

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

August 19th, 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:

Brendan Crumlish, 3215 Sugar Maple Road, South Bend
Kurt Garner, 12954 6th Road, Plymouth, IN 46563
Donna Gruber, 17925 Andrew Drive, South Bend
Thomas Gruber, 17925 Andrew Drive, South Bend
Jonathan Mooney, 108 N Main St, South Bend
Matthew Moyers, 301 S St Louis, South Bend
Jim Nowicki, 1133 E Wayne Street South, South Bend
Phil St. Clair, 1316 Hampshire Drive, South Bend
Kyle Silveus, 227 W Jefferson, South Bend

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Michele Gelfman, President; Elizabeth Hertel, Vice President; Sarah Ponder, Secretary; Lesley Annis, Assistant Secretary; Mary Brazinsky.

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. 629 Carroll #2019-0703A continued #8952-98 Taylor's Field
Local Historic District**
Representation: Brenden Crumlish, 3215 Sugar Maple Drive, South Bend
Kurt Garner, 12954 6th Road, Plymouth, IN 46563
Phil St. Clair, 1316 Hampshire Drive, South Bend

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

Date: July 3, 2019
Application Number: 2019-0703A continued
Property Location: 629 Carroll
Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Neo-Classical/1924
Property Owner: David Steinberg/Bingo Properties LLC
Landmark or District Designation: Taylors Field, Ordinance #8952-98
Rating: Contributing

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: Three story, rectangular plan, brick apartment building. Foundation is concrete. Roof is flat with parapet wall. A central bay in front features an arched entrance with divided light transom above and a balcony window with metal rail. Above the balcony is an entablature with “Carroll” cast in concrete. Windows are 6/1 and 1/1 double hung, both original wood and multiple generations of wood and vinyl replacement. The lot is slightly elevated with a concrete retaining wall.

ALTERATIONS: No COA on file. Some windows are replacement wood or vinyl. Entry doors are non-original metal.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *“The 23-unit brick apartment building is currently vacant. Exterior work includes replacement of all original 6/1 and 4/1 wood windows, and 1/1 replacement windows with vinyl replacement windows with muntins between the glass, insulated 6/1 and 4/1 windows. Opening sizes will be approximately 2” smaller, and front transoms shall be covered with storm units (fan lite, second floor). Front and back entries (non-historic metal and wood infill) shall be replaced with steel panel style doors with top lites and matching side lites. New electric meters (30) shall be placed on north wall of c. 1960 block addition (north façade) and bathroom vents shall be place[d] through the masonry wall for each apartment unity (28). See drawings.”*

“Update for the proposed window project at Carroll Apartments

The owner proposes the installation of Pella Lifestyle Simulated Divided Light windows, which is a wood (interior) and aluminum-clad product for all windows previously marked for replacement on the plans submitted with vinyl windows with between-the-glass grilles.

Through the architect’s office, the owner investigated costs of restoring existing wood windows and installation of matching wood windows where prior replacements had been made. The unit cost of wood/restored windows was \$1800.00. The unit cost of the proposed Pella windows is \$711.00. The cost of wood/restored windows would be a financial burden on the property owner totaling \$324,850.00 (quote from Werntz for 180 windows), and would prohibit the project from moving forward.

The Pella product, which will allow a color-match to the entry units approved at the HPC July 2019 meeting, also provides for a full replacement within the masonry openings rather than the vinyl unit that would snap over existing wood framing and decrease the daylight opening. The windows will be installed at the existing jamb/sill joint, so no exterior change in depth of the window unit will be noticed. Interior walls will be furred out for installation, so carpentry work inside the building to extend the interior sills will need to be undertaken, but does not affect exterior appearance. While color selection is not firm, either a standard color of Colonial Red (similar to existing) or one in hues of the brick is planned.”

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following exterior work:

1. Replace windows:

The Carroll Apartment Building retains a number of its original of its 6/1 and 4/1 wood windows, however, they vary in condition and deterioration. This is most evident by the number of full-replacements that have been made over the years. Approximately 43 windows are later wood or vinyl replacement windows, or about one-third of the overall window count. Several other original wood windows have broken sash members and are boarded over as the building sits vacant.

The application contends that replacement windows throughout the building will greatly improve energy efficiency, safety/security, and provide a uniform appearance that the building has not had since it was first constructed in the 1920s. The muntin patterns of 4/1 and 6/1 will also be maintained, or in the case of where windows have already been replaced, be recreated and appear more historical than the existing replacements.

While the sashes are not deteriorated beyond repair, the jambs and sills are in some instances. ~~Staff recommends that the owner engage a window restoration professional to determine the condition of the original windows and the feasibility for repair.~~

~~The proposed windows are Window World 4000 Series vinyl double hung windows with muntin pattern to be replicated using grids in between the glass.~~

The proposed Pella aluminum-clad simulated divided light windows will resemble the original and not alter the scale or proportion of the building. The windows will help the building to achieve an overall cohesive look.

~~2. Replace doors:~~

~~Existing doors are non-original replacement. New steel panel doors and sidelites will provide a more historically-accurate appearance to the building entries and will be more secure. Note no historic photos of the building have been located, so the door designs are based on security and sympathetic to early 20th century design.~~

Carroll Street Doors:

Pella Clad Wood 36" X 80" Entry Door, Frame Size: 38 1/4 X 81 7/16

Panel Style: Craftsman Light
Glass: Tempered Low-E Air Filled
Grilles: Simulated Divided Light, 1 5/8" Contour, Match Interior Panel Finish, Match Exterior Panel Finish, Traditional, Typical, 3, 1
Panel Selection: Hemlock, Painted, Putty, Painted, White
Frame Selection: Clad, Pine, Oak Threshold, No Panel Reinforcement, Standard Enduraclad, Putty, Wood, White

Door Sidelites

Pella 1280 Fixed Entry Door Sidelight (2), Frame Size: 14 1/4 X 81 7/16
Panel Style: Craftsman Light
Glass: Tempered Low-E Air Filled
Grilles: No Grille
Panel Selection: Hemlock, Painted, Putty, Painted, White
Frame Selection: Clad, Pine, Oak Threshold, No Panel Reinforcement, Standard Enduraclad, Putty, Wood, White

3. Install vents through façade:
Thru wall bathroom vents, see elevation, will be painted sheet metal units, approximately 6" square, similar to those on the brick façade of the historic LaSalle Hotel in downtown South Bend, see picture.
4. Install electric meters:
30 new meters to be placed on north wall of c. 1960 block addition (north façade).

PRESERVATION INSPECTOR REPORT:

First, I wish to provide some background for this property.
July 5, 2018 – Code hearing multiple apartments were ordered Vacate and Seal due to failure to complete necessary repairs.
February 5, 2019 – Code issues a Vacate and Seal on the entire property as the heating system has failed and the city deemed it unsafe without heat.
February 7, 2019 – Code Hearing all occupants have been removed, new owners are working to replace HVAC system, remove trash, and remove loose building material.
May 5, 2019 – I called Homeworks Property Management about a set of windows on the south side that were removed in order to install a garbage [chute] from the third to the dumpster. I received a call back from Homeworks, a gentleman named Troy from a window manufacturer, and from Mr. St. Clair who is the owner's local representative. I explained the COA process to each of them and tried to guide them on the next steps.
July 3, 2019 – An application was received by the HPC staff for windows and miscellaneous other work.

July 9, 2019, I met with the owner's representative, Mr. St. Clair at 629 Carroll. This 28-unit apartment building is located within the Taylor's Field Local Historic District. I photographed the exterior of the structure, each window on all three floors, and the skylights.

38 non-original wood and vinyl windows exist. All original windows had multi-pane upper sashes.

I did not find any sashes that were deteriorated beyond repair. However, the main concerns with these windows are the jambs and sills. The weight pockets are flat trim construction with the "sides" being used as the interior stop. The play in the sashes is quite severe and without the addition of an additional interior stop on each side and top, I do not see a feasible solution for the air gap. I did not find a single set of windows that completely had ropes as most lower sashes were without.

Secondly, the majority of the sills are dry-rotted or deteriorated beyond repair. Especially those closest to the northwest corner. At least a dozen of the sills are soft enough to put my finger into.

I would ask that a clear plan on how replacements would be installed be presented. At the front of the building a bank of three windows were replaced. The original jambs were removed and the new windows were installed with a minor setback from the brick face rather than centered in the frame. This left an interior "shelf" to compensate for the distance from exterior to interior walls. See photograph #106. I fear that a centered installation would leave too much of the limestone sill exposed and result in water infiltration through the walls.

Steve Szaday
Preservation Inspector

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES: TAYLOR'S FIELD

**II. EXISTING STRUCTURES
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 additional siding has been applied window trim has been covered. Many structures in the district have aluminum storm windows. Some houses retain wood framed 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 frame storm windows and doors painted to match the original should be used but should not damage existing frames and should be removable. **If new sashes or doors are installed, the existing or original materials, design, and hardware should be used.** When metal storm doors and windows 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 re-used 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 the 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.

E. MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

~~The majority of the structures within the District have oil or gas heat, and have brick chimneys through the roof. Some houses have one or two window air conditioners.~~

Required

~~Mechanical systems shall be placed in areas that will result in the least possible alteration to the structural integrity and physical appearance of the building. Solar collectors and TV dishes shall be placed at the rear of the property and shielded by shrubbery and landscaping.~~

Recommended

~~Windows air conditioners and exhaust fans should be installed at the rear or at an inconspicuous side window. Original lighting fixtures should be retained whenever possible.~~

Prohibited

~~Holes shall not be cut through walls or roofs to accommodate air conditioners or other mechanical equipment in areas that can be seen from the street.~~

Not Recommended

~~Exterior electrical and telephone cables should not be attached to the principal elevation of the building.~~

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that existing original windows that *are not* deteriorated beyond repair, be retained and that windows that *are* deteriorated beyond repair and that existing replacement windows be replaced with units resembling the original. As a contributing property in a historic district, and constructed of masonry, Staff does not recommend the proposed Window World 4000 Series vinyl window. Staff recommends approval to replace doors, and to install vents and electric meters.

Staff recommends approval of the continued application item.

Report compiled by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

N/A

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hertel expressed thanks to the applicant for doing additional research on the pricing. Commissioner Ponder asked for clarification regarding the windows, and whether any of them would remain. Mr. Crumlish explained that the original windows would be removed, everything will be the new Pella windows, and that the weight pockets would need to be redone to accommodate the new windows.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: N/A

Commissioner Ponder made a motion to approve COA#2019-0703A continued, section 1 “Windows” as applied. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0703A continued, section 1, “Windows” is passed.

**2. 819 Park #2019-0805 #9574-05 Chapin Park Local
and National Register of Historic Places
Representation: Donna Gruber, 17925 Andrew Drive, South Bend
Thomas Gruber, 17925 Andrew Drive, South Bend**

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

Date: August 13, 2019

Application Number: 2019-0805

Property Location: 819 Park Avenue

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: “Calvert House” Gabled-T / Spindework / 1890

Property Owner: Jim and Tracy Hickey

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

Rating: *Outstanding*

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/SITE: Two story Gabled-T (irregular plan) on a brick foundation. A central brick chimney punctuates the asphalt-shingled cross-gabled roof that has molded cornice rake. A flat dormer is at the rear. The walls are wood clapboard with fish-scale and chisel shingles in the front gables. The street-facing façade has a full-width front porch with spindle columns and balustrade, as well as a gable over the entrance with shingles. The windows are one-over-one double-hung; the second-story windows have a bracketed projecting entablature with dentils.

ALTERATIONS: The full-length rear addition is rumored to be a later addition, but the 1899 Sanborn map shows the house in the current configuration. The 1932 Assessor Card indicates that the property was remodeled in 1907 and 1921, and that the property was listed as a ‘Duplex residence’. At some point a stairwell was added to access the second story (when the structure was subdivided into multiple units). The rear garage was constructed sometime prior to 1917.

APPLICATION ITEMS: *“Replace window at back of house with French Door in order to have direct entrance and exit to and from backyard. Placement of door is in part of house that was an earlier addition and not original to the house. Door is facing 1 car garage and cannot be seen from alley.”*

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

1. Remove a one-over-one window at the rear of the structure,
2. Install Andersen 400 Series FWH6068 patio doors,
 - a. Vinyl covered exterior,
 - b. 6’0” W x 6’8” H
3. Install steps to newly installed back entrance
 - a. Applicant was encouraged to consider a wooden stepped option, as it is an interim solution.

The rear addition does not exhibit the same ‘original’ windows as the remainder of the house. The rear of the property is private and enclosed, and not visible from the alley. To enter the back yard, the resident must exit the front of the structure and walk around the side of the house (or go upstairs and exit down the rear stair well). The applicant desires to create access directly from the house to the rear yard.

Andersen patio doors are available in four product lines (arranged from most inexpensive to most expensive): 200 Series, 400 Series Frenchwood, A-Series, and E-Series. The applicant selected the 400 Series Frenchwood, which is a vinyl-clad wood door. Staff would prefer to see an aluminum-clad patio door selected in lieu of the 400 Series Frenchwood.

The applicant indicated that there is interest and desire to construct a rear patio / porch (connecting the existing stairwell access to the new proposed entrance), but that the current application is for a temporary stair access. The applicant expressed interest in returning to the Commission with plans for a new patio in subsequent years once funding was secured for that project.

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

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.

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, with the condition that final product selection of the proposed door be remanded to staff, as well as final design of the 'temporary' steps.

Prepared by
Adam Toering
Historic Preservation Specialist

Recommendation by
Elicia Feasel
Historic Preservation Administrator

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Ms. Gruber requested clarification as to what “recommends approval with conditions” means.

Commissioner Gelfman explained that the Commission can make an approval where they remand specific final details to the Staff of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ms. Gruber asked why there was staff concern regarding the door selection.

Specialist Toering explained that the applicant supplied multiple door options, that the preferred door was a wood door clad in vinyl, and that the Commission has avoided approving vinyl-clad doors in favor of other options. The specific vinyl-clad door is more expensive than an aluminum-clad option by the same manufacturer. The same manufacturer also has a more expensive aluminum-clad door option. Staff has no opinion on either of those available alternatives. Additionally, Staff was concerned as to the construction of the steps for the rear entrance, as the applicant has expressed that they would like to reconstruct the entirety of the back porch but are unable to do so at this time. Multiple proposed options for steps were put forth.

Ms. Gruber asked for clarification on the construction of the door that her daughter had put forth, as she had thought it was a wood door.

Specialist Toering explained that the door as selected by the applicant is a wood door that is clad in vinyl, and that the Commission does not typically look favorably upon doors of that construction.

Commissioner Gelfman explained that vinyl doors are subject to buckle, they don’t last as long, and that the rating of this house is *outstanding*, that vinyl is not an option for this structure.

Ms. Gruber expressed confusion as to what the outcome would be.

Commissioners Gelfman and Hertel explained that the Commission is here to help explain the process and guide the applicant to a solution.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if Ms. Gruber had any additional comments that she would like to add for the record.

Ms. Gruber asked for clarification that Staff had the pricing for all of the submitted doors and asked if any of the submitted doors were what the Commission would want.

Commissioner Hertel clarified that the Commission does not directly consider the price of a submitted option.

Ms. Gruber asked if the applicant would have to start over again, or if any of the submitted work would fall into the category of what is considered acceptable.

Ms. Gruber stated that the applicant had spent a considerable amount of money on the kitchen as well as the backyard, including painting and gravel. She further stated that the applicant had considered removing portions of the rear second story stairwell, as they considered it historic.

Specialist Toering explained that he confirmed that all of the supplied products were vinyl-clad wood doors. He further explained that he understood the applicant desired to extend the existing rear porch across the entirety of the rear porch, and that the steps to be installed would be temporary.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Annis explained that she did not have a problem with the installation of a double door in this location on this house, although – as was discussed – vinyl is unacceptable, and was fine with moving forward with an aluminum-clad product.

Commissioner Brazinsky confirmed the same sentiment.

Commissioner Hertel stated that she would be in favor of – instead of continuing the project – remanding to staff the authority to approve the rear doors and the stairs.

Administrator Feasel clarified her interpretation of Commissioner Hertel’s sentiment that, she would be in favor of remanding to staff the approval of the double-doors to be installed at this location (barring a vinyl product) and including the temporary step design.

Commissioner Ponder stated that she didn’t have any concerns with Staff’s guidance on the project.

Commissioner Hertel asked what the time frame on the extension of the porch or the construction of the stairs would be.

Ms. Gruber explained that contractors are busy, and that the contractor may or may not be able to complete the construction of the steps, but family members could. Ms. Gruber then asked Specialist Toering why the recommendation was written the way it was, and why they did not propose a different product.

Specialist Toering explained that when he had talked to the applicant in the office, the understanding was that the doors to be applied for would be a wood product. It was only when he scrutinized the application that he discovered that the selected product was in fact a vinyl-clad wooden door.

Administrator Feasel stated that the application could have been considered ‘incomplete,’ and that Specialist Toering did extra work to process this project application.

Ms. Gruber introduced her husband.

Mr. Gruber asked for clarification regarding the construction and cost of the preferred door.

Specialist Toering clarified that the Commission preferred aluminum-clad wood doors, and that the applicant’s preferred manufacturer has a model that is an aluminum-clad wood door and is cheaper.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that she would encourage the applicant to consider the more expensive aluminum-clad door, as well as other manufacturers.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to conditionally approve COA#2019-0805, with the condition that staff would review the proposed door material, will exclude a vinyl option, and will review a design for the stairs. Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0805 with conditions is passed.

Ms. Gruber asked for clarification as to what to do next.

Commissioner Gelfman explained that the applicant should review the discussed products, come back with an option that coincides with the recommendations, and provide that to Staff.

- 3. 907 Riverside – Leeper Park #2019-0806 #8734-96 Local**
Landscape Landmark and National Register of Historic Places
Representation: Jonathan Mooney, 108 N Main St, South Bend
Matt Moyers, 301 S St Louis, South Bend
Kyle Silveus, 227 W Jefferson, South Bend

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

Date: 9 August 2019

Application Number: 2019-0806

Property Location: Leeper Park

Architectural Style/Date/Architect or Builder: Planned landscape/1897/City superintendent Herman Beyer; Landscape Architect George Kessler

Property Owner: City of South Bend, Venues Parks & Arts

Landmark or District Designation: Local Landscape Landmark, Ordinance #8734-96 and National Register of Historic Places, 6/15/2000

Rating: N/A

DESCRIPTION OF STRUCTURE/ SITE: Leeper Park is the first planned public park in South Bend located north of downtown and the medical district. Leeper Park is oriented east/west at the St. Joseph River, divided into three sections, East, Central, and West, by Michigan Street and Lafayette Boulevard. The Eastern section was originally established for the Water Works with the first construction on site being a network of thirty, six-inch artesian wells.¹ “The first land condemned for the future Leeper Park, in June of 1895, was meant to provide a second artesian well field and pumping facility for the lively industries and town population which was growing along the south bend of the St. Joseph River.”² City superintendent Herman Beyer first influenced the design including curvilinear paths, plantings, and water features. The 1911-1915 Parks and Boulevard system and the Leeper Park Plan, designed by celebrated planner and landscape architect George Kessler, embodied early twentieth century ideals grounded in the City Beautiful movement, connecting parks and boulevards as planned elements of a coordinated city plan. Kessler’s Plan for Leeper Park included both formal and informal design elements, adopting existing park features of the Beyer era through a skillful remodel. The association of the park sections with different uses was a result of Kessler’s planning; the West section was deemed for active recreation, the Central section as passive recreation, and the Eastern Section was adopted for its function as a Water Works but also boasts a number of recreation-related features. While the Kessler Plan guided Leeper Park development for the next decade, documentary evidence appears that only some elements of the Kessler design were actually installed.³ Sensitive extensions of Kessler’s Plan continued into the 1920s and 1930s and included Works Progress Administration funded labor for several projects.⁴

¹ Leeper Park Cultural Landscape Report, prepared by Westerly Group for the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County, May 1998.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Malcolm Cairns, ASLA. “Leeper Park Historic District.” National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form, NR-1411. South Bend, St. Joseph County, Indiana, June 15, 2000.

Leeper Park East features include: the North Pumping Station, the water reservoir, multiple water well pumps, Ziegler Performing Center with fixed bench seating, signage for the former Garden of Fragrance, the Navarre Cabin, the foundation of the former Powell House, a non-functioning Comfort Station, a swing set/slide, the Sunken (Rose) Garden, the island, and the Works Progress Administration retaining wall and a bridge to the island.

Leeper Park Central features include: West Lagoon (Duck Pond), concrete stairs on embankment, a well house, the Edward B. Reynolds fountain, Lavender Labyrinth, memorials including trees, stones, and plaques.

Leeper Park West features include: backdrop of the former baseball diamond, tennis courts, a recreation building, a parking lot, an odor garden, and raised vegetable gardens with adjoining paths.

ALTERATIONS:

Throughout

COA 2019-0402 approved conditionally 1. Lighting, with condition of staff approval 2. Sign locations, not sign design 3.

Furnishings and Garden Ornaments with exception of the backed, non-custom metal benches around the fountain to be the backless benches, only 4. Planting Design.

COA 2019-0109 approved conditionally 1. Pedestrian circulation improvements and pathways, with condition of staff approval over memorials and landscaping 2. New playground 3. Studebaker Fountain and associated gathering place 4.

Removal of Duck Pond, with condition that "reseed the lawn" is not approved but instead requires a plan be submitted to the Commission to interpret the Duck Pond in another way 5. Concept of a formal river overlook with final design to be approved by Commission.

RMEs and COAs for tree trimming, removal, and installation have been approved under the guidance of the City Forester.

RMEs and COAs for sidewalks have been approved.

Leeper Park East

RME 2017-0410 approved "This permit covers only Phase I of the project - drilling a pilot well. Phase II (drilling the actual well and trenching in the piping) will require a separate COA."

COA 2017-0306 approved installation of new stage and new audience seating, landscape beautification and lighting for stage, new benches with concrete pad closer to stage.

RME 2016-1013 approved removal of brush and planting of willow tree near Rose Garden.

The Sunken (Rose) Garden with reflecting pool and statuaries were removed in the 1960s. RME 2017-1012 approved installation of two small concrete pads with two benches adjacent to Rose Garden. Benches to match those approved through COA 2015-0302A. COA 2017-0228 approved installation of 8' wide crushed limestone walkway connecting the Michigan Street sidewalk with the Sunken Garden, bounded by two, 42" wide flower beds, and irrigation system for entire garden. COA 2015-1002 approved "Within an existing concrete curb (that will remain), the landscaping bed will be enhanced to mimic the reflecting pool formerly within its boundary. New flower beds will be defined using new soil, compost and plantings. A walkway of crushed limestone will pass through the beds. Additional half circle beds will be added to the north and south of the concrete curb. The "three-fates" statues will be repaired pro-bono by a local artist, and then placed into the center of the "pool" bed, where they were originally, in the same back-to-back-to-back style; and the one remaining "cherub" will be nearby, on a footing. That "cherub" will be duplicated from the original, and the new statue also placed nearby in the "pool" bed." COA 2015-0504A approved restoration of Rose Garden and gravel path system by volunteers.

COA 2015-0908 approved "Bartlett Street Roundabout Project Description (114-032b). Project to construct a roundabout at Bartlett and Michigan Street approved per all diagrams and documents submitted. Encroachment to Leeper Park East will be limited to 0.57 acres and all trees removed will be replaced within the park."

The Garden of Fragrance no longer exists, but the signage remains. RME 2015-0422 approved "Rebuild/restack low retaining wall currently located in Leeper Park next to Garden for the Blind. Matching flagstone has been donated by Knepp Sand and Stone and Old Fort Building Supply; and follows material estimate made by a representative of the SB Parks Department. The restacking of the flagstone wall will also require digging away the dirt around loose blocks and backfilling afterwards."

COA 2011-1103A approved "Replace the existing lift station on the south side of the North Pumping Station driveway and relocate it to the north side of the driveway. Screen the new location with landscaping and plantings. Rehabilitate the Garden of Fragrance Braille marker and boulder monument and install new sidewalks and decorative paving. All per diagrams, plans and plant palette submitted and approved."

Wading Pool was filled in and the pergola removed, 1970s.

Circa 1862 vernacular Powell House

Navarre Cabin moved to Leeper Park, 1904; relocated, 1916; relocated again to present site, 1954.

Zoo closed, and structures used for animals were demolished, 1913.

Leeper Park Central

COA 2017-0213B approved "Addition to Leeper Park of a garden labyrinth, 40'-0" diameter center, 80'-0" diameter outer circle per submitted plans. Includes removal and replacement of existing trees specified in plans; removal of DAR memorial tree NOT PERMITTED."

COA 2013-0519 approved "Install a climber and merry-go-round at Leeper Park playground. (Replaces old pieces which were removed.)"

The Mall/Formal Garden, an elongated adaptation of the Kessler design survived well into the 1960s. The Garden and pedestrian walks became grown over, 1980s.

Tennis courts moved from Central to Eastern section, 1916.

1905 Bugbee Fountain removed, unknown date.

1907-08 East Lagoon (Lily Pond) became stagnant and was removed along with the rustic wooden bridge, unknown date.

1907-08 West Lagoon (Duck Pond) was extensively remodeled including a change in configuration from a naturalized shape to a near oval, 1980s and 1990s. The covered shelter and chain link fence are not original.

Only remnants of a path system were recorded by WPA, 1938.

1910 Reynold's horse watering trough, relocated from downtown South Bend, 1937.

Fill added and installation of double flight of concrete steps along west bank of West Lagoon, 1916.

Carriage drives redesigned, unknown date.

Leeper Park West

COA 2015-0302A approved "Create a Garden in four sections totaling about 3000 sf including all plants; include an 8 foot wide ADA standard concrete sidewalk-initially 500 feet long; one monument circle and 2 flanking garden observation/education pads to be added per diagram submitted. Install 8 +/- historic lights of the style of Leeper Park East to be installed along the 8 foot wide walk: 1 on each side of the 3 bump outs along the walk, 1 close to Lafayette and 1 close to the northwest corner end of the current phase of the walkway. 8 +/- durable quality public benches; 4 +/- umbrella tables near tennis court; opportunities for public art along the garden walk. Subject to approval by the Parks Board. All the garden plant and vegetable plant options to be agreed upon by Parks Department/Board, Madison School and HPC Staff to conform to the Standards and Guidelines adopted for Leeper Park. Abstain from planting fruit trees at this time."

COA 2008-0306 approved installation of an "Odor Garden" with blower piping and underground odor control bed to treat sewer gas. Surface odor control bed planted as flower garden. Area will be restored to grass if and when the system is taken out of service.

COA 2007-0605B approved "Renovation of Tennis Courts, Pavement and Fence replacement, expansion of Court pavement approximately 20' to South; removal of 17 trees in the South per Brent Thompson and replace with 12 Cypress per Brent Thompson. Plant to the north of the fence 5 deciduous trees."

A parking lot south of the Tennis Center was added during the Madison School renovation along with lighting without COA, 1998.

The 1936 WPA shelter house was replaced with the present recreation building, 1970.

Fill added for installation of Riverside Drive, 1910 and 1938.

APPLICATION ITEMS: "Construction of a new river overlook in Leeper Park."

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT: Under the direction of Venues, Parks and Arts, the work proposed to Leeper Park has been designed by Jonathon Mooney, RLA, LEED AP, Senior Landscape Architect with Lochmueller Group, having expertise with historic landscapes and specific to George Kessler's historic landscapes.

See Attachment A, Project Description:

1. River Overlook
 - a. Railing
 - b. Benches
 - c. Lighting

Additional application items are adjustments from previously approved COA 2019-0402 and 2019-0109:

2. Benches
 - a. Previously approved "backed, non-custom metal benches around the fountain to be the backless benches" are being amended to be "all benches around the fountain to be backed, non-custom benches". No backless benches are being applied for. Proposed benches around Fountain will be the same as River Overlook and are more historically accurate than backless.
3. Add railings to replicated stairs
 - a. Historic stairs were beyond repair and will be replicated using new aesthetically similar concrete. New concrete will replicate original in appearance with staff having approved the new exposed stone aggregate concrete. The new stairs will require railings, per Code. New railing will be wrought iron and set into sidewalls in six sections, per Staff recommendation.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES:

9.0 LANDSCAPES – STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR LEEPER PARK

9.1 Introduction

1. In these guidelines the verb Should indicates a recommended course of action; the verb Shall indicates those actions which are specifically required to preserve and protect significant architectural elements.
2. The intent of these standards and criteria is to preserve the overall character and appearance of Leeper Park including its spatial organization, topography, vegetation, circulation and features.
3. The standards and criteria acknowledge that there will be changes to the landscape and are intended to make the change sensitive to the historic character of the landscape.
4. Each property will be separately studied to determine if a later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed.
5. Since it is not possible to provide one general guideline, the following factors that will be considered in determining whether a later addition(s) and/or alteration(s) can, or should, be removed include:
 - a. Compatibility with the original property's integrity in scale, materials, and character.
 - b. Historic association with the property.
 - c. Quality in design and execution of the addition/alteration.
 - d. Functional usefulness.
6. Recreational facilities which exist should be allowed to remain as long as they serve substantial community functions. In some cases these features can be redesigned to be more compatible with the overall landscape.
7. Additions to existing recreational facilities shall not be allowed unless such additions make the facilities more compatible with the overall landscape.
8. The development of additional facilities for active recreation or single purpose uses for limited user groups shall not be allowed.
9. Proposals for special activities and events which cause significant impacts or require permanent or even semi-permanent (seasonal) structures or facilities shall not be permitted.
10. The Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County recommends that the work proposed to the landscape be executed with the guidance of landscape professional with expertise with historic landscapes.
11. The land, streets, island(s), street lighting, park lighting, topography, vistas, vegetation, architectural elements, structures, spatial organization, street furniture, sewer covers, electrical and water vault and/or manholes covers, parking areas are subject to the terms of the landscape guidelines herein stated.
12. Items under Historic Preservation review include but are not limited to the following:

9.2 Spatial Organization (includes, Views, Vistas, Landscape Spaces, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7 and 9.8 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. Views and vistas are among the most important aspects of a landscape, therefore, they should be maintained and preserved.
2. All views, vistas, landscape spaces located in the eastern section and central section of Leeper Park shall be preserved. All views, vistas, landscape spaces located north and east and west of a line designated as the northern fence of the tennis courts located in the western section of Leeper Park shall also be preserved. This shall include the island(s) located in the St. Joseph River and the slough which lies between the island(s) and the mainland. All views, vistas, and landscape spaces shall also include the entirety of the riverbank as well as the area lying between the roadway of Riverside Drive up to and including the riverbank and cut stone wall along the riverbank.
3. Original or later contributing special organizational features shall be retained in their existing configuration and shall be maintained through proper drainage, access and erosion control, pruning and removal of invasive vegetation or otherwise using recognized horticultural and soil management practices.
4. Alteration of existing or addition of new spatial organizational features will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
5. Deteriorated or missing spatial organizational features shall be replaced with features that match the original in form, shape, color and texture.
6. When replacement of features is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
8. Important visual connections between spaces within the landscape shall be retained by maintaining vegetation, circulation and topography features which contribute to those visual relationships.
9. The historic spatial and functional relationship of circulation systems, water features and structures shall be preserved by maintaining the massing of adjacent vegetation, vistas, or other associated features.
10. Maintenance of removal or, and additions of vegetation materials and elements should consider maintaining existing or intended vistas and spaces, screening intrusions, creating new spaces where appropriate and maintaining defined areas of shade and sun.

11. The form and shape of individual spaces and their associated vertical element shall be retained in order to preserve the historic relationships of the landscape. Examples include the relationship between open fields and hedgerows or the width and length of an alley.
12. Moving or demolishing historic structures that would alter spatial and visual relationships in the landscape shall not be allowed.
13. Construction of new structures that would alter historic spatial and visual relationships in the landscape shall not be allowed.
14. Intrusive views or new construction may be screened with compatible fencing or plant material so long as the screening would not detract from the historic character of the landscape.

9.3 Topography (includes the Shape, Slope, Elevation, Contour of landforms and Ground Plane, etc.) Refer to Sections 9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 9.8, 9.9 and 9.10 for additional Standard and Criteria that may apply.

1. All locations and items listed in 9.2.2 shall also apply to this section and shall be preserved.
2. Original or later contributing topographical features shall be retained in their existing configuration and shall be maintained through proper drainage, access and erosion control, and recognized soil management practices.
3. Alteration of existing or addition to new topographical features will be considered if they do not later the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
4. Natural features (e.g. rock outcroppings) which are integrated into the landscape shall be treated as part of the overall design and shall be retained.
5. Deteriorated or missing materials or features shall be replaced with materials that match the original in form, shape, color and texture.
6. When replacement of materials or features is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
7. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
8. Whenever appropriate, plant materials, rather than structural materials should be used to solve erosion problems. Repair of WPA island and slough stone construction projects is strongly encouraged.

9.4 Vegetation (includes Trees, Shrubs, Ground Covers, Hedges, Allees, Fields, Forests, Planting Beds, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 9.7, 9.8, 9.9, and 9.10 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. Refer to Section 9.2.2 for items within this section which shall be preserved. Also included in this section shall be the diverse variety of trees, shrubs, bushes and other vegetation which may or may not be indigenous to this region. List of such types of vegetation can be in lists and inventories which were published in the annual reports of both the City of South Bend and the South Bend Park Commissions from the years 1910 to 1940.
2. Original or later contributing vegetation materials and features shall be retained in their existing configuration and shall be maintained through proper horticultural management practices.
3. Alteration of existing or addition of new vegetation materials and features will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
4. Deteriorated or missing materials or features shall be replaced with materials that match the original in form, shape, color and texture.
5. When replacement of vegetation materials or features is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. If using the same vegetation material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute vegetation materials may be considered if they convey the same growth habit, form, foliage and bloom characteristics as the historic plant.
7. Existing vegetation material shall be retained unless it is part of a later non-compatible design or is volunteer vegetation inconsistent with the original design.
8. Consideration for removal of existing healthy vegetation materials and features will be given when it is in conflict with the original design intent of the landscape, such as when an important vista has become overgrown or when plants have grown out of scale with their intended purpose.
9. Maintenance of, removal of, and additions of vegetation materials and features should consider maintaining existing or intended vistas and spaces, screening intrusions, creating new spaces where appropriate and maintaining defined areas of shade and sun.
10. Invasive vegetation shall be removed whenever technically feasible and shall be replaced with appropriate vegetation consistent with the original design of the park and with current factors such as security, ecological conditions, and wildlife management practices.
11. Hazardous plants or portions of plants should be removed promptly.
12. Plants with diseases that are difficult or not practical to control or cure should be removed promptly to prevent their infection of other plants.
13. Mutilated or distorted plants should be removed.
14. Plant replacements should be added on a schedule that will insure a continuity in the landscape design.

15. Existing vegetation shall be protected adjacent construction activities by fencing the root system prior to the start of construction.
16. Future plantings of the main floral garden in the central section of the park shall be guided by the design of the main floral garden as laid out by George Kessler in 1912.

9.5 Circulation (includes Roads, Paths, Parkways, Drives, Trails, Walks, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.2, 9.5, 9.6, 9.8, 9.9 and 9.10 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. The following shall be preserved: Riverside Drive, Lafayette Boulevard, Park Lane (Foote Street), Bartlett Street, the Alleyway east of Michigan Street running north from Bartlett Street, all sidewalks, curbs, pathways around the duck pond (west lagoon), stairways, pathways in and around the Sunken Garden, and the footbridge from the mainland to the island. Alteration or addition of Roads, Paths, Parkways, Trails, Walks, etc. shall be based upon physical or historical documentation of these items as they existed from 1910 to 1940.
2. Original or later contributing layouts of walks, roads, and paved areas shall be maintained.
3. Alteration of existing or addition of new circulation layouts will be considered if it can be shown that better site circulation is necessary, and that the alteration does not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
4. When replacement of circulation layouts is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. Original or later contributing circulation materials and features shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing-in or reinforcing the material or feature using recognized preservation methods.
6. Deteriorated or missing circulation materials and features shall be replaced with materials that match the original in size, shape, color, profile, form, texture, and detail of installation.
7. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
8. Alteration of existing or addition of new circulation materials and features will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
9. Consideration will be given to an alternate paving material if it can be shown that its properties will improve the original or later contributing design concept.
10. When replacement of circulation materials or features is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
11. Consideration for removal of existing circulation systems and features will be given when it is in conflict with the original design intent of the landscape or when they are no longer appropriate to their intended purposes.
12. No vehicles unless of or approved by the South Bend Parks Department shall be permitted on any part of the park surface at any time. Vehicles of American Electric Power and/or other vehicles of the City of South Bend, shall use predetermined routes to and from their destination, when said travel would cause them to cross any area of the park which is not paved and designed for vehicular traffic. Any damage caused by any vehicle, shall be repaired immediately to look as it did prior to said damage.
13. Encroachment of vehicles off the paved roadway of any area of the park shall not be permitted. Areas now used for vehicular parking which are not part of the historical design of that park shall be removed.
14. Construction of any type within the park shall be done so as not to disturb any feature of the park. Sheets of plywood or other approved material may need to be laid upon the surface of the park prior to construction equipment. Repairs which must match the original historic design concept shall be made in any and all circumstances of damage.

9.6 Water Features (includes Fountains, Pools, Irrigation Systems, Ponds, Rivers, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.11 B, C, and D regarding treatment of materials and features; and Sections 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.7, 9.8 and 9.10 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. Features which shall be preserved include: the duck pond (West Lagoon), the water pond in the Sunken Garden, the slough between the island and the mainland, all drinking fountains, pump houses, manhole covers, drainage grates, horse and dog fountain and path of the St. Joseph River in relation to the park.
2. Original or later contributing water features shall be retained and maintained.
3. Existing water courses or bodies should not be altered. Consideration will be given to proposals that improve site drainage, improve water quality, enhance the landscape design or improve wildlife habitat.
4. Alteration of existing or addition of new water features will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
5. When placement of water features and their materials are necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. Original or later contributing water feature materials shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing in, consolidating or reinforcing the material using recognized preservation methods.
7. Deteriorated or missing water feature materials shall be replaced with materials that match the original in size, shape, color, profile, form, texture, and detail of installation.
8. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.

9. Alteration of existing or addition of new water features will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
10. When appropriate from an ecological perspective, dredging of waterways shall be permitted as a means of retaining historic waterways.
11. All wetlands shall be preserved.
12. All shorelines of water courses or bodies shall be protected from erosion in a manner in keeping with the basic concept of the landscape design.
13. Consideration for removal of existing water features will be given when it is in conflict with the original design intent of the landscape or when they are no longer appropriate to their intended purposes.
14. Some areas of Leeper Park are utilized for the pumping of water for the City of South Bend, and there exists both within the park and the St. Joseph River and on the island(s) wells, well-houses and other water supply entities. Repairs that may be necessary to existing services, or additions to existing services, or the sinking or additional new wells; all such work, installations and/or repairs shall return the disturbed areas(s) of the park, island(s) and the St. Joseph River to conditions of the park as in that time period 1912 to 1940. Any new installations of any type may be considered if the alteration does not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.

9.7 Furnishings and Objects (includes Benches, Lights, Signs, Drinking Fountains, Trash Receptacles, Fences, Tree Grates, Flagpoles, Sculpture, Monuments, Memorials, Planters, Urns, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.11 B, C and D regarding treatment of materials and features; and Sections 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.8, 9.9 and 9.10 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. All items listed herein shall be preserved:
 - a. The Duck Pond (West Lagoon), including the Island in the lagoon, the Walls, Curbing, Fence, and Shelter House.
 - b. The Stone and Plaque of the DAR, with related Tulip and Ginkgo Trees.
 - c. The Concrete Stairway leading west southwesterly from the Duck Pond (West Lagoon).
 - d. The High Embankment on the west-southwest side of the Duck Pond (West Lagoon).
 - e. The Pump Houses, number 2 and 3.
 - f. The Edward B. Reynolds Horse and Dog Watering Fountain.
 - g. The Drinking Fountain in the south east portion of the central section of the park.
 - h. The central section of the park, the area of the large Floral Garden and Pathways as designed by George Kessler in 1912.
 - i. All Sidewalks on Lafayette Boulevard, Riverside Drive, Park Lane (Foote Street), Bartlett Street and Michigan Street.
 - j. The Retaining Wall on the western boundary of the western section of the park.
 - k. The Wall comprised of Cut Stone, which extended west-northwest and east-southeast from the southern approach of the Leeper Park Bridge.
 - l. The Log Cabin known as the Navarre House, and the footings of the cabin/house which was burned down.
 - m. All Drinking Fountains located in the eastern section of the park and/or on the island(s).
 - n. The Sunken Garden on the eastern section of the park, along with all the Vegetation, Pathways, Stairs and the Fountain and Statues.
 - o. The WPA walls and Sloughs(s) in the eastern section of the park and the adjoining St. Joseph River.
 - p. All Park Benches.
 - q. All Manhole Covers, Sewer Covers and Grates, and all Electrical Underground Vault and/or Raceway Covers.
 - r. The north/south alleyway east of Michigan Street, running north from Bartlett Street which used to run between Lot 'A' and Lots 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and part of 20 of the Rockstroh Addition.
 - s. All Plaques, Monuments, Sculptures, Memorials, Planters, Urns, Curbing, Roadways, Marker Stones, Sundials, Well-Head Covers, Fences, Trellises, Pergolas, Pathways, and Trees.
2. Original or later contributing furnishings and objects, shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing in, consolidating or reinforcing the material using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing furnishings and objects, materials, elements, features and details shall be replaced with materials that match the original in material, size, shape, color, profiles, form, texture, configuration and detail of installation.
4. Alteration of existing or addition of new furnishings and objects will be considered if they do not alter the basic concept of the historic landscape design.
5. When replacement of furnishings and objects and their materials is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
7. Existing memorials, statues, monuments and fountains shall be carefully preserved and restored where necessary, maintaining the integrity of the original material and design. The work shall be coordinated with the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County.

8. New furnishings and object should be designed using vandal resistant standards.
9. Location of signs shall be guided by a master plan.
10. Signs shall conform to a simple sign system.
11. Existing non-conforming signs should be removed.
12. All new monuments and fountains shall be placed so that they conform to and with the original historic landscape design of the park and park system.

9.8 Structures (includes Walls, Terraces, Arbors, Gazebos, Follies, Playground Equipment, Picnic Shelters, Plazas, Greenhouse, Steps, Bridges, Dams, Buildings, etc.)

Refer to Sections 9.11 B and D regarding treatment of materials and features; and sections 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.9 and 9.10 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. The general intent is to preserve the original or later contributing structures that enhance the historic landscape.
2. Refer to Sections 9.2.2 and 9.7.1 of structures, elements and materials that need to be preserved such as wall, terraces, arbors, gazebos, follies, playground equipment, picnic shelters, plazas, greenhouses, steps, bridges, dams, building, etc. which shall be preserved.
3. Original or later contributing structures, shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing in, consolidating or reinforcing the material using recognized preservation methods.
4. Deteriorated or missing structures, materials, elements, features and details shall be replaced with materials that match the original in material, size, shape, color, profiles, form, texture, configuration and detail of installation.
5. When replacement of structures is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
7. New addition/alterations to the landscape (such as: parking lots, comfort stations, buildings, etc.) shall be as unobtrusive as possible and preserve and original or later contributing landscape features.
8. Removal of non-historic structures from the existing landscape is encouraged.
9. Structures shall be protected from arson and other acts of vandalism through proper monitoring procedures and methods such as; permanent installation of smoke detectors, alarms, or other security systems, or temporarily boarding up windows and openings.
10. No building(s) shall be erected in the central section of the park; the western section of the park, north of the northern fence to the tennis courts; the eastern section of the park, west of the rear set-back of the north Pumping Station, or in the area north and east of the Log Cabin.

9.9 Archeology

Refer to Section 9.11 B and C, and D regarding treatment and materials. Refer to Sections 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7 and 9.8 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. The landscape should be surveyed for potential archeological sites prior to the beginning of any construction project.
2. Known Archeological site(s) shall be protected during any construction project.
3. Disturbance of the terrain within the landscape shall be kept to a minimum so as not to disturb any unknown archeological materials.
4. All planning, any necessary site investigation, or data recovery shall be conducted by professional archeologist.

9.10 Accessibility

Refer to Sections 9.11 B, C and D regarding treatment of materials. Refer to Sections 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, and 9.8 for additional Standards and Criteria that may apply.

1. A three-step approach is recommended to identify and implement accessibility modification that will protect the integrity and historic character of the property.
 - a. Review the historical significance of the property and identify character-defining features;
 - b. Assess the property's existing and required level of accessibility;
 - c. Evaluate accessibility options within a preservation context.
2. Because of the complex nature of accessibility, the Historic Preservation Commission will review proposals on a case by case basis. The Commission recommend consulting with the following document which is available from the Commission office: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, Preservation Assistance Division; Preservation Brief 32, "Making Historic Properties Accessible" by Thomas C. Jester and Sharon C. Park, AIA.

9.11 Architectural Materials

A. General

The Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County recommend that work proposed to the materials outlined in Sections B, C, and D be executed with the guidance of a professional building material conservator.

1. Removal of the speakers atop Pump House Number 3 is encouraged.

B. Masonry (Brick, Stone, Terra Cotta, Concrete, Stucco, and Mortar)

1. [intentionally left blank]
2. Original or later contributing masonry materials, feature, details, surfaces and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing-in, or consolidating the masonry using recognize preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing masonry materials, features, details, surfaces and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile and detail of installation.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible, then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
6. Original mortar shall be retained.
7. Deteriorating mortar shall be carefully removed by hand-raking the joints.
8. Use of mechanical saws and hammers shall not be allowed.
9. Repointing mortar shall duplicate the original mortar in strength, composition, color, texture, joint size, joint profile and method of application.
10. Sample panels of raking the joints and repointing shall be reviewed and approved by the staff of the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County.
11. Cleaning of masonry is discouraged and should be performed only when necessary to halt determination.
12. If the building is to be cleaned, the mildest method possible shall be used.
13. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County. Test patches should always be carried out well in advance of cleaning (including exposure to all seasons if possible.)
14. Sandblasting (wet or dry), wire brushing, or similar abrasive cleaning methods shall not be permitted. Doing so changes the visual quality of the material and accelerates deterioration.
15. Waterproofing or water repellent are strongly discouraged. These treatments are generally not effective in preserving masonry and can cause permanent damage. The Commission does recognize that in extraordinary circumstances their use may be required to solve a specific problem. Samples of any proposed treatment shall be reviewed by the Commission before application.
16. In general, painting masonry surfaces shall not be allowed. Painting masonry surfaces will be considered only when there is documentary evidence that this treatment was used at some point in the history of the property.

C. Wood

1. [intentionally left blank]
2. Original or later contributing wood surfaces, features, details and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary, repaired by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods.
3. Deteriorated or missing wood surfaces, features, details and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile and detail of installation.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical or documentary evidence.
6. Cleaning of wooden elements shall use the mildest method possible.
7. Paint removal should be considered only where there is a paint surface deterioration and as part of an overall maintenance appropriate protective coatings. Coatings such as paints help protect the wood from moisture and ultraviolet light and stripping the wood bare will expose the surface to the effects of weathering.
8. Damage or deteriorated paint should be removed to the next sound layer using the mildest method possible.
9. Propane or butane torches, sandblasting, water blasting, or other abrasive cleaning and/or paint removal methods shall not be permitted. Doing so changes the visual quality of the wood and accelerates deterioration.
10. Repainting should be based on paint serration studies. If an adequate record does not exist repainting shall be done with the colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

D. Architectural Metals (Cast Iron, Steel, Pressed Tin, Copper, Aluminum, and Zinc)

1. All metal materials, features, details and ornamentation of the buildings in the park shall be preserved. This also includes all metal parts of all fountains, monuments, memorials, plaques, street lights, drinking fountains, etc.
2. Original or later contributing metal materials, features, details, and ornamentation shall be retained and, if necessary repaired by patching, splicing or reinforcing the metal using recognized preservation methods.

3. Deteriorated or missing metal materials, features, details and ornamentation shall be replaced with material and elements which match the original in material, color, texture, size, shape, profile and detail of installation.
4. When replacement of materials or elements is necessary, it should be based on physical evidence or documentary evidence.
5. If using the same material is not technically or economically feasible then compatible substitute materials may be considered.
6. Cleaning of metal elements either to remove corrosion or deteriorated paint shall use the mildest method possible.
7. Abrasive cleaning methods, such as low pressure dry grit blasting, may be allowed as long as it does not abrade or damage the surface.
8. A test patch of the cleaning method(s) shall be reviewed and approved on site by staff of the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County. Test patches should always be carried out well in advance of cleaning (including exposure to all seasons if possible.)
9. Cleaning to remove corrosion and paint removal should be considered only where there is deterioration and as part of an overall maintenance program which involved repainting or applying other appropriate protective coatings. Paint or other coatings help retard the corrosion rate of the metal. Leaving the metal base will expose the surface to accelerated corrosion.
10. Repainting should be based on paint seriation studies. If an adequate record does not exist repainting shall be done with colors that are appropriate to the style and period of the building.

The Landscapes- Specific Standard and Criteria was financed in part with funds from the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, through the Massachusetts Historical Commission, Secretary of State, Michael Joseph Connolly, Chairman, and adopted for use by the Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County, Indiana, by permission of the Environment Department, City of Boston, Massachusetts, by Michael A. Cannizzo, Staff Architect, 1996.

SITE VISIT REPORT: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approval of the proposed projects.

Report compiled by
Elicia Feasel, Historic Preservation Administrator

Administrator Feasel summarized the application, detailing the river overlook, which has limestone accents. This application requests a change in the previous approval for backless benches to be transitioned to backed benches. Lighting is proposed to illuminate the benches by the river overlook, and it will be recessed. Staff was able to work with the applicant on the replication of the constitution of the concrete steps to the west of the fountain, because the stairs were reconstructed, there is now a requested approval for a black metal railing.

Commissioner Hertel clarified that she was an employee of the City of South Bend and was appointed to this Commission by the County Commissioners.

PETITIONER COMMENTS:

Administrator Feasel distributed photos of the concrete steps photographed on August 19th.

Mr. Mooney explained the details of the application, including the dimensions of the lighting (1 1/8" tall). This will cast light on the overlook, but not out and about into the riverscape.

Commissioner Gelfman confirmed with Mr. Mooney that the lighting will not be intrusive for the residents on the north side of the river in the West North Shore Local Historic District. The lighting is very durable and are drive-over rated.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if aluminum railing as opposed to iron had been considered.

Mr. Mooney provided clarification regarding the stairs and railing, indicating that it would be mounted in the knee-wall and the code-required height. The railings would be at each flight of steps.

Mr. Silveus explained that code is based on the number of risers.

Commissioner Gelfman voiced concern that the handrail would be helpful for some people walking the length of the stairwell.

Administrator Feasel clarified that, if it is not required for code, the proposed configuration is more in keeping with the Victorian style of the stairs and would minimally detract from their form. There was no railing prior to this reconstruction.

Commissioner Hertel asked if there are other more period-appropriate options available for railings.

Administrator Feasel stated that she believed it would be something like the proposed submission.

Mr. Mooney stated that it would have probably been iron.

Administrator Feasel commented that plumbing pipe would have been used during the 1970s.

Commissioner Hertel expressed thanks that plumbing pipe isn't being proposed.

Inspector Szaday clarified that aluminum and iron have different strengths.

Mr. Mooney clarified that the railings will be installed by coring out and then sealed into place. They could be removed and replaced at a later date.

Commissioner Gelfman clarified that, were someone needing ADA accessibility, there are other ways of getting to the fountain area.

Mr. Mooney clarified that this set of stairs and the new set of stairs on the western edge of the park are the only stairs that are not ADA accessible.

Inspector Szaday asked for clarification as to what kind of railing would be installed on the western stairs.

Mr. Mooney clarified that a black aluminum railing would be installed at the western stairs.

Commissioner Hertel stated concern about the installation of the railings and feared it would look out of place.

Commissioner Annis stated that the curbing creates complexity with the installation of the railings.

Mr. Moyers explained that Venues Parks & Arts had sought to keep the area between the rises of steps open to allow people to transition from the stairs to the greenscape.

Commissioner Annis asked if there was a plan to landscape up to and around the steps.

Mr. Mooney clarified that there is no landscape plan around the steps at this time.

Commissioner Brazinsky asked for clarification on the amount of space around or between the rises of stairs.

Mr. Mooney clarified that the railing is mounted in the knee-wall.

Commissioner Gelfman asked if the Headstone pillars instead of the iron railings would be more appropriate.

Mr. Mooney clarified that the Headstone would, in his opinion, not be more appropriate versus the other railing options. He also suggested removing the vertical spindles in the railing as a means of lessening the impact of the railings.

Commissioner Hertel express her support for the spindle-less option.

Administrator Feasel stated that it isn't as much of an architectural detail.

Commissioner Brazinsky stated that she thinks everyone is agreement on the railing.

Commissioner Annis agreed.

Commissioner Hertel expressed confidence that she would feel comfortable remanding this to staff.

COMMISSIONER GELFMAN LEFT THE PROCEEDINGS AT 6:22PM.

Mr. Mooney unveiled a large rendering of the overlook. Mr. Mooney discussed the curvature of the overlook, that the longest end is some 28', there is a 42" (code-required) tall Headstone railing. There is a doubling of the columns at the corners. Mr. Mooney detailed the construction process. He detailed the options for the spacing of the balustrades, and the code requirement.

COMMISSIONER GELFMAN RETURNED TO THE PROCEEDINGS AT 6:24PM.

Commissioner Annis explained the code requirement, approximating a 4" sphere must not be able to pass through it.

Commissioner Gelfman asked about replacing portions were they to be vandalized or broken.

Mr. Mooney explained that, at most, you would replace an entire section.

Commissioner Gelfman stated that she thought the product was beautiful.

Mr. Mooney expressed his satisfaction at extending the limestone characteristics throughout the park to the overlook.

Administrator Feasel expressed thanks to Mr. Mooney for being respectful and mindful of the Commission's earlier concerns regarding the overlook, specifically noting former Commissioner Canada's sentiments on the design.

Mr. Mooney joked that the curvature complicated the design, as it required considerable design work to get the curvature to work with the proposed material.

Commissioner Hertel asked about additional lighting.

Mr. Mooney explained that the existing Riverside lighting would remain, and that the schematics indicated two of the previously approved concrete aggregate poles would be installed in the near vicinity.

Commissioner Hertel asked for clarification on the location of the backed benches or the custom benches, specifically which were where.

Mr. Mooney brought attention to the bollard as proposed to be by overlook.

Commissioner Ponder asked about the design of the overlook wall and the bridge wall.

Commissioner Annis asked how they compared to those along the wall in Howard Park.

Mr. Moyers explained the design of the Howard Park wall design.

Administrator Feasel stated that the designs were compatible, one was more angular, while the other was more organic and curved. She further stated that she would like to make a site visit, and report back, that she has voiced her concerns to the project team when she has them. She was curious how the grade changes would look.

Commissioner Gelfman clarified the application regarding the benches.

Commissioner Hertel stated that she believed the Commission's concern regarding the backed benches versus the backless, was that the backed benches would take away from the fountain.

Mr. Moyers reminded the Commission that the fountain is very large, and that the benches would not detract from the fountain.

Commissioner Gelfman agreed.

Mr. Moyers stated that there were two advantages to using the proposed benches – that this would limit the number of inventory / stock benches that would need to be retained, and that the historic pictures show the benches in that format.

Mr. Mooney stressed that the entrance points to the fountain plaza are generous.

Commissioner Hertel asked about the custom benches and their location.
Mr. Mooney stated that the custom benches are along the central alley.
Commissioner Gelfman asked about making all the benches the same, using the generic benches.
Mr. Mooney stressed that they are unique and that they wanted to bring them back.
Commissioner Ponder asked if there would be signage regarding the style of the backed 'historic' benches in the park.
Commissioner Ponder inquired about connecting that to history to the interpretive history signage regarding the history of the park.
Mr. Mooney expressed that there were no interpretive signage in his paperwork.
Mr. Moyers stated that based upon previous applications, the interpretive signage would return to the HPC with HPC Staff input.
Mr. Mooney expressed interest in seeing information about the Kessler design on some interpretive signage.
Commissioner Gelfman asked for clarification regarding the installation of the lighting, as to whether they were dark-sky lighting.
Mr. Mooney explained that the lighting included in this application is for the scenic overlook. Mr. Mooney explained that the lights would be on at all times that the park is open, that it is photo-cell controlled.
Commissioner Hertel asked regarding the pedestrian access to the scenic overlook.
Mr. Mooney explained that the intersection would be 'tabled.'
Commissioner Hertel asked about whether a call-box would be installed in the park.
Mr. Moyers explained that security in the park is still being discussed but that no plans were put forward.
Mr. Mooney expressed that call boxes are not typically used anymore, because of the prevalence of cellular devices.
Commissioner Gelfman expressed that she is always thinking of the 'what-if'.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION:

N/A

PUBLIC DISCUSSION:

N/A

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA#2019-0806, section 1A – railing, conditionally with staff approval of railing following a site visit to ensure that the bridge and the railing do not clash. Seconded by Commissioner Annis.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0806 section 1-A, railing, with conditions is passed.

Commissioner Annis made a motion to approve COA #2019-0806, attachment 'A', item 1 river overlook, item 'B' benches, to approve the bench locations, quantities, materials, which we understand would be consistent with the formerly approved backed-benches for the park. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Four in favor, none opposed, one abstention.

Vote: 4 – 0 – 1. Motion to approve COA #2019-0806, attachment 'A', item 1 river overlook, item 'B' benches passes.

Commissioner Ponder made a motion approve COA #2019-0806, attachment 'A' river overlook, item C, pod lighting underneath the benches. Seconded by Commissioner Hertel.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0806 attachment 'A', item C, pod lighting is passed.

Commissioner Annis motioned to approve the amendment for all benches to be backed, non-custom benches, consistent with the other benches formerly approved for the

rest of the site. Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Four in favor, one opposed.

Vote: 4 – 1. Motion to approve the amendment for all the benches to be backed, non-custom benches passes.

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve COA #2019-0806, attachment A-3 to add railings along the stairs, with the condition that they are without spindles, are iron, and black, and that final design is remanded to staff. Seconded by Commissioner Ponder.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve COA #2019-0806, attachment A-3 is passed.

Mr. Mooney expressed regret that this was his last time before the Commission for this project, and that the project had been the highlight of his last two years.

Administrator Feasel and Commissioner Gelfman expressed thanks to the applicant for all of the sensitivity with this project.

Commissioner Gelfman inquired with Mr. Moyers regarding the lighting along Riverside Drive in the River Bend District.

Inspector Szaday explained that there were two near Darden Road Bridge.

Commissioner Gelfman expressed frustration regarding the failure of any response from all the parties who have received the paperwork she had prepared.

IV. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

V. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

i. August 15, 2019

Commissioner Hertel made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as circulated. Seconded by Commissioner Brazinsky.

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Motion to approve the minutes passes.

B. STAFF REPORTS

i. Administrative Approvals

- 1.** Commissioner Ponder asked about the installation of windows at 608 Park. Administrator Feasel explained that this approval was an extension of a previous project.
- 2.** Commissioner Hertel asked if there had been any update on the project that was heard on W North Shore Drive. Inspector Szaday explained that the concrete installer did not execute the project correctly. Specialist Toering explained that Staff had expressed concern to the Brodens regarding the installation, and that it should be remedied.
- 3.** Commissioner Gelfman expressed concerns regarding properties in the River Bend neighborhood. Administrator Feasel explained that one of the properties was approved. Inspector Szaday explained that the other property was called before Code Enforcement and that the work was approved. Specialist Toering confirmed that a building permit had been pulled.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Disposition of Historic Preservation Assets

1. N/A

ii. Standards Update

1. Commissioner Hertel asked what the time frame was on updating the Standards and Guidelines. Administrator Feasel clarified that we are waiting to see what the City's contribution for matching grants, as well as the circumstances of Indiana Landmark's participation. Commissioner Hertel asked if it would be possible to accumulate Standards & Guidelines from other communities.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Commissioner Gelfman asked for clarification on properties with outstanding violations:

- i. 721 LWE –** The front porch was removed as cleanup by the new owners, the Building Department 'Red Tagged' the work, now they need to make contact with Code Enforcement, at which point they can come and get approval from us. Specialist Toering explained the believed long term plans of the new owners to remove the later brick addition, and possibly construct a new garage addition. Commissioner Hertel and Commissioner Gelfman asked what the obligation of the property owner was to make the property compliant. Specialist Toering and Inspector Szaday explained the Building Department's penalty process.
- ii. 702 N St Joseph –** Specialist Toering explained the history of the window replacement project for this property, the applicant was given conditional approval to replace the window aluminum-clad windows. Staff repeatedly reached out to the property owner to find a way to get compliant. No response was received. Last week, the applicant replaced the original windows with vinyl slider windows, not in compliance with the previously issued COA. Staff sent a letter stating the circumstances of the 'Red Tag.'

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. Committee Assignments

Commissioner Gelfman explained that, with the transition of new Commission members, that new Committee assignments have been distributed. Commissioner Gelfman does not have any Committee Chair positions for medical reasons.

B. The old HPC office has humidity issues, which is impacting productivity on projects that are housed there.

C. Inspector Szaday has announced that his last day as the Historic Preservation Inspector is August 29th.

Commissioner Hertel expressed sincere gratitude to Mr. Szaday for his years of service.

Multiple Commissioners expressed interest as to whether Mr. Szaday could be involved as an appointee to the Commission; or as the Architectural Historian.

D. Inspector Szaday informed the Commission of the unveiling of the remnants of the Leeper Park wading pool. During expansion of the exploratory well field, the ground was disturbed. Commissioner Hertel expressed displeasure that Parks and HPC staff did not stop the construction immediately.

COMMISSIONER GELFMAN LEFT THE PROCEEDINGS AT 7:29PM
COMMISSIONER GELFMAN RETURNED TO THE PROCEEDINGS AT 7:31PM.

E. Commissioner Molnar resigned from the Commission prior to this meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT


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

Five in favor, none opposed.

Vote: 5 – 0. Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Attest:


Sarah Ponder, Secretary


Date