction includes any new building or structure constructed within the boundaries of the historic district, or any new addition to an existing building. New construction should be designed considering the appearance of the other buildings in the neighborhood.

A. HEIGHT AND PROPORTION

the majority of structures in the district are two stories high and are square, rectangular, or irregular in plan. There are a few story-and-a-half residences. The prevalent façade proportions are between a 1:1 and a 1:2 height-to-width ratio.

Required

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

Recommended

Contemporary designs should be compatible in character and mood to the building or neighborhood.

Prohibited

Additions may not be constructed that would change the existing façade of a building, alter its scale or architectural character, or add new height.

Not Recommended

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

B. BUILDING MATERIALS

Walls materials in the district range from brick, stucco, clapboard, shingles, aluminum and vinyl siding.

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

C. SHEDS AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS

Required

Sheds and accessory structures (gazebos, decks, doghouses, playhouses, fountains and small reflecting pools, outdoor sculpture, children's play equipment, etc.) shall be located at the rear of the property and as unobtrusively as possible while preserving historical relationships between the buildings, landscape features, and open spaces. Proportions and materials shall conform to those required for new construction.

Recommended

Accessory building designs should be compatible in character and mood to the residence and the neighborhood.

Prohibited

Prefabricated metal sheds shall not be used.

Not Recommended

Prefabricated wood composition sheds should not be used unless they conform to all other standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the proposed project, with the caveat that further information regarding the proposed doors for the shed be provided prior to installation.

Report written by
Adam Toering, Historic Preservation Specialist
Report approved by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Hires explained that the project was self-explanatory, and that it caters to the architecture of the house. The proposal seeks to replicate one of the dormers of the front of the house.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that the proposed plan may improve the rating of the house, for the better.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that she would like to see that the further details regarding the doors should be remanded to staff.

Mr. Hires explained that the windows would be the same as the front of the house, and the doors would be six panel and, possibly a vertical pane at the top.

Commissioners Annis and Fisher asked for and received confirmation that the siding material and profile would be matched.

Mr. Hires talked about the window restoration contractor that they have used before.

Inspector Szaday spoke about the storm windows on the rest of the house being aluminum.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if the aluminum storm windows would be changed at this time.

Mr. Hires responded that changing the aluminum storms was not part of this project.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Fisher stated that she felt like the proposed project was appropriate, that the existing shed was unremarkable, and that there is no 'frontage' issue as it cannot be seen from the street.

Commissioner Annis stated that she would like to see all material, for siding, windows, or doors, be remanded to staff.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA#2019-0530A with the final materials for the exterior of the structures to be approved by staff. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0530A is passed.

3. **1133 E Wayne District** **COA# 2019-0603A #7796-87** **East Wayne Local**
Representation: Wendell Simmons, 124 N 2nd Street, Cassopolis, Michigan

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

Date: June 5, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0603A

Property Location: 1133 East Wayne Street

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Colonial Revival/1938/Toepp House

Property Owner: Jim Nowicki

Landmark or District Designation: East Wayne Street, Ordinance #7796-87

Rating: Contributing

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: Two story house with rectangular plan. Roof is side gable with returns and asbestos shingles (although survey card lists asphalt). Windows are primarily original wood 8/8 double hung at first floor, 6/6 at second floor, with ornamental louvered shutters. There is a central arched entry with fluted pilasters. Façade is painted brick.

ALTERATIONS: RME 2011-0921A removed one dead/dying Green Ash in tree lawn per Permit #197 requiring replacement tree.

APPLICATION ITEMS: "Replacement of the asbestos tile roof and galvanized gutters with the Classic Products Oxford metal shingle and new galvanized gutters"

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Contractor has applied to install new Oxford metal shingle over existing asbestos tile roof, and to install new galvanized half round gutters.

While the 81-year-old roof has been maintained over the years, Slatile Roofing and Sheet Metal Co., Inc. and Preservation Inspector have concluded that the asbestos shingle roof is failing and may be considered beyond repair at this point, please see respective letters for details.

Slatile has proposed to install a metal shingle style roof system that would allow for the asbestos to remain installed on the house. Per the contractor, the main reason for not removing the asbestos is to eliminate the hazard of asbestos particles becoming airborne during demolition and the possibility of becoming a health hazard to the neighborhood. Another reason is the cost of the removal and special considerations needed in disposal, both of which result in a higher cost. Staff advocates for removal of asbestos prior to installing a new roof product to eliminate a potentially hazardous material from existing on the house and to remedy any moisture concerns related to the vegetation growing in or behind the asbestos tile. Regarding the proposed metal roof, this particular product is not commonly found in historic districts but would simulate a tile scale, texture, and pattern.

The proposed gutters are in – kind.

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT:

On June 6, 2019 I met with Wendell Simmons from Slatile and Preservation Specialist Adam Toering at the property located at 1133 E Wayne N part of the East Wayne Local Historic District.

The owner has applied (through the contractor) to cover the existing asbestos shingles with a substrate membrane then finish with aluminum asbestos looking aluminum roof tiles. The step flashing at the chimneys will have to be replaced with a taller version, and the distinctive half-round gutters will also have to be removed and rehung.

There are missing or broken tiles in several locations. The owners and contractors have been using up a stockpile of matching tiles, but now that supply has been depleted. Patches of moss are everywhere on all sides of the roof. This would suggest that the existing underlayment under the asbestos tiles has failed so far as to allow moisture to pool. Not to mention the extra weight.

The moss will need to be removed and the areas washed to prevent regrowth.

In a previous application for 1105 E Wayne where asbestos tiles were present, the roofing had been removed, properly disposed of, and a new underlayment and roof material then installed. I am aware that there are additional costs, but the removal of the asbestos tiles is the only permanent solution. The new underlayment is to be installed with screws and washers through the existing asbestos tiles and underlayment. I would question leaving failed material in place rather than removing it.

Steve Szaday
Preservation Inspector

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: EAST WAYNE STREET

III. EXISTING STRUCTURES

C. ROOFS AND ROOFING

Roof shapes in the district encompass most of the various designs found in residential structures. **Roofs are covered with a variety of materials such as asphalt, asbestos, wood, and slate shingles, as well as clay tiles.** Residences in most cases have wood fascias with gutters and downspouts. The fascias of some vinyl or metal sided houses are covered with the same material.

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff does not recommend installing a new roof over the asbestos and would advocate for removal first. If all architectural features which give the roof its essential character can be retained, Staff recommends the metal shingle. Staff recommends new galvanized half round gutters.

Report compiled by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Simmons stated that the reason that the metal paneling was considered was because of the asbestos roof, the hazards that go with the extra costs of removal, that encapsulation is a nationally recognized and accepted standard, and that his company had executed the proposed encapsulation on a church in Mishawaka. Mr. Simmons discussed the procedure for removing an asbestos roof, and the required precautions needed to ensure that the asbestos does not become airborne. Mr. Simmons explained that this is a more expensive product than the asphalt shingles that were approved in an earlier project. Mr. Simmons stated that if the Commission were to request that the asbestos be removed, that he did not feel the property owner would go forward with it, because it would cost more money.

Commissioner Annis asked what the warranty on this product was.

Mr. Simmons responded that it was a lifetime warranty – if the property owner sells the house, the new owner receives a 40 year warranty.

Commissioner Gelfman asked regarding the mold or moss that is on the existing roof.

Mr. Simmons explained that they have to use a low-pressure power washer before it can be encapsulated.

Commissioner Annis asked about how the project is regulated, is there a specific testing agency that monitors projects like this.

Mr. Simmons explained that there is, that there has to be air monitoring if the asbestos were to be removed, requiring a block or so radius. Mr. Simmons expressed concerns that the summer work period would result in a higher cause for concern as kids would be playing in the neighborhood. Legally they are required to let everyone know in the event of asbestos removal.

Commissioner Hertel asked about the heating of the roof and how that would impact the asbestos roof.

Mr. Simmons stated that the existing asbestos roof probably had the growth within five years of it being installed. The metal roof has a reflective coating on it, and it will have the synthetic felt layer between the asbestos and the metal roof.

Commissioner Hertel expressed concern regarding the presence of a known hazard on the house, that it is important that this be discussed, whether it is removed now, or later, because of long-term concerns of the failure of the material.

Commissioner Fisher asked regarding the constitution of the decking material underneath the asbestos.

Mr. Simmons explained that it was solid decking, that per the homeowner's information, there are no slats. The new material would be put on with screws. The felt would extend over the entire roof.

Commissioner Fisher asked about the trim work.

Mr. Simmons explained that special metal trim work would be utilized on the eave edge that lock in together.

Commissioner Annis asked about the product and the manufacturer.

Mr. Simmons explained that it is by Plastic Products, out of Ohio. This particular design is called 'Oxford.'

Administrator Feasel explained that the word 'mold' was used, that staff referenced moss and material, but that it was somehow confused into mold. Staff does not believe it to be mold. Administrator Feasel expressed concern and questioned whether the moisture could have gotten through and behind the asbestos, and may cause a problem. She expressed that the property owner has said that there is no visible leaks at this time. Since we are seeing live vegetation on the outside of the roof, could it be possible that it is on the inside, and how would we know.

Mr. Simmons expressed that it is only on the north side, the sun kills it otherwise. It's also age.

Inspector Szaday asked about the way through which the material is secured to the roof, via screws, and that would disturb the asbestos.

Mr. Simmons explained that the synthetic felt is over the asbestos and that it is contained. The felt is '20 mil' thick.

Commissioner Molnar stated that we are not the Building Department, and that building permits would be needed.

Administrator Feasel expressed that the concerns were based upon Secretary of the Interior Preservation Briefs.

Specialist Toering stated that he had taken a course on Lead Paint, Asbestos, and Silicates, although that does not make him an expert in it. Encapsulation is an acceptable form of mitigation, that will last for the length of the duration of the covering material. But the asbestos will still be there.

Commissioner Fisher expressed that discussions regarding the use of this material is precedent setting.

Specialist Toering reiterated his concern that the first thing to fail relating to this project will be the gutter systems, which, per Mr. Simmons, will be face mounted, which alleviates some of the concern regarding typical gutter mounting systems. Second, Specialist Toering is concerned that a later owner may drill through the roof not knowing that there is asbestos beneath. The probability of that is arguably low, however. Finally, were a tree to fall onto this roof – there is one tree to the west that may be tall enough – there would still be the opportunity for asbestos fibers to be created and released into the air. Catastrophic roof failure is still a concern.

Commissioner Molnar asked about the cost.

Mr. Simmons stated that the most expensive part of this project is the abatement.

Administrator Feasel and Inspector Szaday discussed the educational commitment of the Commission to engage with materials and environment.

Commissioner Gelfman asked about the gutters, which are painted.

Administrator Feasel discussed the standards and guidelines text regarding the architectural details and essential character of the roof.

Mr. Simmons discussed the ways through which the fascia and details will change with the new installation, some of the detail will be covered with the new trim, of some 2 1/2" portion.

Commissioner Molnar confirmed that Slatile had been doing the maintenance, and asked about the failure of the asbestos.

Mr. Simmons spoke about his company's efforts to maintain the roof, and how they have patched and repaired with material that they have retained previously. Mr. Simmons spoke about the portions of the roof that are failing. Mr. Simmons spoke about the desire of the property owner to fix the issue. The shingles have been on since 1938.

Specialist Toering asked when the last time Slatile had 'demolished' an asbestos roof was.

Mr. Simmons stated that it was over 15 years ago, and there are thankfully fewer asbestos roofs are remaining.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hertel expressed her reservations about this project, in its entirety – it is a major change in appearance. The health concerns regarding the asbestos remediation. This will set a precedent. Commissioner Hertel expressed that this kind of material will have a somewhat industrial look that will detract from the appearance of the structure.

Commissioner Fishes expressed that she too is having trouble with this project, and expressed that she would feel better if she had the homeowner present to express their desire to live with this circumstance. Commissioner Fisher further explained that she didn't really hate the look of the product, but she didn't know what it would look like on, and she was nervous about the details on the corners and how it would look. Her discomfort is really with this product, and whether this will open the door to other metal roofs. She expressed that were this a metal standing-seam roof, it wouldn't be a discussion moving forward.

Mr. Simmons expressed that [standing-seam roofs] have already been installed in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fisher expressed reservations that it wouldn't be approved now.

Specialist Toering explained that the project being referenced was approved four years ago or so (on E Jefferson) for a garage addition.

Mr. Simmons agreed that it looked bad for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Hertel explained that it was the Commission's job to maintain the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

Mr. Simmons stated that he believed the proposed product was the best product to replicate the asbestos shingle, and argued about that the synthetic slate that has been installed looks good.

Commissioner Gelfman asked the Commissioners to look at the provided examples of the proposed roof as installed.

Commissioner Fisher expressed that she thinks it has a monolithic look, but this may be a good test-case for this product.

Commissioner Ponder asked for clarification regarding previous asbestos roof removals.

Inspector Szaday spoke about one of the recent asbestos removal projects, where the replacement of the decking required the removal of the asbestos shingles.

Administrator Feasel discussed a previous example where the Commission approved an encapsulation, but the permit pulled with the Building Department was for a complete tear-off. Administrator Feasel spoke about her experiences working with Mr. Simmons and Slatile prior to this project, and her familiarity with their work and comfort with asking for additional information. She discussed her previous conversation with the property owner where he expressed his ability to 'do nothing' and just leave it like it is because there isn't a leak, and expressed that it is similar to the example behind his (the standing seam roof). She then asked Mr. Nowicki regarding the cost of the removal of the asbestos, and to replace it with asphalt. The National Parks – in their Preservation Briefs – accepts asphalt roofs as a suitable replacement of asbestos shingle.

Mr. Simmons expressed that there were no other alternative products up until recently to encapsulate the asbestos like this. He also expressed additional examples of this kind of roof in the area.

Commissioner Hertel discussed the options available to the Commission, and expressed a desire to have the homeowner present to provide his opinions and his case.

Mr. Simmons explained that he did not think the homeowner would have a problem with tabling the project until next month to ensure the owner be present to answer questions.

Commissioner Gelfman would like to see the cost numbers for other installation options as a comparison.

Administrator Feasel mentioned the rating of the property, and how replicating the shingle pattern isn't as important of a feature to be replicated, so as to allow the asphalt shingle installation.

Commissioner Gelfman felt that the issue wasn't product, it was the asbestos.
Commissioner Fisher expressed that the details of the roof – trim, etc would be changed.
Mr. Simmons explained that the details will be the same, some of the cornice would be covered, because of the installation of the ice shield. Overall the project will come down to money issues.
Commissioner Hertel expressed desire to table until next month to discuss other options.
Commissioner Molnar asked to continue the project to see additional numbers on the project.
Mr. Simmons asked for clarification on which numbers would be requested.
Administrator Feasel explained that the continuation is not a denial, it is just a request for additional information.
Commissioner Annis expressed appreciation that the homeowner had the foresight to contract with a reputable company who is doing things the appropriate way.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

Commissioner Molnar made a motion to continue COA#2019-0603A to the July meeting of the Commission, and request from the petitioner that at the next meeting they return with numbers on how much the asbestos removal would cost, and then how much it would cost to remove with the installation of the asphalt architectural shingles, and then how much this project would cost with the containment metal material, and then also that the homeowner please be present. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-0603A is approved.

Application #2019-0603A is continued until the July Commission meeting.

Mr. Simmons clarified the different options he should have numbers for.

COMMISSIONER HERTEL LEFT THE PROCEEDINGS AT 6:39PM.

4. 237 N Michigan COA# 2019-0603B #8652-1996 Local Landmark
Representation: N/A

WITHDRAWN.

5. 417 W Navarre Avenue #2019-0603C #9574-05 Chapin Park Local and
National Register Historic District
Representation: Peter Wallace, 417 W Navarre, South Bend, IN
 Virginia Wallace, 417 W Navarre, South Bend, IN

COMMISSIONER HERTEL REJOINED THE MEETING AT 6:42 PM.

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

Date: June 13, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0603C
Property Location: 417 W Navarre Avenue
Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Queen Anne / 1919
Property Owner: Peter and Virginia Wallace

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

Rating: *Outstanding*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: Three story Queen Anne (irregular plan) on a brick foundation. Two chimneys punctuate the roof line and have decorative vertical brick string course, polygonal appearance due to central pinching. The wood shingles decorate the exterior as well as the peaks on the second story, with clapboard elsewhere. Considerable decoration is on the west face of the second story. The roof is hipped with gables, barge board on the gables, and has a molded cornice. The south face has an enclosed brick porch with wall and pillars, stone sills, and double-hung sashes. The front entrance was formerly composed of wood double-leaf multi-paned doors with glass in upper quarter. Original screened French doors exist.

ALTERATIONS: Administrative Approval #2019-0603 allowed for trimming overgrown vegetation from the fence-line, deck, and exterior grounds of the house. AA 2019-0402A allowed for the repair and reconstruction of both chimneys with existing material. Exterior doors were removed and replaced without permit or approval in the summer of 2018. RME #2018-0725A allowed for trimming overgrown vegetation from the fence-line, deck, and around the house. RME #2018-0517A allowed for the removal and replacement of the roof. COA #2016-0218 allowed for the in-kind repair of rear exterior window stairs and repair wood siding, as well as the trimming of vegetation 18" from the structure. COA #2013-1202A allowed for the in-kind replacement of a 32" x 85" wood frame window.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *"Remove outside basement stair well, removing rear porch, and using existing foundation footprint for addition. Moving existing window to pantry, adding three windows to match existing kitchen windows, adding kitchen / laundry room / using matching siding/trim."*

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

1. The enclosure of the rear porch, replicating and extending the existing wood siding,
2. New foundation porch masonry to enclose the existing cavity with matching material,
3. The enclosure of the existing basement exterior entrance with a metal hatch door(s),
4. The removal of the northern stair to the exterior porch,
5. The removal of one, and the subsequent addition of two windows to the north façade of the enclosed porch,
6. The removal of the existing north façade window – this window will be moved to the eastern wall of the pantry area,
7. The reinstallation of the existing rear porch door on the western side of the enclosed porch.

The above modifications are to increase/extend the existing kitchen area, as well as mitigate current water infiltration to the structure through the basement entrance. All changes will be executed with like-in-kind materials (wood, concrete, and brick). The applicant is considering window options and plans to investigate the viability of existing HPC window stock as a potential solution.

SITE VISIT REPORT: Preservation Specialist Toering visited the site on June 10, 2019 to discuss the proposed project and photograph the project areas. Windows and doors described as being re-used are in good/stable condition and would make excellent candidates for transfer to the new locations. The existing basement access creates a water-ingress opportunity as well as a security concern; staff recommends the space be enclosed.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: CHAPIN PARK

II. EXISTING STRUCTURES

A. BUILDING MATERIALS

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

Required

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

Masonry, including brick and stucco structures, shall be maintained, and properly cleaned only when necessary to halt deterioration or to remove stains and shall be done in a method acceptable for the preservation of the surface: i.e. low-pressure water and soft natural bristle brushes. Brick or masonry mortar joints should be repointed only when there is evidence of moisture problems, or when sufficient mortar is missing to allow water to stand in the mortar joint. Existing mortar shall be duplicated in composition, color, texture, joint size, method of application and joint profile.

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

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

Recommended

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

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

Prohibited

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

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

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

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

Not Recommended

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

B. ROOFS AND ROOFING

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

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

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

Required

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

Recommended

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

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

D. ENTRANCES, PORCHES AND STEPS

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

Required

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

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

Recommended

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

Not Recommended

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

III. NEW CONSTRUCTION

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

A. HEIGHT AND PROPORTION

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

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

B. BUILDING MATERIALS

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

Required

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

Recommended

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

Prohibited

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

Not Recommended

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted, with the request that final window and basement product selection be relegated to staff.

Prepared by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

Recommendation by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Wallace expressed appreciation for the help and assistance of the HPC Staff throughout the process of purchasing and addressing the many projects on the house.

Commissioner Fisher asked about basement access.

Mrs. Wallace explained the small size of the kitchen area, necessitating expanding onto the rear porch. The existing external basement stairs will be covered, one of the porch stairs will be removed. Window relocation and replacement was discussed.

Commissioner Fisher asked about the detail spindling.

Mr. Wallace expressed their desire to reuse the spindling somewhere on the house.

Specialist Toering explained that the front porch footprint was changed significantly, indicating that the current configuration doesn't have much of the original detail, including spindling.

Commissioners Molnar and Fisher expressed gratification that a new owner was in possession of the house.

Commissioner Hertel asked about the extensive site plan and landscape changes, as evidenced by the site plan included in the packet.

Staff explained that those projects were administratively approved.

Mr. Wallace spoke about the fence line change.

Staff explained that multiple projects were administratively approved, including window repair, brick chimney work.

Mr. Wallace spoke about the trim and woodwork repair work that will be coming soon, including the attic window, as discovered by a 1940 photograph found in the HPC archives.

Specialist Toering apologized for not including the photo in the packet, and explained to the Commission that they will be seeing the Wallaces often as there are many projects.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hertel expressed support, with the conditions that Staff be remanded the authority to approve the hatch door, windows.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

Commissioner Annis made a motion to approve COA#2019-0603C as submitted with condition that the final window and basement product selection be relegated to staff. Seconded by Commissioner Molnar.

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0603C is passed.

6. 1402 E Wayne Street #2019-0603D #7796-77 East Wayne Street Local Historic District

Representation: Barbara Brooke, 1402 E Wayne Street, South Bend, IN
Dylan Risser, Quality Window and Doors, 27888 Co Rd 32, Elkhart, IN

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

Date: June 5, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0603D

Property Location: 1402 East Wayne Street

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Modern/1956/Cooper House

Property Owner: Barbara Brook

Landmark or District Designation: East Wayne Street, Ordinance #7796-87

Rating: Non-contributing

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: Two story wood frame Modern house with L-plan with one story attached garage. Roof is a low gable with asphalt shingles. Windows are primarily original wood divide lite casement. There is a central entry with flat roof and concrete slab. Façade is brick on 1st story, wood on 2nd.

ALTERATIONS: RME 2011-0722 replaced a concrete patio in rear of house, in-kind. RME 2011-0701 removed a dead dogwood tree and replacement. RME 2003-0616 installed furnace vent PVC pipe and installed metal chimney cap. COA 2001-0725 approved replacement of four windows in back of house with new wooden casement windows and picture window-casement combinations, manufactured to exactly match the windows in the front portion of the house. RME 2001-0622 replaced asphalt roof, in-kind.

APPLICATION ITEMS: "Replacement windows, See attachments for material descriptions"

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Owner has applied for seventeen (17) original wood windows to be replaced with Infinity by Marvin Fibrex extruded fiberglass exterior/wood interior windows. The windows proposed to be replaced are on the first and second stories of the house.

Heritage Construction Co., Inc. and HPC Preservation Inspector have concluded that the original wood casement windows are beyond repair, please see respective letters for details.

The proposed windows will be inserts, utilizing the existing jamb which commonly results in a slight reduction to the amount of glazing overall. The window pane pattern will be replicated for each window using 7/8" simulated divided lites on the exterior and interior with a spacer bar in between the glass providing dimension resembling the original. Color selection is Cashmere which matches painted details on the house. Exterior trim is proposed to be wrapped with an aluminum coil stock that will wrap the exterior trim of the windows with mitered joints. Quality Window and Door representative has confirmed that the stone sill on the first floor will not be wrapped and the coil would terminate at the wood. With a replicated pane pattern and simulated divided light, the fiberglass windows resemble the original aesthetic.

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT:

On April 30, 2019 I met with the property owner on site to photograph and evaluate the condition of the windows at the property. For the sake of ease, I will list the windows and each side of the house then state the overall condition and cite examples. All windows are of wood construction except where noted.

North Face (front side)

First floor 2- Combination 4 pane casement-picture-4 pane casement windows
Second floor 3- Double 4 pane casement windows

East Face (garage side)

First floor 1- Double 3 pane casement window on garage
1- Double 4 pane casement window
Second floor 1- Double 2 pane casement window
1- Double 4 pane casement window

South Face (rear side)

First floor 1- Combination 4 pane casement-picture-4 pane casement window -wood clad replacement
1- Single casement window-wood clad replacement
1- Double casement window-wood clad replacement
1- Double 3 pane casement window on garage
Second Floor 1- Double 4 pane casement window

West Face

First floor 2- Double 4 pane casement window
1- Combination 4 pane casement-picture-4 pane casement window -wood clad replacement
Second floor 1- Double 4 pane casement window

Overall assessment; the original wood casement windows are non-repairable.

-The addition of interior storms has allowed moisture to become trapped against the wooden elements causing deterioration and the sashes to become out of square. The photo of the front combination window demonstrates a crowning effect on the bottom sill plate.

-The sills on the west and north sides are soft to the touch. Multiple layers of paint but little caulk have allowed moisture to become trapped and rotting the wood out from the inside

-Several closure and locking mechanisms on these windows are non-operable. Replacement parts may be difficult to obtain and replace.

The owner informed me that the wood clad replacement windows in back were installed prior to the LHD designation and were installed to replace the Jalousie or louvered original windows. The existing windows are in good shape and she does not intend to replace them.

Steve Szaday
Preservation Inspector

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: EAST WAYNE STREET

IV. EXISTING STRUCTURES

A. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Window and door frames are of wood or steel (some casements) or in the case of brick structures, stone sills and brick lintels. Where metal or vinyl siding has been applied, window trim has been covered. Storm windows are of wood and aluminum.

Required

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

Recommended

Wood frame storm windows and doors painted to match the original should not be used but should not damage existing frames. If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design, and hardware should be used. When metal storm doors are used they should be painted, anodized or coated to match the existing. When awnings are used they should be of canvas material.

Prohibited

Original doors, windows, and hardware shall not be discarded when they can be restored and used in place. New window and door openings which would alter the scale and proportion of the building shall not be introduced. Inappropriate new windows and door features such as aluminum insulating glass combinations that require removal of the original windows and doors shall not be installed.

Not Recommended

Awnings, hoods, and fake shutters made of metal, vinyl, or fiberglass should not be used if they would detract from the existing character or appearance of the building

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: With the house having a non-contributing rating, along with the original windows deemed deteriorated beyond repair, and the proposed replacements resembling the original, per the Standards for East Wayne Street Local Historic District, Staff recommends approval.

Report compiled by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

Administrator Feasel clarified that the following corrections to the description should be noted, specifically that the application is for the replacement of *twelve* original windows with *fiberglass* windows by Marvin.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Ms. Brooks explained her reasons for coming forward with an application, and her selection of Quality Window & Door. Commissioner Molnar questioned the selection of fiberglass.

Administrator Feasel expressed that Staff is curious about fiberglass, and has been looking forward to seeing projects using these products in lieu of vinyl, especially considering the lack of long-term survivability of new wood windows (because of the loss of old-growth wood). Indiana Landmarks has used this product.

Commissioner Fisher asked why we weren't talking about a fiberglass-wood product.

Mr. Risser spoke about the differences between the Infinity and the Integrity product lines, the Infinity is made to give more visibility so you don't lose as much daylight, and the divided lite size can be replicated. The divided lite pattern can be replicated.

Commissioner Fisher asked about the operability, do they operate as the same the existing windows?

Mr. Risser explained they do operate the same as the existing casement windows.

Commissioner Fisher asked about paint chipping.

Mr. Risser explained that the product does not chip, as the color is part of the product. The color is a lifetime product.

Commissioner Fisher asked about the simulated divided lite.

Mr. Risser described the construction of the product, with components on both sides of the window, as well as between the panes of glass.

Commissioner Molnar asked Administrator Feasel to explain the *non-contributing* rating.

Administrator Feasel explained that at the time of the survey in 2005, the house was about 50 years old, and for whatever reason it was not considered contributing to the fabric of the neighborhood. Administrator Feasel corroborated the statements by the regular contractor who has cared for and maintained these windows, Inspector Szaday's site visit with a separate but same assessment, and the new product selected that led Staff to support the approval of the replacement of the windows.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Fisher expressed support, and curiosity about the new product.

Commissioner Molnar expressed support and appreciation for consistent maintenance.

Commissioner Ponder expressed that this was the 'easiest window to date.'

Ms. Brooks expressed thanks and her happiness at being the second owner of the house.

Administrator Feasel requested that we get updates from the property owner as to how the product holds up.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to approve COA#2019-0603D to approve the application as amended and asks that the homeowner provide feedback on the product in the coming years. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0603D is passed.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

B. STAFF REPORTS

1. Administrative Approvals

COMMISSIONER GELFMAN LEFT THE MEETING AT 7:18PM.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets
 - a. Committee Chair Fisher provided an update to the Commission as a whole, including:
 - i. The Committee met on 5/2/2019.
 - ii. Digitization is ongoing.
 - iii. A list of items needs to be generated on items that need to be dispossessed.
 - iv. The Committee made votes on the following:
 1. Books to be given to the Library for first right of refusal.
 2. Newspapers were tabled,
 3. Photo Negatives to be offered to the Saint Joseph County Public Library
 4. Unwanted computer technology to the St. Joseph County IT Department

COMMISSIONER GELFMAN REJOINED THE MEETING AT 7:22PM

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to accept the minutes from the meeting and approve the actions of the Committee. Commissioner Ponder seconded.

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Motion to approve the actions of the Disposition of the Historic Preservation Assets as a whole is approved.

2. Standards Update
 - a. Committee Chair Feasel provided an update as to the timeline of the actions for the Standards Update Committee, namely:
 - i. A meeting of the Committee will be scheduled in July or August
 - ii. Staff envisions that Standards work will not be executed before the end of the calendar year,
 - iii. Staff is working with Indiana Landmarks, who hopes to have a template that can be distributed statewide.
 - iv. Todd Zeiger is planning to integrate his Notre Dame Architecture students to help with this process.
 - v. 2020 Budget allotments are being investigated to assist with this next year.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A.** Lead Standards have been distributed to all Commission members. Commissioner Hertel asked if we could expand the section to include other hazards.

- B. Commissioner Gelfman inquired about the progress of the moving the ancillary structure at 326 Marion.
 - 1. Commissioner Hertel expressed concerns regarding the reapplication of projects that are not completed.
 - 2. Staff lamented that the approval of the project related to 322 Marion was a 'blanket' approval in September of 2018.
 - 3. Specialist Toering expressed to the Commission members the need and importance of making an explicit motion, as 'blanket' approvals will be legally considered to be approvals of the project as submitted by the applicant.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

- A. Architectural Historian Greta Fisher is announcing that she will be resigning from her position as the Architectural Historian because of time constraints due to her new position as the Executive Director of the Casaday Costume Company.
 - 1. Commissioner Hertel, Commissioner Gelfman, and Commissioner Molnar all expressed sadness at the departure of Commissioner Fisher from the Commission.
 - 2. Commissioner Fisher stated her intent to facilitate the transition of assets from the Historic Preservation Commission to the Library, with the hope of addressing this sometime in early July.
- B. Historic Preservation Specialist Toering explained that he and his wife are in the process of working on their 1912 house at the NE corner of Notre Dame and Wayne Street. Currently they are in the process of 'unveiling' the original siding beneath of aluminum siding. Commissioners are encouraged to stop by and see the process as it happens.
- C. Historic Preservation Administrator Feasel informed the Commission of the Staff's newest intern, Abigail Meckstroth.
- D. Commissioner Eric Stalheim is in Trinidad and Tobago doing site evaluation work of historic sites.
- E. Administrator Feasel brought forward that we will be lacking a Secretary and Assistant Secretary position.
 - 1. Commission President Gelfman appointed Commissioner Ponder as the Secretary.
 - 2. Commission President Gelfman appointed Commissioner Annis as the Assistant Secretary.
- F. Commissioner Hertel asked what Commissioner Fisher's departure means for quorum. Administrator Feasel explained that we are awaiting a pending appointment to the Commission by the City of South Bend.
- G. Commissioner Molnar asked about the process to select and appoint a new Architectural Historian to fill Commissioner Fisher's vacancy.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

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

Six in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 6 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.

Attest:

Sarah D Ponder

Sarah Ponder, Secretary

7.15.19

Date