

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

December 16th, 2019
13th Floor Conference Room
County – City Building
South Bend, IN 46601

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members of the Public Present:

Fengrong Ma, 51340 Lake Point Court, Granger, IN 46530

II. ROLL CALL

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

Members Not in Attendance: N/A

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

Staff Not in Attendance: N/A

III. PUBLIC HEARING

**Commissioner Hertel made a motion to amend the agenda to hear Section V, C, ii COMMITTEE
REPORTS prior to Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Stalheim.**

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to amend the agenda is passed.

Deb Parcell 801 W Washington

Ms. Parcell discussed the model guidelines. Most of the guidelines that are in place were based upon what Todd drafted many years ago. Different material and technology. Meeting in Plymouth earlier this year revealed that it is time for change. Developing a model guideline, rather general that will be customizable for every community. Engaged a consultant, Eric Stalheim. Began researching best practices from across the country. Combine that with needs that have been heard from across the state. Research done by the end of the year. Draft the language and a layout. Spring create drawings and photos that will illustrate. Finished product by Summer. Personalize it to your needs.

Points we are looking at, open to change: create basic guidelines, residential and commercial.

Adjustable to the needs of the community. Address new topics (lead/hazardous materials, substitute materials, alternative energy, solar, wind). General description of levels of integrity for survey ratings that will help people understand the significance of their property and why they want to maintain original materials. Major hope is to create guidelines written in plain language. Understandable by everyone, especially those who are not familiar with architecture or historic preservation. Make the process easier for an owner. Softer language, but direct and firm. Guidelines will be separated into concise review language that gets used for staff reports and commission consideration. Links to online materials for more information. Educational. Research that would help support the reasoning. Setup by topic (windows, siding). Matrix of what it is allowed, what is not allowed, what would be allowed under special circumstances.

Develop a handout to be given out for each section so that they know what is needed when applying for different projects. Projects are not one-size fits all. Web-based formatting to have all standards and guidelines online with the potential to develop a COA submission form. Asking each community that uses the guidelines to contribute \$500 to assist in supporting the process.

Commissioner Gelfman asked about how the different district standards and guidelines, noting that some are lenient, and others are strict. How would this be considered?

Ms. Parcell noted that this project would be to create one standard and guideline, not for the different sets.

Administrator Feasel explained the process that would build upon our product in partnership with Indiana Landmarks by engaging the community utilizing a consultant to host public meetings with charrettes for each district as a stakeholder group with the findings incorporated into the model standards and guidelines, customizing it for South Bend. Timeline for South Bend updates will take place after the model is done in May.

Commissioner Deegan asked when the charrettes would take place.

Administrator Feasel stated that we would like to start them in May, which is National Historic Preservation Month, had hoped to do two to three charrettes, one presenting the model and community input, two midway with consultant in developing customized version, and third with a final presentation. The Preservation Commission has to vote and approve the standards. Does not require a vote by the neighborhood nor council.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko wanted to know how they are going to handle if a district has a particular concern and the drafters of the new guidelines totally want to disregard that.

Administrator Feasel responded that this first version is not specific to South Bend, it is a template that can be adjusted and build on. The template will be based on best practices, a starting point.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko asked about appendices for different districts.

Administrator Feasel responded that each district has its own nuances, for instance in Chapin Park, the Commission governs brick streets and lights, East Wayne's characteristic is very different with a central park, so in an appendix there will be a section for each districts nuances and additional things that are governed. There will be a chance for us to adjust for the districts in the appendices but we are hoping that the standard is one standard for all historic properties whereas now we have nine districts, Group B, Leeper Park, Landscape Landmarks. We want one set of language and the specialties of the district called out separately.

Specialist Toering provided the example of Edgewater where there is nothing in their guidelines for ancillary shed structures on their lots. That isn't consistent with Chapin Park or Wayne street. We got a call today about, "can I build a shed?" and right now there would be a process for that but we would have nothing to base it off of so just having a baseline for whatever it is would be very beneficial versus us having to check every time to try to find the specific text that talks about sheds.

A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. 702 North St. Joseph Street
Bend Local Historic District | #2019-1108 | #8308-92 | River |
| Representation: | Fengrong Ma, 51340 Lake Point Court, Granger, IN 46530 | | |

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

Date: December 12, 2019

Application Number: 2019-1108

Property Location: 702 N St Joseph

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: American Foursquare / 1907

Property Owner: Fengrong Ma

Landmark or District Designation: River Bend Local Historic District (#8308-92)

Rating: *Contributing*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: This is a two-story square house on a fieldstone foundation. Walls are asphalt shingles; the second story has a slight overhang. The roof is hipped with asphalt shingles. Hipped dormers are at the north and south sides, with the southern being slightly larger. A gable dormer is on the west roof face. A first story hipped roof porch is on the west face with concrete steps and decking. Windows are 1/1 double hung, some wood and some aluminum storms. The chimney is centrally mounted.

ALTERATIONS: The irregular sized dormers appear to indicate some later modifications to the roofline of the house. COA 1998-0818 allowed for the in-kind replacement of the roof and gutters. COA 1998-0827 added further clarification for the in-kind roof replacement. RME 2018-0829 allowed for the reconstruction of the centrally mounted chimney. COA 2018-1113A conditionally approved the removal and replacement of the south and west dormer windows pending staff approval of proposed aluminum-clad windows (this was not completed). Two attic dormer windows were replaced with vinyl slider windows without Certificate of Approval in August of 2019.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “Replace two windows aluminum clad window in attic, gables on south and west roof. Pella Lifestyle Series windows. South gable will not be side-by-side smaller windows, rather 1 single double-hung.”

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

1. Removal of two (2) vinyl ‘slider’ windows from the west and southern attic dormers.
 - a. Vinyl windows were installed without Certificate of Appropriateness.
 - b. Vinyl windows do not match the previous windows in size, configuration, material, or style.
 - c. Vinyl windows replaced four windows: two ‘narrow’ double-hung windows in the southern and western dormers.
2. Replace with two (2) Pella Lifestyle brand aluminum-clad (wood core) windows in white.

Following the conditional approval of COA 2018-1113A for the replacement of the deteriorated original windows with aluminum clad wood double-hung windows matching the original configuration, Staff corresponded with the applicant and monitored the site. On August 6th, 2019, Staff discovered that the two west and two southern dormer windows had been replaced with vinyl slider windows. Staff documented the replaced windows, drafted and mailed a notification letter to the property owner, and informed the Building Department of work having been executed without an approved Certificate of Appropriateness/Building Permit. The Building Department ‘Red Tagged’ the property.

The applicant contacted Staff on August 13, 2019 upon receipt of the notification letter. Applicant attempted to find an aluminum-clad product that would replicate the original southern window size but was unable to do so after contacting multiple vendors. The original ‘narrow’ (approximately 10” wide) configuration of the sashes in each dormer resulted in no known appropriate replacement windows.

Commission deliberation for COA 2018-1113A included considering replacing the two smaller double-hung sashes with a single larger double-hung aluminum-clad sash. The Commission decided that the applicant should determine that the smaller 10’ sashes were not viable, and, having determined that, return to the Commission to apply for replacing the windows with the larger double-hung window.

SITE VISIT REPORT:

November 13, 2018

On November 12, 2018 I met with the owner of the property located at 702 N St. Joseph. She has applied to replace the windows located on the south-facing third floor dormer. I was unable to go inside the structure as the tenant works from home and did not want to be disturbed. I photographed the windows from the outside and was able to determine that one of the four sashes would need to be replaced or be rebuilt. The meeting rail of the top sash is broken free. The other window has the sashes reversed meaning upper forced down and lower sash forced up. The sashes do not look to be in place.

The owner provided me with a quote sheet for a Semco window from Richards Supply. I did not feel that the quote provided enough information about what was being proposed. I went to Richards Supply and got model-specific brochures and photographed a showroom model. Photographs are in the digital file.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: River Bend Local Historic District Standards and Guidelines

C. WINDOWS AND DOORS

Windows and door frames are in nearly all cases wood. Brick structures have stone sills and brick lintels; masonry block structures have masonry sills and 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 storm windows.

Required

Original windows and doors including sash, lintels, sills, shutters, decorative glass, pediments, hoods, and hardware shall be retained or when deteriorated beyond repair, replaced with duplicates of the existing or original.

Recommended

Wood frame storm windows and doors, painted to match the existing or original, should be used but should not damage existing frames and should be removable in the future. If new sash and doors are used, 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

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

Not Recommended

Metal, vinyl, or fiberglass awnings, hoods, and fake shutters that would detract from the existing character or appearance of the building should not be used.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff accepts that the applicant attempted to find a smaller (approximately 10” wide) aluminum-clad sash and was unable to do so. Given the applicant’s statements that windows of that size are not available, staff recommends approval of replacing the southern and western dormer windows with Pella Lifestyle Aluminum-clad windows as per the submitted application.

Written by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist
Approved by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

That is very clear what Elicia stated.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Which window companies did you investigate?

Fengrong Ma: I have the list that Adam gave me. I just went through all this. The size is just too small for the aluminum clad to produce and for the double hung eventually when I call them and mostly nothing produce the size of aluminum clad and then Lowe’s has that one and then October finally found they produce a Pella window which is the style of that.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: like that one?

Fengrong Ma: This called the Lifestyle Series. It won’t look like that it will resemble the look of that. It’s the side by side double hung. It’s a twin double hung.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: So, it would be two double hung windows side by side?

Fengrong Ma: Yes

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: And how much space...

Fengrong Ma: It’s a twin actually. It’s actually built in one set but both set a double hung.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: And how many window companies did you actually look at?

Fengrong Ma: Fifteen. I went through the list I went through all of them. Because of the size, I need like a 47 by 47 and then they have 51 by 48 but not exactly the size, only this Lowes carry that and can look like whatever I needed.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Is the opening size the same as original even though you put in a different window?

Fengrong Ma: Yeah, right now it’s the same size.

Commissioner Gelfman: Okay, this need to be a closed discussion right now for the Commission.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Okay, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Gelfman: That's all right.

Commissioner Hertel: That doesn't seem right because if you look at this photo here there's no way that the opening is the same with the new windows as with the old, it doesn't...

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I don't know, the eye is deceiving with those types of things

Unidentified male Commissioners: Looks the same. There's more frame.

Commissioner Gelfman: Size of the window hasn't changed, I live around the corner from it.

Commissioner Hertel: Well, that's actually inaccurate, these are two windows. Two separate windows to one window.

Commissioner Gelfman: I see what you're saying, all right, gotcha.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: The size of the glass that is exposed has changed. But the size of the actual cut into the side of the building may not have changed.

Commissioner Hertel: Yes. Correct.

Commissioner Gelfman: I follow you now, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I hate to ask these questions but in this case, since the window proposed I think is not going to look that great, the sash between the two is super narrow and the proportions of the window are still going to be like that and look really bad like it might actually look better to change the size of the opening a little bit and put in something that is proportionally better and doesn't have a super skinny little sash both vertical and horizontal because it seems like the drawing suggests that the one proposed has incy-wincy little profiles and that's going to give you, it's not going to look as bad as this, but it's not going to give you the right mass whereas if you actually change the confirmation of the dormer window opening and put in a slightly different style, still double hung but maybe if you weren't tied to the proportions of the hole in the side of the building, maybe you could get something that proportionally looked a little better. I'm not talking about changing the proportion a lot it's just a question.

Commissioner Stalheim: Enough to get a wider division between the windows.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Yeah, or maybe you could get instead of you know like in this particular like you might be able to keep the drip cap like right now this is a really wide, this is really wide and the one that's proposed is eee, eee, eee. So maybe instead of windows that are like this long, you can get one that still has a relatively wide center post, but the openings are a little shorter or something and maybe those proportions wouldn't look as awkward as the one with the little spaghetti divisions which are going to be weird looking.

Commissioner Hertel: Hang on one second because our job is not to design this project, our job is the COA which did come before us in 2018 and you were given an approval with a remand to staff so if you knew that the product that you were looking into was not what you were given a COA for, it was your job as the homeowner to come back to us then.

Fengrong Ma: I made a mistake.

Commissioner Hertel: Yeah. So, I think we're all on the same page here. I'm not going to approve something, we talk about windows a lot here, windows are a key element of most structures, especially historic structures, so I am not going to approve this.

Commissioner Gelfman: Neither am I at this point.

Commissioner Hertel: We could sit here all night and talk about the different options but really, it's her job to bring options and the plan that she has proposed I am not in favor of.

Commissioner Deegan: So, of the fifteen different places she went to she was able to find one workable solution. It wasn't that she found fifteen solutions and just chose one for you and that end is insufficient I gather. At what point in time do we just say a window is sufficient, it is better, or does it actually have to be like the exact replica? Are we operating museums or are people living here?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I don't think we're asking for the exact replica.

Commissioner Deegan: But where is the line in the sand?

Commissioner Hertel: But the historic integrity, that is our job, is historic integrity.

Commissioner Deegan: Our job is to maintain the balance between the integrity and the livability, it's not actually just one.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I think the problem is that, and this is not her fault, she was like, my opening is this big. What commercially made window can I fit into this opening. And I'm saying we might get a way better visual end result if instead of starting with we have to work with an opening this big, we say, gee, if the opening wasn't that big, if it was a little shorter, a little wider, a little taller, whatever, then can we find a window which would give us a better mass and scale and fill the opening in a way that replicates or harmonizes and I think that it's not wrong that she started off with the like I'm stuck with these parameters because that's certainly where you'd start but it looks like it hasn't yielded a very satisfactory result so I'm just wondering if you had more latitude if all the sudden you'd have more options.

Commissioner Gelfman: Doesn't seem like the options are there, that's what we're talking about right now.

Commissioner Tiffany: What about the siding underneath, would you have to replace the siding?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Yes.

Commissioner Tiffany: That might be opening a can of worms.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: [inaudible]

Commissioner Gelfman: It's in serious need of repair.

Specialist Toering: I'm trying to pull up another photo. The north dormer window. It's one over one not that that matters, I'm trying to find a good one, I'm sorry but I'm rather certain that it's one over one. Because I think that this came up last year.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Is the other dormer a different size?

Specialist Toering: It may be smaller. This is older, the most recent street view is 2011.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: And it's dark and there is a tree.

Specialist Toering: Yeah.

Commissioner Stalheim: I guess I support Joanie's position on this because if you have slightly shorter windows from the bottom and then you make it work above, it works better in favor of the overall property because you get more distance between the sill and the actual roof, which helps with water shed. It's easy enough to replace siding with something that matches. The roof needs to be replaced anyhow, it could work. And the windows would not be that as obviously replacements because proportionately with themselves and on the façade they would be more balanced overall beyond just themselves.

Commissioner Gelfman: I understand what everybody is saying. Have any of you gone by this property and seen it?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I know that house.

Commissioner Gelfman: Okay, the siding on this house cannot be duplicated. It's like an asphalt shingle siding and there is a considerable amount of it that is not in good shape.

Commissioner Stalheim: So it's due for a repair or replacement anyhow, presumably.

Commissioner Gelfman: Presumably but it hasn't happened in a long time so to try to shorten or lengthen that window and then make the necessary adjustments to the siding itself would open up an entire other situation.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Except that the window is much more likely to be a sixty or eighty year item on the house and the siding may be there for another couple more years and then the siding will go and then like I hate to put in the wrong window because we've got ugly siding. At some point the siding is going to have to be replaced it's probably past that now so I'd hate to compromise on the window because we're stuck with ugly siding. At some point the siding will change but we would've had the wrong window. But you can put some kind of filler piece of exterior siding for instance under the window because the window has gotten shorter or something.

Commissioner Stalheim: And, if it's only a couple inches, a nice piece of flashing would not be unusual for just a little distance.

Commissioner Hertel: Are there any file pictures?

Specialist Toering: That's what I've been going through. We don't have anything on the north side; what do you want to see?

Commissioner Hertel: So I'm even curious with the front of the house because the front window on that third floor, they would have always matched so...

Specialist Toering: Do you want last year?

Commissioner Hertel: No, like as far back as you can go. The first photos of this house.

Specialist Toering: These are 2014.

Commissioner Hertel: Let's see them. They match. It's hard to see it from there but have they always gone right to the roof line or was this a larger opening or was this made a larger opening?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: It's hard to say from that picture.

Commissioner Hertel: Yeah. From the angle.

Specialist Toering: These pictures were taken because they were looking at the soffit, the roof, and the chimney. Let me see if I've got anything else.

Commissioner Gelfman: Looks like all the windows on that second floor go right up to the top.

Commissioner Stalheim: And maybe that's why they failed before the rest.

Commissioner Hertel: Maybe. Because they are sitting right there.

Commissioner Stalheim: In that case I would recommend personally that we don't cause the same situation to happen again because that is detrimental to the overall structure.

Commissioner Tiffany: No flashing.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Can we do a little more research on this and see if we can....

Commissioner Gelfman: You have to understand, this is not our job to restructure this particular or any of the COAs that come before us.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Yeah, I know, I know.

Commissioner Gelfman: If you want to work privately with her, that's another story but the way it stands right now personally I don't approve it I mean that's just my take on it.

Commissioner Annis: I'm curious if anybody has seen, window manufacturers make samples of the window units so you can understand the relationship of the frames, the glass, what the jamb conditions are. I'm not really familiar with the Pella Lifestyle series so I'd be interested in seeing a sample of that window unit to help understand how thick is that frame. These computer renderings may just be representational, so I think it's kind of hard for us to evaluate it.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: They do make a three-dimensional drawing that is way more detailed than this. It really shows profiles and really shows the dimensions of all the features. The manufacturer can get us one of those but this does not suggest that the proportions are kind of where we would like to go, this drawing.

Commissioner Gelfman: I have a question. Were any of the people that were on that list, Adam, people that make windows?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: You mean custom windows?

Commissioner Gelfman: Yes.

Commissioner Annis: I can say Marvin and most of these companies can make custom windows if presented with what they're trying to match.

Specialist Toering: I think the problem is that she was trying to match the 10" wide narrow double hung. The two windows that were there before were very small and in my understanding of the people that she spoke to and my cursory searching on aluminum clad windows is that making them that small, 10" wide, didn't seem to be something that I could find

trying to price one out online so that's why the staff report says I believe you might not be able to get them that narrow which if you can find one, she would love to find it.

Commissioner Gelfman: Well I think that it's an important situation at this point to maybe talk to Marvin or talk to Pella or one of the other companies about making those windows for that structure and to price them out.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: That is something I know about because I worked with Marvin to get windows made with the right profiles for one of my projects.

Commissioner Tiffany: In aluminum?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I don't know, I wasn't asking about aluminum, I was asking about wood.

Commissioner Annis: They do aluminum clad wood. I've worked on several larger commercial projects and they can match almost anything you want to do it's just a matter of having that conversation with them and having an idea of what you're trying to accomplish, so I think it would be possible to.

Specialist Toering: That was my position before as well.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: They did make me last year, Marvin made me windows that were not quite right but in this case I think you don't have to match the profiles of the larger windows in the house because if you look at the dining room window with the lattice work in it, if you look at the picture of the original window in the attic and the original window on the dining room you can kind of imagine that you could replace the windows in the attic dormers with something that wasn't quite as tall but in keeping with the proportions of something not exactly as the dining room window but a little different and it would still harmonize like I can just imagine that there is a way to find harmony there and they may have something if you ask that if you aren't stuck with that size opening that it would be better than the one that is suggested.

Commissioner Gelfman: Does anyone have anything else they want to add before we take a vote on this COA?

Commissioner Hertel: Can I ask her a question?

Commissioner Gelfman: Yes.

Commissioner Hertel: So, there are three options ahead of us here, we could approve this, we could deny it, or we could offer you a continuance and if we offered a continuance, it would allow you an opportunity to get some more quotes maybe look at an adjustment of the window size and maybe find a better option.

Fengrong Ma: I been really trying very hard and also I do something changing this window this the attic, how about the rest of the windows, do I have to match this window and because it would be an issue for this condition house, I bought in 2017 and I didn't know this is historical building and I already put way more money in it and then the budget also an issue.

Commissioner Hertel: So I'm just offering you another option because you've heard our discussion and kind of where we sit with this.

Fengrong Ma: And then this one I was so excited I actually came produce something that mostly resemble what has there and there drawing may not be the same. I can go get a 3D whatever drawing would be more better looking that will show the structure of this window but this is kind of a higher line for their product it should be more good looking that what the picture shows.

Commissioner Deegan: I would agree with that in the sense that I had a COA pass through on just an administrative recommendation with this same line in historic East Wayne and I can guarantee you that the Lowe's rendering is not something that you will want to use as an actual indication of what the window will look like in place either dimensionally or proportionally. Miss Ma I'm curious did you when you were consulting with the various manufacturers ask about specific custom builds?

Fengrong Ma: Yeah, because it has to be. It's actually not pre-made, rather special order.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: So did you show them this picture?

Fengrong Ma: Just like most the renderings because the aluminum-clad just most of them no we don't produce that.

Commissioner Gelfman: Did you show them a picture of these windows?

Fengrong Ma: Yeah I did, we showed them the picture and we decide accordingly trying to match what this looks like.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Because this is what concerns us, this profile right here and this profile right here and this because the one, the drawing may be horrible but the one that you brought us is not even close to this.

Fengrong Ma: I can go back and ask them to give a more accurate picture. And also, I didn't have the two at least the two will match I don't have this double side by side hung windows on the other side of the building so they match.

Commissioner Gelfman: Two out of three dormers match and so it indicates to me that the other one was replaced a long time ago probably. Yes. The other thing is that you're a realtor and you should know about these neighborhoods.

Fengrong Ma: That is before I was licensed.

Commissioner Gelfman: It doesn't matter because your bio tells me that you are a neighborhood specialist and you're familiar with local communities and home values and price trends, I have it right in front of me so it lends me to wonder, you bought this home, you did not do your homework on whether or not this was a historic district or you did know and thought that you could do it anyway.

Fengrong Ma: I didn't know at all, that was before I was licensed. I bought in 2016 and didn't even start my license application at that time.

Commissioner Deegan: It was before...

Fengrong Ma: It was a really bad investment, that's my first investment here, that was a really bad.

Commissioner Gelfman: I wouldn't say it was a bad investment. You know you invest in things that you want to make better and in neighborhoods you want to make better.

Fengrong Ma: I did but because of when I go there the roof was leaking and then nothing works so I put so much work on that then the plumbing because the house was vacant for several years before that was on market.

Commissioner Gelfman: Right, I'm aware of that.

Fengrong Ma: It was really bad.

Commissioner Hertel: So, this is what the Pella Lifestyle wood windows look like and I think my biggest concern would be how thin.

Commissioner Deegan: Yeah but see look, there's a rather thicker interior. Again these are, we're looking at shotty nonspecific web pictures.

Commissioner Hertel: I agree, I don't feel like I have enough information really even to approve. Typically, I would say I would remand this to staff with more information however, we tried that last year and we offered you a remand and you failed to come through with it so I'm hesitant to offer that again.

Commissioner Gelfman: A retroactive COA is not what this was about. We expected you to come with a different option and you went ahead and put that window in without a COA.

Fengrong Ma: My manager did that while I was on vacation and then bees got into the attic. Even the attic is not a resting area, it was only for storage but the bees start to get in there so we were worried about the tenants health so he did that himself. He just go there and got the window from somewhere, Menard's probably, and then that's a vinyl window. When I come back I know that I got an issue and I happened to be out of town at that time.

Commissioner Gelfman: It's your house.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I'm really confident that if we went to staff that we would get a better result than we have now.

Commissioner Hertel: The problem is that last year when she came before us, we offered her the remand to staff but she didn't come back into the office and that is how we ended up in the position we're in now.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Right, but I'm pretty confident that wouldn't happen again, would it?

Commissioner Hertel: You have to go by what people display and what they do.

Commissioner Deegan: She'll still be back for another window approval and the only thing you are doing is incurring for her additional \$20 charge for the procedure.

Commissioner Gelfman: No, with a continuance we don't charge.

Commissioner Deegan: That's right but if you didn't approve it, I guess I thought that you weren't thinking about a continuance, I understand now, my fault.

Commissioner Gelfman: Is there any further discussion? Could I have a motion please. Can I have a motion please.

Commissioner Annis made a motion to continue COA #2019-1108, to the next meeting if the applicant can provide possibly some window samples or further exploration of options for general review by the Board including a rendering or window unit sample for review by the staff. Seconded by Commissioner Downs-Krostenko.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1108 passes.

Commissioner Gelfman: There will be no charge to refile but warned that retroactive COAs is not what this commission is about and we hope that it will not happen again so that if you have a project for this house we are more than willing to work with you and so is the staff but we need you to cooperate with the rules and regulations and the standards and guidelines that are set forth. Thank you.

2. 619 Cushing #2019-1023A #8142-90 Local
Landmark
Representation: N/A

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

Date: November 13, 2019

Application Number: 2019-1023A

Property Location: 617-619 North Cushing

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Gabled-ell/Stick / 1892

Property Owner: Dito's Investments, LLC

Landmark or District Designation: Local Landmark, Ordinance #8142-90

Rating: *Outstanding*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: Local Landmark “Group B”

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

A. Maintenance

The maintenance of any historical structure or site shall in no way involve any direct physical change except for the general cleaning and upkeep of the landmark. The Commission shall encourage the proper maintenance of all structures 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 the 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 public safety, and demolition is the only alternative, documentation by way of photographs, measured drawings, or other descriptive methods should be made of both the exterior and interior of the landmark. The person or agency responsible for demolition of the landmark shall be responsible for this documentation.

E. Moving

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

F. Signs

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

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

1. Required

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

2. Recommended

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

3. Prohibited

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff supports the removal of the secondary doors. However, staff would prefer:

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

Prepared and recommended by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

Approved by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

Administrator Feasel makes the announcement that the COA has been withdrawn by the applicant.

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to accept the owners withdrawn COA. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to accept the withdrawal of COA #2019-1023A is passed.

**3. 504 E LaSalle #2019-1203 #7591-1986 Local
Landmark, National Register East Bank Multiple Property Listing
Representation: N/A**

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

Date: December 3, 2019

Application Number: 2019-1203

Property Location: 504 E LaSalle

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Italianate/Neoclassical/ 1900/1924/ J.C. Lauber Company

Property Owner: Greater Lowell Holdings, LLC

Landmark or District Designation: Historic Landmark (Ordinance #7591-1986); National Register East Bank Multiple Property Listing

Rating: *Contributing*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: The J.C. Lauber Company building is described in the National Register listing as a unique example of the Commercial-Functional style of architecture that combines utility with ornament. The structure is comprised of several additions with the primary LaSalle Street facing constructed as a one-story, rectangular-plan, commercial building with a foundation of concrete and rubble, walls are brick and block. A metal cornice stretches seventy feet across the façade. Roof is flat. LaSalle Street façade features modillions on ends of dentilled cornice with scroll end brackets. The front elevation has a strong horizontal emphasis. Windows are divided into nine bays and are wood framed, fixed plate glass with solid transoms above. Front entrance is a wood double door with glass. The 1924 addition, directly behind the 1900 building, is a one-story, rectangular-plan, constructed of concrete block, with a flat roof. Windows are metal with multi-panels. The rear of the building is organized by multiple additions and incorporate various garage doors. Signage exists on all sides, both attached to and painted directly on the structure, reflecting different eras of the former J.C. Lauber business.

ALTERATIONS: COA 2005-1031 approved demolition of portion of building constructed in 1882 at northwest corner of LaSalle and Niles. COA 2006-0413 approved reinstallation of J.C. Lauber Sheet Metal sign, formerly on west side of 1882 portion of building. COA 2016-1128 to demolish 5,000 sq. ft. building was not executed. COA 2018-0404A approved improvements to the entire structure including restoration of the primary façade, new fenced (retroactive) patio, new openings, two new cooler structures, and preservation of existing legacy signs. COA 2018-0613 approved additional alterations to openings. COA 2019-0329A approved application of window treatments to existing windows.

APPLICATION ITEMS: “Receive permit for existing fence and pergola”

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness for changes to the landmark:

1. Install new 51’ x 54’ fence to enclose rear lot, creating an outdoor recreational patio. Fence matches previously approved fence at the patio on the northwest corner of building and is of ornamental black aluminum material. 17’ sliding gate opens along Niles. Two 5’ gates open at rear/south parking area.
2. Construct new 24’ x 32’ steel frame pergola with wood top deck within newly fenced outdoor recreational patio. Steel is painted to match color scheme on building.

The application items are compatible with the historic character of the site and neighborhood and share proportions, materials, and ratios of the existing structure and site.

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES, GROUP B:

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

A. Maintenance

The maintenance of any historical structure or site shall in no way involve any direct physical change except for the general cleaning and upkeep of the landmark. The Commission shall encourage the proper maintenance of all structures 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 the 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 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 with the historic character of the site and neighborhood and inconspicuous when viewed from a public way.

2. Recommended

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

3. Prohibited

No changes may be made to the appearance of the site by removing major landscaping items, trees, fencing, walkways, outbuildings, and other elements before evaluating their importance to the property's history and development. Front yard areas shall not be transformed into parking lots nor paved nor blacktopped. The installation

of unsightly devices such as TV reception dishes and solar collectors shall not be permitted in areas where they can be viewed from public thoroughfares.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval.

Prepared by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

N/A

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Concern for retroactive review was expressed. Questions arose regarding fence and pergola.

Staff requested a continuance due to short notice of public hearing to the property owner.

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to continue COA #2019-1203 to next month's meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Stalheim.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to continue COA #2019-1203 is passed.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

N/A

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

i. October 21st, 2019

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to adopt the October minutes.
Seconded by Commissioner Stalheim.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to accept the October 21st minutes passes.

ii. November 18th, 2019

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to adopt the November minutes.
Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to accept the November 18th minutes passes.

B. STAFF REPORTS

i. Administrative Approvals

1. 1031 E Jefferson / 123 S Eddy – discussion regarding the multiple addresses for this property.

2. 713 West LaSalle Avenue – Historic Plaque installation. Background on Bernhard Neitzel.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets

1. A Resolution and list will be presented to the Board of Public Works Thursday, December 19th.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2020 HPC officer elections

i. Treasurer

Commissioner Brazinsky volunteered for the Treasurer vacancy. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to appoint Commissioner Brazinsky as the Commission Treasurer is approved.

ii. Slate of Commission Officers

Commissioner Hertel made a motion that we continue the slate of officers. Seconded by Commissioner Downs-Krostenko.

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Motion to continue the current slate of officers is approved.

iii. Commissioner Hertel requested that the By-Laws be sent to all Commissioners.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. 2020 HPC meeting dates. All are the third Monday of the month with the exception of January which will be on the third Tuesday due to the Dr. King holiday. All meetings are at 5:30 pm in the BPW Conference room.

B. 2020 Preserving Historic Places Conference in South Bend

i. Update from the conference planner meeting.

ii. Local mailing list will be sent to Indiana Landmarks who will mail a save the date postcard.

iii. More opportunities to be involved will be available closer to the event.

iv. Scholarships are expected to be available.

v. Discussion of local speakers.

C. Commission Meeting Discussion

Commissioner Stalheim inquired about the increased number of continued projects in the last few months and is wondering if there is something that we or staff or someone can do to help improve applications so that they have a better understanding of both design intent and approach to design, material understanding and that kind of thing before they come to us and then we have this big debate about it and this tug of war like we had today and is there something we can do to help lessen that before meetings.

Commissioner Gelfman: If someone is not showing up for a meeting, they should not be on the agenda.

Commissioner Hertel: Today was a little bit different since their application was late, it should not have been on the agenda. We have a deadline for a reason, and we must remain consistent with all applicants so if you do not meet that deadline, you should not be on the agenda.

Commissioner Stalheim: Also talking about the first applicant. Feels like the applicant could have been better prepared somewhat for the types of things that we're looking for. And/or been better prepared with the broader breadth of information to have a better discussion.

Commissioner Deegan: Do you feel like there needs to be a better quality look over before the files come to us. This is only my second meeting, but it is not difficult to guess the kinds of questions that come up. Would it be better if those people were prepped and those dockets were comprehensive in a way?

Commissioner Hertel: They bring the applications to Adam and Elicia and Adam and Elicia have been doing this long enough that they offer the appropriate information to them, whether the applicant takes that advice or not, you guys to a great job and you are consistently doing a good job.

Administrator Feasel: Because of staff working with applicants, there are many things that we are able to get off of your agenda because they then comply. There are so many Administrative Approvals because those applications fit the mold. The Commission is more of an appeals board at this point, getting the tough applications and retroactive makes it extremely difficult.

Specialist Toering: The packet for the first project hopefully shows that I have gone out of my way to try to help that person over and over again and at this point am very frustrated and I am sorry.

Commissioner Gelfman: You have nothing to be sorry about.

Commissioner Stalheim: I was just inquiring in the broad...

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I feel like a picture says a thousand words. I've gone around town with people and my guys, it used to be that we had liaisons in the neighborhood and I would go walk down the sidewalk and be like see that window right there that's totally wrong and people would go okay it's a window I don't know why it's totally wrong and then turn your head and see that window that is totally right and they would go oh because really honestly you can tell with the applicant today that to her a window is just a window so we were talking about proportion and scale and the width of the sashes and all that and she was like she never ever thought any of that or she wouldn't have put in the window she put in in the first place. I feel like some basic things about where we stand might be super great online with basic things like I've seen so many doors somebody is like it's a door it has a window in it and your like that's the end of the kind of yes we wanted a door with a window and you could easily be like here's ten doors that are new that are likely to be approved in these kinds of houses like here's a Colonial door, here's a Craftsman door, here's a Queen Anne door or whatever even four doors would do it and then get rid of the ugly Menard's door with the big oval with the fake glass like a big red X through it and I mean I feel like with the windows like four pictures I mean like good window/bad window. I think a lot of people are just not used to thinking at all about any of that would at least go oh and like kind of tune up their brain a little bit so they're not inclined to make these kind of like needed to buy window/is window checkbox.

Commissioner Stalheim: At least a clear understanding that there are types or a variety of window types, typology of windows.

Commissioner Deegan: What are you suggesting towards your question, that's what I'd like to know? I mean these are all real things.

Commissioner Stalheim: I pose it as something we should discuss because this is a recurring thing that I feel like we could have a better education related thing whether it's in our standards and guidelines or somewhere that helps owners who are directed to or otherwise.

Commissioner Gelfman: This is what Todd is working on as well and he was talking earlier this year that he was talking about things that are acceptable and things that are not. Now is he still planning on doing that, I hope so.

Commissioner Hertel: We have to use caution with that though because it was brought up tonight with nine different areas we may accept one thing in one area and not in another.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Like I can imagine that like we don't want to put this on Elicia and Adam because they have so much work to do. We could start something information where we're like here's two kinds of do you have a Craftsman style house? Here's two kinds of doors that are in the vein of what we would be probably looking for, right, and then like make a big red X through four other kinds that would not be or whatever. Do you have a Colonial house? And even if your particular question to HPC is not about say doors you might go oh and sort of be like I see there are issues of conformity which I was blank to. Its just a little bit of our historical architectural research that we introduce them to because I feel like one of the problems is what I've noticed is that people are literally like god smacked by it matters what the window looks like and they are not used to like, you know every time I drive by the LaSalle Hotel and I look at the Hoffman right next door I think this should be a poster. Like the windows when we asked historic preservationists what they should look like which will probably last 160 years and have like improved the property values and are gorgeous the windows are literally like someone who had the architectural training of a garden snail pitch the complete everything is wrong about them, every single thing and they totally blow the building and again we'll have to look at those for sixty years until someone rips them all out and maybe we'll have a second chance at getting them right and I feel like most people drive by those buildings their entire life and they never notice that one set is absolutely 100% right and one set is absolutely 100% wrong and just like two or three examples that like popped up if you went to like COA and it was like this is the kind of thing we're talking about might tune people up enough so they're like oh just a second like I might need a finer eye, I might need somebody else with a finer eye, I might need to be a little bit humble about this process because apparently any old window is not okay and I think that we're just starting in a human culture position where people are like whoa I had no idea.

Commissioner Gelfman: I think you're assuming that the general populous of the districts and I might be entirely wrong, but I know from my district for sure how many of those people actually went on the internet and looked at the standards and guidelines for the neighborhood. I would say maybe 20% and that is very generous so when we tell people look, we have this on there for a guide so you can look at it, they're going to go to Menard's.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: When they go to COA and they click on it to get the downloadable form maybe this is again something you guys probably wouldn't do but it would be great if there was a pop-up menu that was like before you do this look at two examples.

Commissioner Stalheim: And then also shouldn't allow you to submit it until every box is checked for whatever you are applying for.

Commissioner Hertel: Adam and Elicia do a great job of guiding these people to what is the appropriate material to be using in their structure, so the problem is that people aren't listening so Adam and Elicia are already doing what you're saying in a more personal way.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Elicia could be talking and of course I'm hanging on every golden word but someone else might be hearing the Charlie Brown teacher, wah wah wah wah, windows. I guess because I'm the old historical professor and I'm just like the old fashioned people and you're like one is not like the other and even for people who visually have trouble and are like oh yeah they are not and I've seen kids in class be like wow who like the light goes

on and I just feel like when we talk to people they're not there and maybe a little visual aid would help. At least with attitude, soften up the attitude so they'll be like okay I guess I need to be thinking a little more.

Commissioner Gelfman: And all of you will have to excuse me that I was very curt with her because she knew better.

Commissioner Stalheim: No, I think that it was fair.

Commissioner Gelfman: And I'm going to do that with anyone who comes before us with retroactive COAs because it has gotten out of control and you guys that are new, and everyone who is new, well you've seen it happen a thousand times.

Commissioner Deegan: I feel like it's good to reject it where it doesn't fit, that part I completely concur. I don't think our role is to be didactic for the sake of didacticism. The woman was not in good shape anyway and I don't think you've added any element that will edify her like she's going to come back and the only thing that you did was like maybe perhaps had a moment where something got off your chest but was it a wholesome situation no and then the time before like I'd rather we stick to the business.

Commissioner Gelfman: You know what though, you have to understand that from the aspect of this specific commission that we have put up with so many unreasonable retroactives and I'm not talking about people that don't understand, she understood, she's a realtor.

Commissioner Hertel: She's been here before.

Commissioner Gelfman: She's been here before, she knew the situation.

Commissioner Deegan: You'll save everybody time because it comes to the same conclusion, just go to the conclusion.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: The human culture piece is there. There are people who get away with stuff and then its out there and people know and so I see people in the neighborhood trying stuff and then play a little dumb and sometimes they get away with it.

Specialist Toering: So, I'm going to bring this up, going to your visual aid, this is the new Zoning ordinance and again it doesn't directly correlate to us because it has to do with zoning or whether a building can be built on a lot or not but one of their purposes as Elicia mentioned earlier is to make it visually digestible where you can see it and say oh I can't build this close to the property line, it can't be two stories, or the garage can't be taller than the house, things like that.

Commissioner Stalheim: Compared to every other zoning ordinance these are a great visual, they are on point.

Specialist Toering: We can celebrate it. For something like this I would love to have more visuals, but we have to be careful because there are a lot of nuances in our historic districts and architectural styles so getting it right for each one will be complicated. The other thing I wanted to say and this is trying to get it to a high note is that two weeks ago I was driving down East Wayne Street and I saw a mason who I've been working with a property owner on with this particular mason for a front porch and I saw the property owners out front and so I stopped to talk with them and ended up talking with them for the next hour and twenty minutes or so and I was finally in a good place to come to work that morning because they had been restoring all of their windows themselves and are doing an immaculate and beautiful job and they were doing it because they felt it was the right thing to do. Now we don't have to evangelize them because they get it, we've already got them. Now it's their neighbors, it's the next person down the street that is the struggle for us, so I like to celebrate when I have those people because they make my job easier when they're checking all the boxes.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: And again, it's the culture, they should be celebrated. Their neighborhoods should know that these people are on our A+ list and they are doing great work, I mean those kinds of things have value.

Commissioner Hertel: We had talked about a newsletter, didn't we, about a quarterly newsletter?

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: It would be something we would have to do because poor Elicia and Adam have enough to do.

Commissioner Hertel: But I think that was something that was brought up. We did talk about it.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Even an annual one, celebrating however many people in town came through here and we were like thank you, you're great, love it with just a little blurb and picture of their house.

Commissioner Stalheim: A mini case study.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Well especially because we have so much bad press, because everybody thinks of us as the scolders and the nitpickers so if we're out there saying you know what...

Commissioner Hertel: Hey look at the Johnson's, they just put all these new wood windows in.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Also, like I don't know what the portion of people who are like A+ annually but maybe it's like a third of the people or something and I feel like it would be important for people to know that like I feel like they think all we do is reject and nitpick and they don't realize that there are people who come in here with an A+ project totally on the ball get it we are like smiling our heads off at them and they go off and do good work in our community and add value to our neighborhoods and I think like I said the people who aren't like visually trained drive by their houses and don't see them just like they drive by a house with the wrong windows and don't see them.

Commissioner Annis: I know the City of Mishawaka Preservation Commission has yard signs and they aren't the expensive yard signs, they are like the Mayor Pete yard signs so one thing that we could consider could be that if we see an exemplary project, can we not have a little yard sign. Maybe there is a type of yard sign that we could say this is an A+ project.

Commissioner Deegan: And then that shows to the other neighbors one you get that people have to go through the process because that's the problem is that people don't know and by the time they get here it's just unpleasant.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Right, so I love that idea. Maybe we could even do an I don't know education to the city, do a research I would tap somebody to find out what is the minimum order for yard signs, can we ask the city for whatever it is for a hundred or whatever and if you come in here we can have them behind the chair and if we're starting to feel the vibe we can take a vote and be like we love you.

Administrator Feasel: Okay, I'm going to recommend putting your money where your mouth is and to take all your great ideas and do it.

Commissioner Hertel: The only thing I would caution you is we have a project where she was approved, last year when she came before us, then there was no follow through on her end so as long as there's follow through perfect.

Commissioner Annis: Maybe Historic Preservation month, May.

Commissioner Gelfman: Great ideas, so if anyone wants to run with those, please feel free to do so.

Administrator Feasel: There is no email listserv that would reach all property owners so if there is a newsletter, we could mail it. You could form as a committee that could meet and do these things. I would welcome that, often our day to day

duties are bureaucracy, and we are doing this. I love the positive things, but you aren't really hearing about them except for here and there.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: I would be willing to look into the yard sign thing.

Commissioner Gelfman: Is there anyone who would like to take on an annual newsletter for historic districts. Don't everyone jump at once.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Don't they all have listservs so if we produce material, we can just post it to that listserv.

Commissioner Gelfman: We don't have it.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Don't most of the districts have listservs?

Administrator Feasel: Former social media. That doesn't necessarily reach everybody. We sent out a brochure two years ago to everybody.

Commissioner Brazinsky: The City uses nextdoor.com. For your neighborhood it tells you everything going on in your neighborhood.

Commissioner Downs-Krostenko: Between listservs, Facebook pages, and nextdoor.com we can at least get to some people.

Commissioner Gelfman: Since we just threw all this out, let's think about it to the next meeting and then everyone can give it more weight. We'll put it on the agenda for January's meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

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

Nine in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 9 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 7:09 pm.

Attest:


Sarah Ponder, Secretary


Date