

HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Minutes

June 27, 2011

The City of Madison Historic District Board of Review held a regular meeting on Monday, June 27, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. in City Hall. Dirk Cheatham, chairman, presided over the meeting with the following board members present: Mike Pittman, Ann Roller, John DeLuca, Ginger Jorgensen, and Ron Hopper. Also present were: Mike Hoffman, Building Inspector; Darrell Auxier, attorney; and Louann Waller, secretary. Absent was board member Paul Davis.

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. R. Hopper made the motion to approve the minutes – seconded by M. Pittman – all ayes. (Note: There was a typo on page 410 – correction noted – thank you Ann.) *Minutes stand approved as recorded and distributed.*

D. Cheatham introduced Camille Fife, Historic Preservationist Planner

New Applications:

1. **Horst and Mary Moehlmann** – *C. of A.* for gable trim, sign and flower box to front face of the building. To promote new use as a Retail Bakery.
Location: **843 W. Main Street** Zoned: Local Business (LB)

Kevin Carlson present for application.

C. Fife stated we are really thrilled that Horst and Mary are opening a bakery on the west end of town. Utilizing a power point presentation, C. Fife showed a picture of the building before, streetscape, and neighboring buildings; there is an interesting history to the building – surveyed in 2002 and there used to be a mansard roof on it which has since been removed, that was an addition, gosh knows when – thought the building was an 18__ building but a photograph from our Historical Society showed us that there was a fire in 1892 so we're pretty sure this building has to be after that time period. C. Fife stated that the Moehlmann's have done a nice job – the shutters are something that were already there; pointed out sketch which C. Fife thought Mr. Carlson had provided which is not the case per Mr. Carlson. C. Fife explained that the trim and sign will be the primary thing they are doing on the façade. Mr. Carlson said the façade trim will be more wisteria type. C. Fife said she did not have a slide of that particular trim – that's a little more detailed than the picture. Mr. Carlson noted his design will be a little more scalloped, running trim will be a little more scalloped than picture, there is a house on Plum Street (tan with dark brown trim) – going for more of a dramatic chalet type of feel, trying to keep within the Historic Guidelines as well. C. Fife stated there is no evidence that we know of that there was trim on this building but on the other hand we don't know there wasn't and certainly a little gabled front like this could have had and would have been appropriate to have a decorative trim – so something like this, in her opinion, would be erroneous as there are a number of buildings around this with the same trim.

Mr. Carlson explained that the sign will be 2/3 of the narrowest face of the building not to exceed 20% of the height so it would be well within the Guidelines. D. Cheatham asked if there will be just the one sign on the building. Mr. Carlson answered there is a projecting sign that is hanging, it was approved when they (Mr. & Mrs. Moehlmann) had their other location here on Main Street.

In response to J. DeLuca asking Mr. Carlson what the trim material will be, Mr. Carlson answered it will be wood.

Page 2
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

G. Jorgensen asked for confirmation from Mr. Carlson that they have decided on the style, that it would be wisteria with the scalloped edge. Mr. Carlson answered that it will be similar to that, yes. G. Jorgensen noted they had several examples that C. Fife had provided to the board. Mr. Carlson noted that none of the samples are what he intends to do.

No questions or comments from the audience. No further questions or comments from the board members.

R. Hopper made the motion to approve as presented – seconded by J. DeLuca – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as presented.

2. **David and Jean Kinyon** – *C. of A.* to continue existing 6-ft. fence from gate across north side (approximately 4-ft.) and extend approximately 24-ft. along east side of the property. Remove a modern storage shed.

Location: **416 W. Third Street**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Power point presentation by C. Fife – stated this is a lovely home that the Kinyons have, can see picture of it on the right; shows their neighborhood; close in with their neighbors as all are downtown; picture showing the building from the rear and pointed to the existing fence on the left; new fence, as explained to C. Fife by David and Jean Kinyon, will match “this” fence, will be same; can see from “here” there is a small storage shed, which by the way is contemporary – quite recent – they are going to remove that; carry the fence down to the existing fence.

J. DeLuca said this was not his understanding. C. Fife said, okay, need to get clarification – pointed to a sketch. Mr. Kinyon explained the sketch was a picture of the back of the house.

J. DeLuca questioned Mr. Kinyon if it isn’t 20-ft or so to the back to the neighbor’s property.

That is right per Mr. Kinyon. J. DeLuca confirmed with Mr. Kinyon this is where the chain link fence is located. C. Fife explained all of that will be on their property. C. Fife then showed another picture of the back.

Mr. Kinyon told the board members they just want to finish up the privacy over there; John Paul Park is right behind them so it’s kind of ...really an open area.

M. Pittman asked Mr. Kinyon if they will keep the wrought iron in the front. Oh yea, per Mr. Kinyon.

No questions or comments from the audience. No further questions or comments from the board.

J. DeLuca made the motion to approve application as submitted – seconded by R. Hopper – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as submitted.

3. **Sally Wurtz on behalf of property owners: Kevin and Linda Malloy** – *C. of A.* to add exterior wood stairway on the west side of the dwelling to access second floor porch.

Location: **511 Broadway St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Application presented by applicant, Linda Malloy who said that she and her husband purchased this property last year and would like permission to proceed with the construction of an external staircase, going to use it for easy access to the second floor balcony which currently only has an access from the interior stairwell of the home. Mrs. Malloy said they are also considering to use it as a fire escape since there wouldn’t be any other escape from that particular section of the home.

Page 3
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

Power point presentation by C. Fife – Alfred Dunner home, built in 1849 – one of our lovely statuesque buildings on Broadway; picture showing the front of the building, left side, and believed the pictures gave a pretty good idea of the spot in the back and on the right is the west elevation where the stair would go – left shows a little bit of the _____ porch; showed sketches as provided by applicants (board also has a copy) so can see how it is planned. Mrs. Malloy noted they have not committed – noted there is also on the last page of her handout another sketch from another of the construction folks they talked with, just a little bit of a different perspective –

Mr. Marsh suggested that they use double kiln dried wood for the step risers and platform and then possibly cypress to continue the same railing and baluster – certainly paint white to continue that theme. J. DeLuca asked Mrs. Malloy which configuration she proposed. Mrs. Malloy said that the one she had here is probably going to be the configuration that they choose – really haven't had a chance to consider what they want, just got it today, just wanted to make sure the board had it. She added that it should be similar but she is not certain ... the rise on this one is just a little bit different, thought they would even the rise. J. DeLuca said it looks totally different, similar in that it is stairs but _____ comes from the ground up. Mrs. Malloy said they will probably go with the one that is presented as Camille has it in the power point presentation. J. DeLuca then asked Mrs. Malloy if the bollards and handrails would not be of treated lumber. Mrs. Malloy said that Mr. Marsh had suggested cypress – didn't know that they've made a decision on that yet. J. DeLuca said that his concern, was that they wouldn't use treated lumber for the bollards and the handrails, which just for clarification because he thought with the cypress on the verticals... because then it would match what they have already and the theme so similarly designed as opposed to say just square, treated lumber. Mrs. Malloy asked J. DeLuca what is his recommendation, sorry didn't ... J. DeLuca told Mrs. Malloy it's what her builder says. Mrs. Malloy noted that Mr. Marsh did point out that the squared bollards would be offset just a little bit to match the design of the current railing. There was clarification this is referring to the balusters. M. Pittman asked Mrs. Malloy if she wasn't basically saying they will not use treated lumber. No, Mrs. Malloy said he (Mr. Marsh) is suggesting double kilned lumber on the steps (the platform up) but the railing would be cypress – that was what he suggested. M. Pittman then stated that's not treated lumber, that is basically kiln dried. J. DeLuca explained that treated lumber is what you might put on a deck and it looks very traditional but doesn't have the same charm as the old wood.

G. Jorgensen told Mrs. Malloy the board understands why they want the stairs in the back because there is no access except through the porch and you have to go outside in the winter time. J. DeLuca added it is also for safety consideration. That is right per G. Jorgensen.

D. Cheatham said it looked to him that at one time there was a stairway there coming up through the decking on the porch. Correct, per Mrs. Malloy and they had considered that but then because they would like to take more advantage of the outside space, they thought they would put it to the west side of the house.

M. Pittman told Mrs. Malloy they have some major brick issues on the side. Mrs. Malloy said they know they do and have not had someone to take a look at that yet. M. Pittman said he just wanted them to know it needs some attention. Mrs. Malloy asked M. Pittman if he had a recommendation (contractor). No, per M. Pittman – advised Mrs. Malloy to talk to Camille. J. DeLuca explained to Mrs. Malloy as Historic Board members they cannot make contractor recommendations.

No questions or comments from the audience. No further questions or comments from the board members.

Page 4
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

R. Hopper made the motion to approve application as designed – seconded by M. Pittman stating he approves with the stairway being painted and no treated lumber – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved with the entire stairway being painted and no treated lumber.

- 4. Billy and Mary Beth Comer** – *C. of A.* to replace existing metal roof with a modern, laminated architectural shingle (Pinnacle Premium), a multi-layered shingle.

Location: **421 E. Fourth St.**

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Power point presentation by C. Fife stating this is a delightful home that the owners have fixed up on the interior and have kept in beautiful condition on the exterior; as can see in pictures, on E. Fourth this is certainly a contributing resource in our district; there are other homes around which do have a shingled roof; existing roof, as she understands it, has some problems with leakage; photograph of architectural shingles – laminated architectural type of shingle that looks, as she understands it, a shingle. C. Fife said one of the things she might add is that it is very, very common in this particular home – thinks it is probably an example, although she cannot prove it – maybe Link Ludington can add something or detract from what she is saying here, but period roofs of this type are often the second or third roof, this home may very well be _____ second or third, it does appear that way, so going back to a wood shingle these days – of course generally in purpose do not recommend going back to a wood shingle which is costly and a fire hazard – so, the second best alternative is to go with a shingle which appears much like the original wood shingle.

Mr. Comer said he could give a little background – a couple of years ago when they purchased the home they worked inside and then to work out, J.D. Mullikan was the one who did most of their interior – redid all the floors and his wife did most of that – but he suggested they replace the roof at that time and they chose not to, it had been repaired numerous times and this past year there has been a large amount of water and now have some damage inside, not major, but needs to be addressed. He went on to say they have contacted two contractors locally and had them look at the property and asked for their suggestions, honestly did not ask them about repairing, asked them about replacing and they both indicated that the roof needed to be replaced – and, there was a significance difference ...they checked going back to the metal and it was double, which this board is probably well aware of that, so they came in to talk to Camille and that is why they are here, to see if they could replace this.

M. Pittman stated there appeared to be only one other home having a metal roof in this neighborhood. C. Fife noted the other roofs in the neighborhood are shingle. M. Comer told that his neighbors, Jan Melton and Jane DeVito both have replaced theirs as well as well as the Taylor property across the street and ladies in a house behind ... M. Comer said this is their request, he has the estimates – both local contractors.

G. Jorgensen wanted to know if anyone knew the age of this particular roof. A little confusion on the question – answered by Mr. Comer said 1860's. Mr. Comer also said he has been told that next door had been a tavern at one time, have speculated as to what their house was because it is so small.

G. Jorgensen said she was not completely opposed to go to an architectural shingle as she has architectural shingles on her home, just replaced with more shingles, did go with sand or tan color because it would emulate the original wood shingle look.

Mr. Comer said that he might say one other thing, he was at the Jennings County fair this past week and saw there are various shingles out there now that are metal and they look ...there was a display and he spent a considerable amount of time with them, they were ready to come put it on tomorrow but didn't feel like he knew enough about it. Mr. Comer said they are trying to

Page 5
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

salvage as much as they can – now starting on the process of the outside, don't think you ever stop.

J. DeLuca asked C. Fife if there would be any use for the Historical Society to have this old metal – by the time you take it off it may be destroyed. C. Fife noted is a marvelous, somewhat kept secret and that is that they (HMI) do have architectural salvage from many of the buildings in town and she mentioned that here because of many people watching who might take advantage of that. C. Fife stated she thought it is worth asking – was over there not too long ago and didn't see much metal because usually once the roof is removed ...that might be a very good idea and they may welcome it because it might be reusable – don't know the condition of it or how it is...not usually once it has been used. J. DeLuca said he wouldn't think so but wanted to think about it beforehand and ... C. Fife said it would be a good idea to ask about.

G. Jorgensen asked Mr. Comer what color he is going to ...this board doesn't oversee color but out of curiosity what color is he...Mrs. Comer answered that the color will be black. Mr. Comer said that is what it is now – kind of dark gray. G. Jorgensen told Mr. Comer that she was just thinking if they are going to emulate the look of shingles...C. Fife told Mr. Comer that a brown color might be ...

Audience member, Link Ludington, said for consideration that black will make it more difficult for cooling in the summer as opposed to a lighter color. C. Fife told Mr. Comer that more heat will come in because of the black color – that is just the nature.

No further questions or comments from the audience or board members.

R. Hopper made the motion to approve application as applied – seconded by A. Roller – roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as applied.

- 5. Andy L. Lytle – C. of A. to install new 24-ft. x 24-ft. carport with storage shed on rear of lot off alley.**

Location: 717 E. Second St.

Zoned: Historic District Residential (HDR)

Power point presentation by C. Fife – photos of property. Mr. Lytle explained that the property on the bottom left would be his neighbors across the alley, towards Main Street, have looked around and like that design. Mr. Lytle noted there is a power line that runs right along his side of the alley so a gabled roof with the setbacks would not work real well there, so the _____ roof was something they looked at. Mr. Lytle further explained that the neighbors roof is a little bit taller than we ... (pointed to a picture) – neighbors roof is about 10-11 ft. height with no attic space so he would like to bring that down to about an 8-ft. ceiling so it wouldn't be as tall as theirs, but just really want to mimic that exact structure. Again, in utilizing picture, Mr. Lytle said on the bottom left it is just ... went out on Google images and just got something that looked like a diagonal type carport – guessed before he went and took pictures of neighbor's house...they probably wondered why he was in the alley taking pictures of their home. Mr. Lytle said that his property, if looking at the top right picture, his property would be right down on the right side where the car is – see a small tool shed that he is going to remove, temporary tool shed that has been there since he bought it – going to get rid of that. Mr. Lytle said since his would be 24 x 24, neighbors is 16 x 16 so what he would like to do is make it 24 x 24 which takes advantage of the whole lot – his property is 30-ft. wide so with setbacks it would be the entire width and then would like to have about a 5-ft. inset shed underneath the carport so it wouldn't extend outside of the carport.

Page 6
Historic District Board of Review
June 20, 2011

G. Jorgensen told Mr. Lytle what she liked about his plan is that it is consistent with what is going on with the other properties – thinks this is appropriate. Mr. Lytle said it was easy too, just went across the street, took pictures, and said they wanted that.

J. DeLuca asked Mr. Lytle about the tree. Mr. Lytle answered that with the gable roof, when they do the measurements, they are going to try to keep that and actually the whole reason to build the carport, which sounds pretty interesting, is to save the tree – the reason for the carport is that they are washing their cars about once a week so they wanted a carport to protect them that – tree will remain. Mr. Lytle also said the board can see where his neighbor, Tom, was good with their wishes and he built his fence around the tree which was nice of him – like to keep trees.

J. DeLuca told Mr. Lytle as far as the permit goes and the power lines there are some easement situations in the city and didn't know if Mr. Lytle would want to talk to Mike (Hoffman) about the easements, but there is a situation in town now with another house, owner is at odds with the city because owner built under...not sure exactly where and Mr. Lytle doesn't want to be the second case – doesn't know the rules for that but thought Mr. Lytle might want to check that. C. Fife said she agreed, first of all, this carport is not visible from the front of the street, only visible from the alley, and J. DeLuca's comment is echoed about checking with Mike (Hoffman) about the easement just to make sure...sure the builder will be careful too.

J. DeLuca commented to Mr. Lytle – thought he was here last year asking for vinyl shutters and Camille mentioned how nice Mr. Lytle's house looked from the front – good job – it wasn't conspicuous.

No questions or comments from the audience. No further questions or comments from the board.

J. DeLuca made the motion to approve application as applied – seconded by M. Pittman- roll call – all ayes.

Application approved as applied.

Business – Old or New:

C. Fife gave a report to the board which included:

1. History of her work since starting job as Historic Preservationist Planner
2. Preservation Resource Center at 225 E. Main Street – invitation to all to stop by
3. CLG (Certified Local Government) status packets were done within her first two weeks, have gone into the State to the Historic Preservationist officer – have been received, encourage them to give us as much consideration as possible and just found out today that they have begun the first review and they are going to put the technical and standard reviews together in order to speed it up – very excited
4. Because we have applied for CLG, our Historic Board has been invited to the camp which is a two day workshop for board members
5. Beginning to evaluate and collecting samples from other places to find out how we can streamline the sign application and streamline our other policies and procedures
6. As of next month going to find ourselves a preservation hero – want to nominate someone who has been before the board and has completed their project based on the things that were submitted and approved and is a good example. C. Fife stated she has given the board a few of her nominations, open to more – needs to be done quickly

Page 7
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

- because we want to announce it at the next board meeting in July
7. The empty downtown spaces have been a concern, is on her to-do list from day one, already met with Main Street folks and other people, hopefully before the end of this week will have at least a few displays in empty store windows, and for the next two weeks after that have a plan to collaborate, hopes on getting some artists into some of these buildings
 8. Collaborating with Main Street Program on website – workshops including Cornerstone, Main Street, and ourselves are sponsoring on our website – right now have a plan for a workshop in September, historic tax credits will be the subject, discover your house story (will be a great one on how to research your house), roof matters (thinks there has been a lot of confusion about what roofs are, at, or why should go before the Historic Board), and then have one suggested tentatively for March – Preservation for Us Poor Folks; possibly doing a workshop, sponsored by this board, and that is understanding our historic district and procedures and how people can find it easier to come before the board.
 9. Noted she has moved into an office in City Hall
 10. Working on a new website to try to raise awareness to some of our endangered buildings
 11. Have had a number of misconceptions and misunderstanding about people who have done something earlier and didn't realize they were supposed to come before this board – some of those issues will be addressed next month
 12. Attended a workshop in regards to Heritage Tourism in Washington, DC – was the only person from Indiana and certainly from a small town in Indiana to be there

J. DeLuca brought up about the roles of Mike Hoffman in approving and issuing C. of A.'s – don't know if he should, shouldn't, or what's to do or not but thinks should clarify the Ordinance Overlay that the board has received because it conflicts with itself – one page it advised he (Mike) has the authority to issue C. of A.'s for signs and that was issued in 1987 with additional responsibilities to follow – that was 24 years ago; and then, two pages later it says he (Mike) has the authority to issue C. of A.'s – so, again, not saying which way it should go but thought it should be clarified for Mike's benefit so he knows if it's his responsibility or not and the same with the board – maybe that is something Camille could put down as one of her responsibilities – just clarified in general. Camille said, as she understands it, the delegation of the authority for signs that fall within the guidelines of the ordinance, such as 20% of the overall space and 2/3 of the width of the building which is what _____ - believes that is what was delegated in 1987. J. DeLuca noted that he did not want to turn this into a debate, he acknowledges that – that is why he is bringing it up now and needing clarification because if you turn the page from what Camille just said and turn to “Judicial Review” and then Section 12 “Administration” it specifically says that he has the authorization to issue C. of A.'s and under “Administration” it doesn't say anything about signage nor does it imply that it has to come specifically from this board, so he just thought there needs to be clarification – need a sentence that says it's only signs – period – or it is signs plus anything else that he deems appropriate – we don't have a black and white understanding of that. Camille noted that is a very good point. D. Auxier said he has looked at this – if going to delegate to the building inspector it has to be by ordinance, ordinance would need to be amended to delegate what specific powers... The state statute does provide that there are four areas that you may not delegate to the building inspector and those are the demolition of a building, moving of a building, the construction of an addition to a building, or the construction of a new building – those four cannot be delegated, but everything else could be if the board saw fit to delegate. J. DeLuca said the reason...it is under Section 12 “Administration” and he said he quoted – “For the purpose of this ordinance the building inspector shall have the following duties – then has the list – concludes with “this may include the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness and such similar administration duties as are permissible under the law.” J. DeLuca said he found that kind of confusing because he doesn't know what is permissible under the law, but it sounds like as long as it is compliant, it is

Page 8
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

permissible. J. DeLuca went on to say that he thought a lot of the language from back in the 80's is very not very specific and may have had some very good reasons but it is causing him some confusion when... not to do his job or anything of that nature, but it is confusing as to who is doing what and why.

Also, J. DeLuca brought up about alleys – he had sent D. Auxier a note asking D. Auxier if he could clarify it. J. DeLuca said the ordinances don't mention the word "alley" just mention "streets" and then they have a semi-colon as though that is to mean something else but they never say it – but, as Darrell pointed out, if it is not specified in the ordinance you go to the zoning laws and the zoning laws define a street and alley as the same thing – but going back to the presentation about Mr. Lytle, you can't see it from the front of the house, only from the alley, well, if he sees it from the alley based on the interpretation, that's still something that is just as important as from the street so he is just saying to change it around so we have streets or alley in there and not leave it vague because he knows he has made some comments based on his reading of the ordinance that was given to the board having never seen the zoning ordinance, board either needs more education or just a clarification so the board can accurately do their job – and, maybe those people here who have lived here since their grandfathers were babies can understand it, but he is sorry, he is a 64 year old who has only been here three years so just trying to get his job done a little more clearly.

C. Fife said she might add just one more comment – on that multiple list of things she went through, two or three very important things that she thinks in the next six months or so we will be looking at and hoping the board will have an opportunity to do and she has mentioned that before - #1 procedures (want to simply that – more of an administrative thing than anything else, come up with a simpler way for people to know what is expected and how to come before the board – so that is a procedure); #2 policies – she has recommended to the board that they look at a couple of policies, one being the hardship policy and see if that might be applicable here – knows Darrell is looking at it as to whether we can instigate a policy without having to change the ordinance and then it is an old ordinance – 1984? (received confirmation of 1982) – and there are changes in the way we talk about things, there are changes in words and things and the way we understand. She noted this would be a little bit more long term but hoping can gather the best information to ultimately make it easier for all of us.

J. DeLuca said the last thing he would like to bring up is the Pittman's house – couldn't explain it in words but here it is – one picture is worth a thousand words – inconspicuous – showed a picture of Pittman house and told that last month M. Pittman was before the board for storm windows. J. DeLuca noted that contractor, Jack Patchin, did an excellent job and you can't see a storm window from one inch away.

Old Business:

M. Pittman said he had mentioned something about the way notifications are done with certified mail and what a pain it was becoming for not only the applicant but also the people who live around the applicant because a lot of people work, they get the notice, they have to go to the post office – don't know if you've had to sign for a certified at the post office but you have to sign, he thinks, two or three times now to get a certified so it is not an easy process. M. Pittman asked D. Auxier if he had looked at that. D. Auxier stated that he thought this is pretty much controlled by the board as part of procedure – one thing he did want to point out, if you don't use certified mail there is no way for the applicant to prove to the board that they have actually mailed the letters if they don't go by certified mail; we don't require that the person receive it, he didn't believe, just thinks we just require that it be sent by certified mail – many times we don't get them all back – have a mailing stub to prove the mailing. M. Pittman added that it had been discussed about placing a sign in front of the house stating they are coming before...D. Auxier

Page 9
Historic District Board of Review
June 27, 2011

said he knew the way the _____ people do it, they have a bright orange sign, think you pay \$2.00 for the sign, fill in the date of the hearing, what you are proposing to do, post in front of your house for ten days prior to the meeting and that's it. D. Auxier explained that the whole idea is to let the neighbors know that something is being done and that can be probably served as well with a sign as a certified letter. C. Fife agreed.

In addressing C. Fife, D. Cheatham said he knew they had talked about having a special meeting before the next regular meeting and asked if that is still appropriate. C. Fife said she would love to see, again – a couple of things – knows some people will be on vacation, but would like to have a session wherein the board meets in a special session to consider the first thing on her agenda and that is a hardship policy. She stated that she has not heard back yet from the CLG, so far they have asked for _____ - if they want us to revise our procedures and policies we may need a training session – she should hear back about that this week. C. Fife said it would be nice to know what kind of schedule the board members have so that when a meeting is scheduled we won't have a lot of people on vacation – knows some of the members will be gone during the 15th and 16th of July which is probably about the time we're talking so that's not...

J. DeLuca asked if she would like to stay tonight for a while for less technical things.

C. Fife answered that actually not tonight, would really like for the board to look the code of conduct which she pulled from another place and also a hardship policy, would like to have this on paper for members, can hammer out some of those details. C. Fife said that D. Auxier was going to let her know if this board can enact...D. Auxier answered that he is still pondering that because the only authority that the statute specifically gives is for practice and procedure, not the actual...C. Fife said the board might need to wait on the policies until Darrell has had a chance to check it out. J. DeLuca said just to stir the pot a little and go back to his reputation, he just wanted to say he is against the policy for the hardships based on the seemingly amount of information of finding out the value of your home and all those other type of things _____ particularly cost estimates in this economic time period. G. Jorgensen told J. DeLuca this is a common requirement in a lot of states – knows this board has not had a lot of experience with that kind of thing. J. DeLuca added that he knows that is so formalized that it scares him for here, but... C. Fife told J. DeLuca this would not be for a whole neighborhood but would be individually. J. DeLuca said for the individual it seems like a burden. G. Jorgensen said it is but depending on what they want to do, a lot of times the hardship clause is used for demolition, that's what she has seen it mostly used for – and, like what she has seen is for two years proof of income and proof of loss like you have to do is prove the loss of income on that property for a hardship case in order to have it demolished. J. DeLuca asked if this includes commercial property. Yes, per G. Jorgensen. C. Fife told that she has a policy from Fort Wayne that they have enacted – similar to what G. Jorgensen may have seen from the places she has been – but, one of the things she particularly liked about it, is the first paragraphs which in essence, giving the position of the city, gave the position that it was not the intention of the city to create financial hardship but rather to protect – thinks it would be something that she would like the board to consider, if they all decide they don't want to do it, fine but we do have a number of situations and here is how it is coming down that she has already experienced, people have a recognizable difficulty in that they can't pay five times the amount of one kind of roof or another – roofs seem to be our cross right now – and as a result for a building that is in economic/commercial use that could turn it from a profitable to a nonprofitable situation – now, if a person wants to come before the board with that as a claim it is fair that they need to document that, they need to show why it is a hardship – maybe not as extensively as that particular ordinance but could look at two or three other examples of how that is done. C. Fife said the other thing they are going to see a lot of is that we need to find a way to make preservation the right thing to do, the easy thing to do, and the reasonable cost thing to do and right now, even though it is much better than it has been in the past, but we're still a ways from that and when we can do that we're going to start seeing a lot more people feeling really good about this because it's not _____ and then people are going to pay a little more attention to do

Page 10
Historic District Board of Review
June 20, 2011

the right thing. But, C. Fife said she would like to wait on this and Darrell has to give his ruling anyway because we don't really know if this can be done as a board or if it needs to be an amendment.

Following considerable more conversation, ultimately a special meeting was not scheduled – will wait to schedule after the regular July meeting.

No further business to be brought before the board.

J. DeLuca made the motion to adjourn – seconded by R. Hopper.

Meeting adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

BY ORDER OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW

Louann Waller, Secretary