



Elkhart Historic & Cultural
Preservation Commission

ELKHART HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MARCH 21, 2024

7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers – 2nd Floor

AGENDA

- 1) CALL TO ORDER
- 2) ROLL CALL
- 3) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- 4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - A. JULY 20, 2023
 - B. DECEMBER 7, 2023
 - C. FEBRUARY 15, 2024
- 5) FINANCIAL REPORT
- 6) HEARING OF VISITORS
- 7) OLD BUSINESS
 - A. NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATE/PROGRESS REVIEW/NOMINATIONS
- 8) NEW BUSINESS
 - A. 24-COA-02, 221-223 DIVISION ST, LATTICE INSTALLATION AND WINDOW WOOD FRAME RESTORATION
- 9) ANNOUNCEMENTS
- 10) ADJOURNMENT

.....

If you are unable to attend, please contact Wendy Sonora at 574-294-5471 x 1013

WebEx Information

Meeting number:
2304 917 7496

Password:
Historic1

THE NEXT MEETING IS APRIL 18, 2024 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

City of Elkhart
Municipal Building
229 South Second Street
Elkhart, Indiana 46516
574.294.5471 Ext. 1018

Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission

Meeting Thursday, July 20, 2023

Call to Order:

Ann Linley called to order the Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission Meeting for Thursday, July 20, 2023 at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call:

Present: Raymond Enfield, JA Whitmer, Ann Linley, Phalene Leichtman, Bill Zimmerman; Nathan Hooley, Eric Trotter with the City of Elkhart Planning and Development and Deb Parcell with Indiana Landmarks.

Absent: Robert Glassburn

Approval of Agenda:

Linley asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Motion made by Zimmerman, seconded by Whitmer; motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

Ann Linley gave everyone a minute to look over the minutes from Thursday February 16, 2023 to see if any corrections or adjustments needed to be made.

Linley asked for a motion to approve the February 16, 2023 minutes as presented. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Enfield; motion carried.

Financial Report:

N/A

Hearing of Visitors:

Linley stated that there were a few visitors speaking to their projects and a presentation.

Old Business:

A: Neighborhood Update/Progress Review/Nominations

N/A

New Business:

A: 23-COA-06, 425 Division St, Install new fence

Deb Parcell: Application 23-COA-06, applicant is Capstone II Llc, property address is 425 Division Street. It is an American foursquare rated contributing built around 1920.

Alterations: Previous COA #06-COA-16, approved the existing asphalt shingle roof with asphalt rounded roof panels and #13-COA-03, approved replacement of all the windows except those on the porch with wood widows.

Description of proposed project: New fencing all around the structure with 6' white vinyl fence. Parcell said she was unable to contact the owner and could not leave a message because the voicemail was not set up. She was not able to know specifically what all around the structure meant. Parcell said there was a fence now and she assumed by the picture that it was going to be where the existing one was located.

Finding of Fact:

- 1) Existing fence at the front plane of the house is wrought iron style; side and rear fence is chain link.
- 2) Chain link fence is considered inappropriate in the historic district.
- 3) Vinyl is not considered an appropriate material in the historic district.
- 4) Recommended fence styles are slat, picket, and wrought iron.
- 5) Fence will not affect the historic integrity of the house.

Recommendation: While wood is the more appropriate fence material for the historic district, to address safety concerns, approval is recommended, with the condition that the fence does not extend beyond the front wall of the house.

Linley asked Parcell to give the board more information about the safety concern. Parcell replied that the concern came from problems in the neighborhood and the fence would give the homeowner more security around the house. Parcell added that the chain link is pretty open and removing the chain link would be great. Parcell definitely recommended that but commented that wood fence would be a more appropriate choice. Whitmer asked what about the wrought iron style that was already in the front of the house. Parcell replied that she liked that in the front and that's why she was hoping to get a hold of the applicant. Whitmer and Linley asked if the homeowner was there to speak on their project. Linley asked the applicant to come forward to speak to the project. Applicant presented herself, Rosibel Hernandez, with address 425 Division Street. Linley asked homeowner if the wrought iron fence in the front was going to stay and Hernandez response was inaudible. Linley said that usually a 6 foot fence in the front of the house was not allowed by code. Hooley explained how it was drawn and had conversation with Hernandez and Parcell off the mic that was inaudible. Linley asked if it was just the chain link that was seen in the photographs being replaced by proposed to be replaced by the vinyl. Parcell replied that they are willing to do that.

Inaudible

Linley stated you are not allowed to do that anywhere in the city. Hooley stated the wrought iron apparently was not actually in front of the house and it could be removed but homeowner agreed to maintain the wrought iron to transition into the final further back from the edge of the house. Whitmer asked applicant for aesthetics reasons if she could move the wrought iron from where it was to the front of the house. Hooley replied I believe if you were to look at the front of the house you are only going to see wrought iron from the street. Parcell showed Whitmer the drawing which she did not get with the package and they had a conversation off the microphone. Enfield asked if the chain-link fence would come up to where the wrought iron was. Hooley responded to his understanding it would transition from the wrought iron to the chain-link. Enfield asked Hooley if

the vinyl fence could start where the wrought iron was and Hooley replied yes. Whitmer asked Hooley if the fence would even come up to the front of the house and Hooley replied no and explained if you are standing at the street, you should see wrought iron and then the transition into the vinyl, as it goes around the back by the alley. Whitmer asked applicant if there were alternatives to the solid vinyl fencing and Hernandez, replied no. Whitmer asked homeowner if it was because she did not want it or because it was not available.

Inaudible

Translator replied for her younger sibling's safety. Whitmer asked if they played in the yard and translator replied yes they do play in the yard. Whitmer understood the concern was in the back not as much on the side. Linley said we have clarified where it starts from again. The commission focus was always from the right of way looking at the house but this was going to transition in a side line where you are not going to see it. Linley said we usually do not involved ourselves too much in the backyards and totally understood wanting security for children in busy downtown areas.

Whitmer asked for a motion to recommend approval for 23 COA 06 upon condition that only the chain-link fence is removed and replaced and the wrought iron remained. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Enfield; motion carried.

B: 23-COA-07, 415 Division Street

Parcell: Application 23-COA-07, applicant is Terry Floyd, property address is 415 Division Street. The subject property is a modular constructed ranch from 1970. The property is rated non-contributing.

Alterations:

Previous COAs for this were in 2006 where they retroactively approved removal of the original aluminum siding and replacement with vinyl siding and 03-COA-10, approved installation of a fence.

Description of proposed project: Replace the existing asphalt shingles with a pewter colored metal roof.

Staff Recommendation:

Finding of Fact:

- 1) Property is non-historic and non-contributing.
- 2) Existing roof is seriously deteriorated.
- 3) Metal roof is not typical for ranch or for modular-constructed circuit 1970 house.
- 4) Metal exposed-fastener roofing systems are not recommended.
- 5) Traditional standing-seam metal roofs can be considered in a historic district.
- 6) Owner has purchased roofing material and it's exposed faster.

Recommendation: The state division street guidelines state replacement roofing materials should be appropriate to the style of the house. Exposed-fastener metal roofing is not inappropriate

material. However, since the structure on the side is non-contributing, it should be reviewed as new construction, which would allow the use of standing-seam metal roofing systems.

Linley asked the applicant, Terry Floyd, to come to the microphone sign his name for the record and speak to the COA. Floyd explained that he knew the house was in the historical district but he went ahead and ordered the material but the work had not been done. Floyd had it delivered but when he went to get the permit he remembered that he was not able to get a permit because he was in the Historical District. Floyd had to load all the material back up when he realized that he was in the Historical District.

Inaudible

Whitmer asked homeowner if the material could be exchanged and Floyd replied no. Linley confirmed the reception of the oversight by email and thanked Mr. Floyd for that. Enfield asked Floyd if this was a rental property and Floyd replied yes, but he was selling it to retire. Enfield asked if homeowner would live there and Floyd responded no.

Enfield said that fasteners through the roof eventually leak or rotten the roof. Homeowner replied that he planned on cutting off the top 2 feet of it and replaced it.

Inaudible

Parcell asked a question to Floyd but it was inaudible. Floyd replied I thought there was only 1 layer, but I think there is a 2 layers. Deb asked a question to homeowner (inaudible). Floyd replied that according to the last time he checked you were allow to put metal roof over 2 layer shingles. Hooley said he had talk to the building commissioner to double check because he was told that the applicant may had to re-roof if there were two layer shingles.

Inaudible

Linley asked if they needed to go back to the building commission. Hooley replied that it would get resolve when Floyd gets his roofing permit. Hooley said the bigger question was whether or not the board would approve the material. Floyd agreed with Hooley's question.

Zimmerman asked Parcell for the staff recommendations.

Parcell said that staff recommendation first choice would be asphalt shingles because that's what was there and it was typical for a modular construction from the 1970. Parcell said that they try to keep things looking like they were even if they are not historic and when it is non-contributing. Parcell stated that they do not have the new guidelines which would allow metal roof because it looked at it as a new construction but the current guidelines said that it should be something typical for that period of construction which is asphalt but it is non-contributing. Parcell continued to say that they normally do not recommended exposed fasteners because over time fasteners are not waterproof, end up leaking if they are not installed perfectly square and gaskets are exposed to the elements due to UV degradation over time plus the profile doesn't match what they normally recommended. Parcell said when we are talking about standing seam in the historic district we are talking about a historic house and this is not. It is a little different situation. Zimmerman said that they would stay with those guidelines.

Inaudible

Leichtman said that she would love to hear that actually.

Speaker presented himself as Steve Gruber. Grubber said he owned 3 buildings in the Historic district: 112, 116 and 128 Division Street. Gruber said he actually knew the house that this applicant bought the roofing material for. He asked the board if the applicant did not go through with it, what was going to happen to the roof and what was going to happen to the house. Grubber said we need affordable housing in this city and your ordinance; the very ordinance that created this body was at the best of the residents and it was not decided by the city.

Gruber continued to say the residents in 1980 none of whom live in the district; one is still alive, Emily Morrison Good. She does not live in the neighborhood. This ordinance that was created for the residents specifies: there is to be three annually elected representatives of this historic district to serve annually as liaisons to this body. Gruber said that the commission is operating out of compliance with the very ordinance that created their body.

Gruber said he lived across from 129 Division Street. Craig Gibson from premier Arts who committed \$160,000 dollars to that project but after meeting with Ann Linley he said to Gruber that he was not able to do the Historic ordinances. Gruber said it has been nine years since then and they would not sell it because people do not want to deal with the historic restrictions. Gruber said that in his 100 block they were much more aesthetically historic than what the applicant's pre fab house was. He said that Leichtman just walked the neighborhood and she had never been in that neighborhood.

Gruber was disturbed that nobody from this neighborhood was speaking for the applicant who bought nonrefundable building materials to preserve a roof for a little while. He came to the meeting with an invitation to see the progress on 129 Division owned by German Hernandez. He pointed out the masterful job that Mr. Hernandez was doing with recycled materials and preserving the German siding. Gruber stated since none of you live there, I commend you to go and visit him and congratulate him on helping to restore a family home. Gruber added that the property should have been occupied eleven years ago but no one wanted to deal with the Historic and Cultural Resource Commission.

Gruber said his home was 112 Division Street right behind vanilla bean and it was done after working on it for 2 years. Gruber invited everybody from the commission and Planning and Zoning department to his open house to walk the neighborhood on Tuesday, September 12 for them to see the real progress. Grubber said he would tell Kayla to send out invites. Grubber said the progress had been in spite of these regulations not because of them, the only progressive development had been by 501 C3 nonprofits that do not pay property tax or sales tax. Grubber added that they can get government grants, community grants, and family foundation grants. La Casa had its own construction team. They can say, hey, guys, we are going to stop because we got to talk about the pillars. No, commercial contractor would put up with that.

Gruber said your ordinance also says that the five members who are appointed by the mayor should be in the professions of construction, architecture not as a knows, but as experts who advised our neighborhood, because you serve at our pleasure. Gruber said that his urgent flea was that the city

needed housing. Gruber pointed out that there were other houses like the beautiful First Italian Nate house on Division Street which was rotting and nobody wanted it because they did not want to deal with the Historic ordinances and no contractor would touch that. Grubber stated it is falling in on itself and the commission wants to talk about the applicant's metal roof.

Gruber said that on 1970's he swore that there was a company with other drop in modular houses that had been there since before this ordinance and other 1970's horrible looking apartment buildings and they had to be painting their houses with historic colors, patching the roof because that's the only way to afford to live there was by doing the work themselves.

Gruber again invited Trotter and the City departments to his open house. Grubber said that he did not want to be their adversary but he loves the neighborhood. Grubber had lived there 12 years and none of the commission members did. Gruber recommended to leave the petitioner alone since the city was not able to take care of a pre-fab concrete deck behind Havilah Beardsley sculpture and an illegal multifamily apartment building behind Ruthmere. Gruber questioned the board why you are imposing on mine with a metal roof if the applicant did not have anybody on the board representing his neighborhood or investment.

Linley thanked Gruber and added to the record that Bobby Glassburn who was not present lived in the Historic neighborhood.

Inaudible

Enfield stated that as an architect and as a non-historic building the proposed roof did not make a difference. Enfield stated that he does not like the screws on surface fasteners but based on the character of the house he would move if motion in order to approve the metal roof if that's an order.

Linley stated that the Historic commission often received and looked at homes with the same situation with started projects as Mr. Floyd whom already bought the materials. Linley added that the commission had been working along with Deb Parcell to get the new rules which have been ongoing for three years to get the new Indiana standards. The new rules would be tied to what a house is rated which the applicant is nonconforming and it would be measured differently to Mr. Gruber and Mr. Glassburn's properties to be fair to those people who follow the letter of the law to keep magnificent homes. Linley said that the commission often received a number of neighbors saying they invested and they did not know the rules or they had language barriers like the one earlier. Linley said that there were a couple of assumptions made before the audience which were not 100% accurate reflecting the work of the committee.

Linley asked for a motion to approve **23-COA-07 for 415 Division Street** based on the staff recommendation. Motion made by Enfield, seconded by Leichtman; motion carried.

Linley said it had been noted that they had 3 to 1 votes but it meant the COA was approve. Linley referred the applicant to Hooley for the next steps.

C: Downtown Elkhart Historic Building Inventory

Linley presented the downtown Elkhart Historic Building Inventory.

Drew Wynes stated that he was a development specialist for the city of Elkhart during the summer. Wynes had the pleasure to work with 4 interns from Notre Dame Center for civic innovation. Wynes said the interns completed a historic building inventory, documenting critical information on historic buildings, downtown, and uploading their findings into ArcGIS. This information included photos, structural additions, current use, occupancy status, historical integrity and historical contribution. Wynes asked to commend the interns for their hard work and stated that they were there to present their findings and discuss their project. Wynes said that their final presentation along with 3 other intern groups would be July 26 from 5 to 7 at Pierre Moran middle school. Wynes thanked Trotter and the planning staff for their help with the project.

(Inaudible)

Linley stated that she was amazed and asked if the project was already completed or was an interim report. The intern responded it was already completed. Linley expressed admiration for the fast work done in a few weeks.

(Inaudible)

First speaker presented herself as Marisol and her team member's Kate, Duncan and Stephanie who was not present. Marisol said their project was a rich historical and cultural project that involved the ArcGIS and mapping system that involved multiple layers and documented multiple information that they had collected over the past few weeks. The project was based on the conditions of their circle buildings specifically around downtown Elkhart and a few areas further away. It had everything: the years of the buildings, the condition of the buildings and anything that had been altered or changed.

Duncan came to the mic and stated that they were tasked with going around downtown. They had 174 locations from the railroad tracks out of the town following the river over to Prairie as far up as Pottawatomie, and then just a few buildings scattered around the West side of 3rd street. Duncan stated we had to make a coding chart to establish what things meant. The red dots meant contributing and black dots meant they could not get to those properties. Duncan explained that they tried to use the same language that the commission used, contributing and noncontributing. Duncan explained that some buildings were not recognized as historical until the earliest 1973. Duncan said that he had to walk a lot and it was difficult to do 174 locations. Duncan stated that they learned a lot, met some nice people, and people wondered what their project was about. Duncan said that they added potential contributing category because they believed that there were some houses that were homogenized as Trotter would call them. It meant that it could be a modern roof, windows and siding over something that could have been original. That brought the following questions: if they removed any of that could they find a beautiful brick, original window frames or if that could go back to original, was it residential or commercial.

Duncan stated that few times they couldn't tell if the location was vacant or occupied and the hardest one to talk about was the structural additions. People kept old homes looking the same way

after additions so it was hard to tell if it was structural addition all in one go like the one on Washington Street built on the late 1800.

Katelyn took over the presentation and stated depending on the coding sheet they used the version of the interim report and they asked Dr. Danielle Wood for recommendations with the project. Katelyn said that they were not focusing as much on sidewalk but they could not tell everything just from looking on the streets. They used map property to look at bills.

Whitmer stated I might said this is an outstanding job. Whitmer said she was sad that they did not come to her office on Fourth Street. Linley said maybe next summer. Katelyn added that they are actually hoping other interns would expand on the project since they only had 8 weeks.

Linley stated that Mr. Gruber would love them to come over to their home to look at it and many other people who worked so hard from that neighborhood would love to share their information. Linley asked the internets what was the goal with all the great information gathered.

Duncan responded that they went for the homes that were not already acknowledge to bring attention. Duncan continued to say that they used the last interim report which was from 20 years ago and many homes as time went by have reached the qualification to have historical merit. Duncan said we were hoping to bring attention to those and have an asset, piece of data to look at if you wanted to see what those buildings held historically.

Linley asked if anyone in the commission had a question or comments. Linley thanked the presenters for the tremendous work done in eight weeks. Linley asked if the information was going to be access on the website or was just for internal use. Trotter responded probably both. Trotter stated that they have not worked on how the information would be published and would let Wynes work on it. Trotter encouraged everyone to attend their final presentation at Pierre Moran on Wednesday February 26 at 5'oclock. Trotter said he would be there representing the department.

Leichtman asked if they actually had photos of every stop since she was curious to know which property was on every dot. Duncan response was inaudible.

Linley asked if the presenters had questions for the board. They said no. Linley thanked the presenters and was looking forward to the full polished presentation next week.

Announcements:

A. NAPC Virtual Summer Short Course

Hooley read the NAPC virtual summer short course was coming up on August 23rd through the 24th and they were offering 11 aia, and aicp credits to register now. Hooley said there was another course coming up on August 2nd with exterior carpentry is trades training workshop series at Saint Joe County public library of South Bend. They were offering noon and 6pm classes through the next months. Linley asked for the new commission member if you had to be in the trades to attend or was it like the old window restoration. Hooley responded that it was opened to anyone. Linley said it was for anyone with ten dollars and if you learned 3 things from a class it made your money worth it.

Inaudible

Linley stated that the classes the commission had taken before were amazing and encourage them to go.

Parcell stated that she did not know a lot about the workshop. Parcell said it was a group that formed last year called Tradeworks in South Bend. She said it is a very interesting group of people. The group included Todd, Elicia Feasel director of the South Bend HPC, homeowners that have worked on their own houses and contractors. Parcell said they met once a month and they had what is called beer and buildings. She had heard it was fun but she had never attended. She said the program was getting some traction and they were offering workshop series where people came in and got trained. Parcell said that this group also connected with La Casa on a building that they had to do a 106 review on in Goshen. Tradeworks was able to get trim work out of that job and salvage all that stuff in their warehousing which was open to the public. People could go and buy vintage trim, stairs, doors, windows or whatever. Parcell added that tradeworks group at Logansport on the fall would give a public workshop demonstration and a little bit of training. Parcell thought that would be something they will be working with the different commissions they worked with and that this maybe something the commissions might want to promote or host locally and open up to the public for people to learned to do it themselves. Linley thanked Parcell and added that the rehab safety class was one that needed to be recorded and put on the website so homeowners know before they watch HGTV rip into a wall and poison everybody.

Linley asked if there was any comments or announcements from the commission.

Enfield stated that he saw in the minutes that his Middlebury school project was mentioned and he would report within the next two or three weeks to submit the drawings to the state of Indiana for their approval. Enfield stated that he did not know the client's timeframe since he was out of town so much and he hardly saw him, met him or talked to him. Enfield ought the commission to know this information.

Linley asked what his plan were for the building.

Enfield responded that they have twelve apartments plan for the structure. Enfield stated that the site would be totally redesign because of parking and landscaping but the exterior would not change except for the window and interior would totally rehab. Linley stated that it would be nice to see the building in use.

Adjournment:

Ann Linley stated she would accept a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 pm. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Zimmerman; motion carried.

Ann Linley, Chair

Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission

Meeting Thursday, December 7, 2023

Call to Order:

Ann Linley called to order the Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission Meeting for Thursday, December 7, 2023 at 7:04 pm.

Roll Call:

Present: Raymond Enfield, JA Whitmer, Ann Linley and Bill Zimmerman; Eric Trotter and Carla Lipsey with the City of Elkhart. Bobby Glassburn (via telephone).

Absent: Phalene Leichtman and Deb Parcell

Approval of Agenda:

Linley asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Motion made by Enfield, Seconded by Whitmer; motion carried.

Approval of Minutes:

N/A

Financial Report:

Eric Trotter presented the budget and the balance on the donation accounts. Trotter said that they had paid three invoices for 2023: the national alliance of preservation commissioners 2023 membership renewal, Indiana Landmarks commission individual memberships, and Indiana landmark's second invoice of their service contract. The beginning balance was \$8,000 and the final balance was \$320.

Trotter wanted to highlight for the commission that NAPC membership was an individual membership that allowed him to take continuing education on behalf and to support the commission's endeavors. Trotter stated that there was an option to allow all the board members to participate in the continuing credit program NAPC offered. Trotter added that since COVID they offered a number of online workshops that could help in depth many issues that the commissions faced in Elkhart. Trotter said he would get the renewal for 2024 and he would bring it up to the board. Trotter thought that if there was interest and it would be use then it would be something for the commission to consider for 2024.

Linley stated that she got her own membership the previous year because there were a couple of online conferences that were well done and they could be recorded or archived for future use in case a situation like that came up. Linley said that the timing on the conferences were a little different times during the day. Trotter agreed that classes were typically during the day. Trotter stated that he would bring it back to the commission when the invoice came. Trotter stated that they may not have enough money out of the current budget but he could take from other commissions since he was able to move money around Planning and Development services from the planning section if it was necessary.

Ann Linley said she would accept a motion to approve the financial report as presented. Motion made by Zimmerman, seconded by Enfield; motion carried.

Hearing of Visitors:

Linley asked if there were any visitors and asked Trotter if he would like to introduce their proxy.

Trotter said Kristen Smole was their proxy through that month. Trotter said the quorum was not enough from two to seven and she was close. Trotter said Smole was there in case they needed her. Linley thanked Smole for being there.

Linley said that Parcell was absent and she was at another meeting at Michigan City.

Old Business:

Trotter stated they were going to have a busy first quarter and probably 2nd quarter. Trotter stated that Mary Ann Lorentz building on East Lexington was purchased by Kil architecture of South Bend. Linley asked if it was the old copy shop. Trotter responded yes and stated that the new owners would do a full rehab and restoration of the building. Trotter said they had Indiana Landmarks information and Deb Parcell had spoken to the architect a couple times. Trotter said that the project would be coming before the commission due to some time.

Trotter stated that the property on W Franklin has sold again and they had been in touch with the new owners. The new owners asked for the list of outstanding issues with the exterior work that was not completed by previous owners and that would be coming to the board.

Trotter said 515 East Street, Wheelchair factory, was awarded with light tech credits. They would be seeking two or three different requests from the board: the first one would be the demolition, second would be the construction of sixty apartment building four story narrow very urban going straight back parallel the parking garage. Trotter gave them Deb's contact information to start the process of completing the paperwork. Trotter believed that the demolition approval would be coming to the board on Q1.

Linley asked if the board would be looking at infrastructure in the Historic District.

Trotter stated that there would be some discussion in the coming year about some infrastructure or the district which would mean that they have to take the streets up. Trotter stated that the infrastructure is over hundred years old and it was the last neighborhood with meaningful in major infrastructure work in the city. Trotter said that it would be coming. Trotter said that they would start some dialogue this year or future year on how they were going to address that because the entire neighborhood would have to be worked on.

Linley asked if anyone had any questions or concerns for Trotter. Linley added that it was nice to know that they would be needed.

Trotter said that Bobby Glassburn was trying to call into the meeting. Glassburn joined the meeting via telephone. Glassburn said that he had been in the meeting for ten minutes but his video was not working.

Linley asked since Glassburn was not able to connect via video how that would affect the board. Trotter replied that Glassburn was able to participate but could not vote.

Zimmerman asked Trotter if the infrastructure on brick street in the Historic District that was breaking on 2nd Street which ran from Prairie Street and dead ended in Dr. Martin Luther King Drive had been addressed. Trotter replied the street was part of the most recent neighborhood planning process for the Benham West neighborhood. Trotter guess was yes that the infrastructure street was part of that but he had not seen the plan yet. Trotter stated that there would be some discussion on how to deal with that since he knew that Zimmerman had some concerns about it. Zimmerman stated that it was getting pretty rough and really bad to drive. Trotter said that it was noted and he would get to the plan at the end of the year to report back to the board in January.

New Business:

Linley said that the 2024 Meeting Calendar was the Commission's typical schedule, with the meetings on the third Thursday of the month and COA file date on the first Thursday of the month.

Linley asked if anyone had a question or concern about the schedule and asked for a motion to approve the 2024 calendar as presented. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Enfield; motion carried.

Announcements:

Trotter stated that the city and the department of drone services were in the process of updating the zoning ordinance to UDO which would incorporate the current zoning, subdivision and the preservation ordinances. Trotter said the consultant was in the process of doing a draft to bring to the board and it could be presented either on a regular Historic commission meeting or a special one. Trotter said that they would be discussing the standards and how to put together the preservation and incorporate it into the UDO. Trotter said that they were thinking that rather than being a separate section that's going to be an overlay district with a separate set of standards that would then hyperlink to what the workbook that Indiana Landmarks had put together. Trotter added that they would be looking at more graphical and language improvements for the people who would need help for reference and eventually a Spanish translated version of the ordinance.

Linley asked if the single sites would become an overlay. Trotter replied probably it would not change because they each have their own individual ordinances associated with them. Trotter said that their ordinance would then incorporate them but that would have to reference the individual ordinances that each one of those are approved by. Trotter stated that they have not worked all that out and he was planning to go down to Indianapolis a couple of days to work there to move things forward. Trotter stated that Parcell presented to the plan commission on the uses and some of the development standards to inform the time frame to cross the finish line. Trotter wanted to keep the board informed that during Q1 they would have a special meeting or would be asked to participate virtually.

Adjournment:

Ann Linley states she would accept a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:21 pm. Motion made by Enfield, seconded by Whitmer; motion carried.

Ann Linley, Chair

DRAFT

Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission

Meeting Thursday, February 15, 2024

Call to Order:

Ann Linley called to order the Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission Meeting for Thursday, February 15, 2024 at 7:04 pm.

Roll Call:

Present: Bobby Glassburn, JA Whitmer, Ann Linley, and Bill Zimmerman. Eric Trotter with the City of Elkhart Planning and Development and Deb Parcell with Indiana Landmarks.

Absent: Raymond Enfield

Approval of Agenda:

Linley asked for a motion to approve two amendments to the agenda in order to add item 2.5 Election of Officers and Contract renewal for Deb Parcell with Indiana Landmarks as item B under New Business. Motion made by JA Whitmer, seconded by Bobby Glassburn; motion carried.

Ann Linley asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Motion made by Zimmerman, seconded by Whitmer; motion carried.

Election of Officers:

Eric Trotter stated as a reviewed the election would be a Chair person, Vice Chair person, and the Treasurer.

Linley opened nominations for the Chair. JA Whitmer nominated Ann Linley, seconded by Zimmerman; Ann Linley is Chair for the Historic Commission for 2024.

Trotter said that Zimmerman was Vice Chair previous year. Glassburn nominated Bill Zimmerman, seconded by Whitmer; Bill Zimmerman is Vice Chair for the Historic Commission for 2024.

Linley said that Whitmer was current treasurer. Zimmerman nominated JA Whitmer for Treasurer, seconded by Glassburn; JA Whitmer is Treasurer for the Historic Commission for 2024.

Approval of Minutes:

Linley gave everyone a minute to look over the minutes from May 18, 2023 to see if any corrections needed to be made.

Linley said she would accept a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Zimmerman; motion carried. The May 18, 2023 minutes are approved.

Financial Report:

Trotter stated that the starting balance was \$8,000 mainly to cover the contract for Indiana Landmarks and incidental expenses incurred by the commission. Trotter said that he did not recall the balance but the Historic donation account would roll over from 2023 to 2024.

Linley said that the financial report does not need to be approved because there is nothing to officially approve.

Hearing of Visitors:

N/A

Old Business:

N/A

New Business:

A: 24-COA-01, 515 East Street

Deb Parcell: Application 24-COA-01 for property address 515 East Street. The subject property is a contributing rated building, 20th century functional build around 1900. Parcell said that she got an interesting History fact from the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board that originally the building was a chewing gum factory.

Description of the proposed project: Demolition

Parcell saw the building and hoped that there was some way to reuse the building.

Applicable guidelines: Consider demolition only when fire, winds, flooding, or other natural disasters cause extensive damage to a building and its structural framework, and only if the building represents a threat to the health and safety of the public.

Parcell stated that this building does not fall into those demolition guidelines but it would be extremely difficult and expensive to rehab it because of the deterioration of the additions made over the years. Parcell stated that she recommended the same as the state of Indiana because of their funding, it had to be reviewed at the state level.

Staff Recommendation: Proposed demolition would provide space for construction of a new four-story 60-unit affordable housing complex in this location, also extending into the vacant parcel to the west. Two commercial spaces will be located on the ground floor. A surface parking lot will be constructed at the west side of the development, and new sidewalk and on-street parking will be added along Hug Street. The current occupant (Wheel Chair Help) will be relocating. Adaptive reuse of the existing building was considered, but was ultimately determined not feasible due to the substantial cost needed for rehabilitation and lack of space within the existing building as compared with that needed for the development.

An on-site inspection by staff found the building appears to be in condition where rehabilitation would be feasible; however, the multiple expansions over time would make the process very challenging. Although the proposed structure is greater in height than those adjacent, the ground drops off to the north of Division Street, allowing a four-story building to be at a compatible height with adjacent structures.

The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) also noted in their review that both sides of East Street between Division Street and the Elkhart River were historically occupied by manufacturing facilities, and thus it has always retained a different character than the residential neighborhood to the south.

Staff concurs with the DHPA recommendation that, if a certificate of approval is granted, the certificate have the following conditions:

- 1) Documentation of the building at 515 East Street in accordance with the "DHPA Minimum Architectural Documentation Standards" to be completed by Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority and approved by DHPA before demolition commences.
- 2) One interpretive sign discussing the history of manufacturing on the subject property and within the surrounding neighborhood, developed by Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority, designed by qualified historic preservation professionals, and approved by DHPA prior to installation.
- 3) An archaeological survey of the proposed project area by a qualified professional archaeologist be performed.

Linley asked if there was anyone from 515 East LLC to speak to the project.

Meghann Thannikkunnath introduced herself from RealAmerican companies whom are the developers and intend to be the long term owners of the property. Thannikkunnath stated that first she wanted to share a little bit about them. Thannikkunnath stated that they are primarily developers that comes in and builds smaller workforce housing. In this case they were never planning in coming in and demoing something and building a high rise or of large stature. Thannikkunnath stated that in this case unfortunately, despite their experience with Historic preservation where they have done acquisition rehabilitation, worked with historic tax credit, and are familiar with the process of rehab Historic structures and weighing that the tremendous need of housing in the city of Elkhart they have decided that demolition was the most feasible option in order to move forward.

Thannikkunnath said that Wall Street Journal ranked Elkhart as the number three emerging housing market in the US last summer and it has consistently maintained a top five position in the emerging housing markets index report. However, behind this growth is increased cost of living and pent up demand for housing. Levon Johnson, president of the greater Elkhart Chamber said "Our greatest restriction point is not just people it's a place for them to live." 515 East is a significant step forward alleviating this problem and providing much needed workforce housing. Thannikkunnath said that is the thriving urban core.

Thannikkunnath said that looking at the pent up demand and the need for housing in the city that is so beautifully growing and thriving, they did have to outweigh that with how much of the building could possibly be saved if anything. Their construction and preconstruction teams, vice-president of construction and development, and their director of preconstruction toured the building and determined structurally, as you heard in Deb's report, that it was just not going to be feasible to build the amount of housing needed on the site. Thannikkunnath continued to say for that reason they were moving forward at the commission approval if granted. Thannikkunnath said

that they already received proposals from qualified archaeologists who have already visited the site and have sent them proposals for the process of creating the interpretive signage as well as doing an archaeological phase 1A as mentioned in the state report requirements. Thannikkunnath said that there is a plan for a mural on the back of the building to add possible references to the historic use of the site, the chewing gum factory, the planning process that they had there or whatever else they could find in those sandbar maps that were continuously combing through for inspiration.

Thannikkunnath said that she was happy to answer any questions that the board may have specifically to the project.

Zimmerman asked could you define what you are terming as affordable housing. Thannikkunnath responded yes, it will be housing that is income based and in this particular project we have housing that is both income based and market rate. Thannikkunnath stated that the pend of demand in the areas demanding for a mix of income levels and they utilize the low income housing tax credit program in order to provide that valuable workforce housing at a variety of levels.

Zimmerman asked if there would be elevators in the facility. Thannikkunnath responded yes. Zimmerman asked if they are rate and standard. Thannikkunnath said that she believed that just standard. Zimmerman asked how many elevators. Thannikkunnath said that they have not started their official design on the construction or on the architectural side yet that is contingent upon this approval because they wanted to make sure they were adhering to the architectural standards of the area and she believed that the current plan is for two elevators. Thannikkunnath said that she would get that information for Zimmerman.

Zimmerman asked how many parking spaces will be attached to that. Thannikkunnath responded we actually received a parking reduction variance from the city because it is so tight. Thannikkunnath continued as currently plan they have the allotted number accessible spaces right next to the building it will be on the west side as where is planned currently and they got an additional fourteen additional non accessible spaces in addition to the at least four spaces and along with the parking variance received by the city they were giving permission to use the adjacent parking garage next to the site.

Whitmer asked Thannikkunnath to remind her how many apartments there would be. Thannikkunnath responded sixty. Whitmer stated not much parking. Whitmer asked a question that was inaudible. Whitmer said that there was a picture in the packet that was eyesore in the Historic district. It reminded her of the song "Ticky-tacky little houses on the hillside." Whitmer said that is not a reflection of what our area is and she asked Thannikkunnath if there would be some flexibility on the architectural. Thannikkunnath responded yes, absolutely and she hesitated to bring any renderings because she knew that. Thannikkunnath stated that to submit the funding application they needed to submit rendering and those were preliminary rendering which made sense for the site and concept.

Thannikkunnath said that in their solicitation for proposals for architectural designers they specifically said they wanted someone who was experienced working in a historic district and who was open to working with local Historic preservation voices in the area and those plans were very

preliminary rendering and was absolutely up for discussion. Whitmer was glad to hear that because that is not what she wants for the Historic district.

Whitmer asked Trotter if the applicant needed to come back to the board to present the architectural design. Trotter responded yes and he explained that this was a two-step process, first step was the demolition request and then the applicant needed to come back as they developed and finalize their plans and have a second request before the commission.

Whitmer said that the state had five requirements but Parcell only had three. Whitmer asked Parcell if the other two were not necessary. Parcell responded that those were necessary.

Glassburn: If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earth moving activities, the discovery shall be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two business days.

Parcell said that the other requirement is the certificate of approval is valid for two years but she assumed that it would start before the expiration date. Whitmer said that you would assume if the state found something they will report it and asked if they should have that concern. Parcell responded that the state will make sure that happens and she thinks that would not be a concern for the board. Thannikkunnath mentioned that is also in the contracts with the proposal received from the archeological team. Whitmer commented that she was sorry to see this building go because she liked the look of it.

Inaudible

Thannikkunnath said that they will do justice to the building.

Glassburn asked Thannikkunnath if the Indiana preservation board approved it back in October when they heard it or they are waiting on the Historic commission approval prior to their action. Thannikkunnath responded that they heard it on January 24 and approved it. Linley added that it was approved with the conditions that Parcell listed.

Linley gave everyone a couple more minutes to look through the paperwork.

Glassburn asked Thannikkunnath if the board approved it did they have a timeline to start the project. Thannikkunnath responded that if they got approval for the demolition they have planned to meet with the architects in two weeks to begin the design process and they are still working with the city to when the demo would actually take place.

Whitmer asked is there going to be a knock it down or is there going to be any salvage because there's interesting stuff in the manufacturing facility or nothing is worth in there. Thannikkunnath said that was part of their recon. Glassburn said that he was in the building one time and it was like a pack rat full of random stuff, Zimmerman seconded that. Glassburn asked if the current tenant have relocated or starter the process. Thannikkunnath said that they have started but is to be announce since she does not know. Glassburn asked if the demolition was going to take place after designs are approved for the new structure or the demolition would happen while renderings and plans are being made for the new space. Thannikkunnath responded that she would defer to Trotter because they are open to make sure they are in compliance. Trotter said that this being a new project and a new info project he assured the board that they would be working with staff with the

city and Indiana Landmarks to make sure that there's something that will be appropriate that the sport will approve at the end. Glassburn said that he was just curious on the timeline of it.

Linley asked for a motion to approve **24-COA-01 515 East Street** to approve the demolition based on the caveats by the Indiana Departments. Motion made by Zimmerman, seconded by Whitmer; motion carried.

B: Deb Parcel and Indiana Landmarks Contract

Trotter said the contract is for \$7,250 dollars plus \$35 per member of the commission and they will be break down in two installment payments of \$3,665 each. Linley asked the members if they have any questions.

Linley asked for a motion to approve the contract for services as proposed. Motion made by Whitmer, seconded by Zimmerman; motion carried.

Announcements:

A: Neighborhood update/Progress Review/ Nominations

Trotter made the board aware that they are in the process of updating the zoning ordinance to a unified development ordinance and as part of that was incorporating the preservation along with the zoning and subdivision. Trotter hoped to have a date from the consultant to mark their calendars and he apologized for not having a date. Trotter said that he would anticipate some working session to talk through the updates, ordinance and have some feedback to move forward into this new era of redevelopment in the area of the city. Trotter said that he will emailing the board members some tentative dates for meeting.

Adjournment:

Linley said that she would accept a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:36 pm. Motion made Whitmer, seconded by Glassburn; motion carried.

Ann Linley, Chair

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

All information requested must be completed on this application. If you have questions, please call the City Planning and Zoning Department at 294-5471.

Application is hereby made for a Certificate of Appropriateness as REQUIRED under Ordinance Number 4041 of the City of Elkhart, Indiana. For any structure located in a locally designated historic district, a Certificate of Appropriateness must be issued by the Historic and Cultural Preservation Commission before a permit is issued for, or work is begun on, any of the following: demolition or moving of any building; a conspicuous change in the exterior appearance of existing buildings by additions, reconstruction, alteration, or maintenance involving exterior color changes; any new construction; a change in walls or fences or construction of walls and fences; or a conspicuous change in the exterior appearance of non-historic buildings subject to view from the public way by additions, reconstruction, alteration, or maintenance involving exterior color change.

In addition to this application, there may be requirements of other state and/or local laws and regulations with which you must comply in order to undertake the project.

=====

Owner's Name Historic Properties of Elkhart, LLC File Number 24-COA-02

Address 221/223 Division Street Date March 11, 2024

Zip Code 46514 Cell: None Phone: None Work None

ADDRESS WHERE WORK IS TO BE DONE 221/223 Division Street

Existing Use of Structure (residential, commercial, etc.) residential

Proposed Use of Structure continued residential

Description of Project:

The project is two-fold: first, installation of framed vertical lattice on the three undersides of front porch. High quality lumber to be used, painted appropriate colors complementing the residence's current color scheme. On the back side of vertical grill screening will be fiberglass window screens affixed to keep leaves and grass clippings from blowing under the porch. Second, restoration of wood framed glass windows along the foundation. Windows will be inoperable, and wood frames will be painted appropriate colors complementing home's current color scheme.

The following documents must be submitted:

Site Plan Legal Description Photographs Building Plans
Samples/Swatches Other

Signature of Owner: Timothy S. Shelly Date: March, 2024





Elkhart Historic & Cultural Preservation Commission
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
Community Preservation Specialist - Staff Review

Application Number: 24-COA-02

Applicant's Name: Historic Properties of Elkhart, LLC

Property Address: 221-223 Division Street

Local Landmark or District: State-Division Street Historic District

Rating: Contributing

Architectural Style: Gable-front – Free Classic

Architect/Builder: Not known

Date Constructed: circa-1915

Description of structure: The subject property is a two-story house set upon a block foundation with wood clapboard siding, one/one double-hung wood windows, asphalt shingle roof, and two brick chimneys. A one-story wood porch stretches across the front, with hip roof, wood columns and balustrades, and wood porch deck. Concrete steps lead from the porch to the front walk.

Description of proposed project:

- 1) Installation of framed vertical lattice on the three undersides of front porch. High quality lumber to be used, painted appropriate colors complementing the residence's current color scheme. Fiberglass window screens will be affixed to the back side of vertical grill screening to keep leaves and grass clippings from blowing under the porch.
- 2) Restoration of wood-framed glass windows along the foundation. Windows will be inoperable, and wood frames will be painted appropriate colors complementing home's current color scheme.

Applicable Ordinance Authority: Section 12.6 of Ordinance 4041 of the City of Elkhart requires a Certificate of Appropriateness to be issued for a conspicuous change in the exterior appearance of the existing building by demolitions, moving, additions, new construction, alteration, color change or maintenance of existing buildings, including windows, doors and all exterior features, walls or fences. As such, a Certificate of Appropriateness must be issued for the work proposed at the 221-223 Division Street.

Applicable Guidelines:

Porches: Retain existing or original porches, including handrails, balusters, columns, brackets, tiles, and roof decorations. If wood elements are deteriorated beyond repair, replace with wood elements. Windows: Retain original windows. Repair, replacing deteriorated elements to match original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) Currently, no skirting exists at the base of the front porch. Vertical wood lattice is a typical feature at the underside of porches, is appropriate for this c.1915 house, and meets the historic district guidelines. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

2)Original basement windows should be retained and repaired. Proposed repairs meet the historic district guidelines. Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Filed by: Deb Parcell

Date: March 21, 2024