



**CITY OF
BLOOMINGTON**
HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

BHPC MEETING PACKET

Thursday January 23, 2025

5:00 p.m. EST

Prepared by HAND Staff

In Person: The McCloskey Room, 401 N Morton St., Ste. 135, Bloomington, IN 47404

Zoom:

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/86470652637?pwd=rX9vgWlboM2cZXBEPnhokqtzRhtKi4.1>

Meeting ID: 864 7065 2637

Passcode: 719258

Table of Contents

AGENDA	4
MINUTES December 12	6
COA 25-01.....	13
COA 25-02.....	15
COA 25-03.....	18
COA 25-04.....	29
COA 25-05.....	37
COA 25-06.....	45
COA 25-07.....	51
COA 25-08.....	60
DD 25-01.....	75
DD 25-02.....	77

Accessibility Statement

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals.

If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact Anna Killion-Hanson at the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department at anna.killionhanson@bloomington.in.gov or 813-349-3582 and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with.

Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call 812-349-3429 or email, human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

Thursday January 23rd, 2025, 5:00 P.M.

In Person:

The McCloskey Room, 401 N Morton St., Ste. 135, Bloomington, IN 47404

Zoom: [Housing & Neighborhood Development is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.](#)

[Topic: Historic Preservation Commission Meeting](#)

[Time: January 23, 2025, 05:00 PM Eastern Time \(US and Canada\)](#)

<https://bloomington.zoom.us/j/86470652637?pwd=rX9vgWlboM2cZXBEPnhokqtzRhtKi4.1>

Meeting ID: 864 7065 2637

Passcode: 719258

AGENDA

The City is committed to providing equal access to information. However, despite our efforts, at times, portions of our board and commission packets are not accessible for some individuals. If you encounter difficulties accessing material in this packet, please contact Anna Killion-Hanson at the Housing and Neighborhood Development Department at anna.killionhanson@bloomington.in.gov or 812-349-3577 and provide your name, contact information, and a link to or description of the document or web page you are having problems with. Auxiliary aids for people with disabilities are available upon request with adequate notice. Please call 812-349-3429 or email human.rights@bloomington.in.gov.

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. ROLL CALL**
- III. ELECTION OF OFFICES**
 - A. Chair**
 - B. Vice-Chair**
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. December 12th**
- V. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Commission Review

- A. COA 25-01**
 - 1112 S Madison St (McDoel HD)
 - Petitioner Vera Flocke
 - Removal of two awnings*
- B. COA 25-02**
 - 329 S Maple St (Greater Prospect Hill HD)

Chris Sturbaum

Removal of stone sidewalk

C. COA 25-03

112 E 3rd St (Fleener Building HD)

Petitioner Doug Bruce

New windows and replacement of door with a window on secondary facades

D. COA 25-04

1104 N Grant St (Garden Hill HD)

Petitioner Tyler Martin

New construction

E. COA 25-05

910 N Maple St (Maple Heights HD)

Petitioner Caylan Evans

New Construction

F. COA 25-06

215 E 16th St (Garden Hill HD)

Eric Ast

Rear addition, front porch, and alterations to front

G. COA 25-07

207 E 16th St (Garden Hill HD)

Eric Ast

Second story addition and front alterations

H. COA 25-08

711 W 9th St (Near West Side HD)

Aaron Prange

Replacement of doors, windows, roof, and siding on rear garage

VI. DEMOLITION DELAY

A. DD 25-01

1106 N Woodburn Ave

Valubuilt Construction

B. DD 25-02

321 E 10th St

Valubuilt Construction

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

X. PUBLIC COMMENTS

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Next meeting date is February 13th, 2025 at 5:00 P.M. and will be held in a hybrid manner,
both in person and via Zoom.

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Thursday December 12th, 2024

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by Co-Chair **William Fulk @ 5:00 p.m.**

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:

Sam DeSollar (Present)
Daniel Schlegel (Present)
William Fulk (Present)
Marlene Newman (Present)
Reynard Cross (Present)
Elizabeth Mitchell (Present)

Advisory Members:

Karen Duffy (Virtual)
Jack Baker (Present)

Staff:

Noah Sandweiss, HAND (Present)
Eddie Wright, HAND (Present)
Anna Killion-Hansen, HAND (Present)
Anna Holmes, City Legal (Present)
Eric Greulich, Planning (Present)
J.D. Boruff, Facilities (Virtual)

Guests:

Richard Crider (Present)
Lyndsi Thompson (Present)
John Simpson (Present)
Grace Hanusein (Virtual)

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 14th

Elizabeth Mitchell made a motion to approve minutes, Marleen Newman seconded.

Motion carried 5-0-1 (Yes-No-Abstain)

IV. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Staff Review

A. COA 24-48

110 N Walnut St (Courthouse Square HD)

Petitioner Carlos Lopez Aca

LED Signage

Noah Sandweiss gave presentation. See packet for details.

William Fulk explained a change in the discussion process. Questions and comments will now be followed with a discussion period before a motion will be entertained.

Commission Review

B. COA 24-46

119 W 7th St (Courthouse Square HD)

Petitioner Michael Chamblee

Rear addition enclosing non-contributing loading dock

Noah Sandweiss gave presentation. See packet for details.

Richard Crider further explained the changes to the loading dock.

Questions

San DeSollar asked if they are leaving the sloped slab of the loading dock in place. **Richard Crider** stated that it would remain. **Sam** asked if they would need to shim the floor and he asked about the foundation. **Richard** said it would be new block. **Sam** asked about details. The block will be coated in mortar.

Comments

Jack Baker likes the project and recommends approval. **Sam DeSollar** likes the scale but the sloped concrete might be a little weird. But overall the design looks fine. **Elizabeth Mitchell** likes the design. **Daniel Schlegel**, **Marleen Newman** and **Reynard Cross** concur.

San DeSollar made a motion to approve **COA 24-46** w/amendment that the Commission is fine if they need to replace the sloped concrete with a flat slab. **Daniel Schlegel** seconded.

Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

C. COA 24-47

701/703 S Woodlawn Ave (Elm Heights HD)

Petitioner Lyndsi Thompson

Window replacement

Noah Sandweiss gave presentation. See packet for details.

Lyndsi Thompson added to the presentation that the problem using storm windows is the property is a rental, the tenants want to open & close the windows. **John Simpson** agreed.

Questions

Jack Baker asked for clarification of the type storm windows being used. **Lyndsi Thompson** clarified the type of windows to be used and stated they would have to make the windows. **Jack** asked if under neighborhood guidelines the windows should be replaced. **Noah Sandweiss** clarified that the windows should be restored but if for comfort they could be replaced. **Jack** asked about fiberglass windows as he is unfamiliar. **Lyndsi** stated she could provide samples. **Sam DeSollar** asked about comments from the neighborhood. There has been no response. **Sam** asked if they would change the color of the windows. **Lyndsi** stated they will go with factory white. **Sam** asked if all the windows will have the same operation. They are all double hung. **Elizabeth Mitchell** asked how many windows will be replaced. 20 total. **Marleen Newman** asked if they would match the windows in the top and bottom. All the windows will match. **Reynard Cross** asked about the justification for replacements for the windows. He asked if there is any documentation or reports from a contractor concerning replacement versus restoration. **Lyndsi** stated that it was the tenants that asked about replacement of the windows due to heating and cooling issues. These are rental properties and three sets of tenants have complained about the windows. The petitioner is asking for guidance in replacing or restoring the windows. **John Simpson** stated that the replacement windows are very nice windows. **Reynard** asked if they are just relying on their tenants for information. **Lyndsi** stated that they had their contractor come and check the property. **Reynard** would like to see a report that supports the petitioner's position. **Lyndsi** stated they can provide a report.

Comments

Jack Baker stated he would like to see the material being used in the windows. **Sam DeSollar** has no problem replacing the downstairs windows but he would like to see a sample and know exactly what they are doing. But he has issues with replacement of the upstairs windows. But he stated that before they decide on this he would like to hear from the design commission of neighborhood. He noted they want like replaced with like. He reminded that the mission of the **Commission** is to maintain these buildings. **Daniel Schlegel** and **Elizabeth Mitchell** agree. **Marleen Newman** suggested there might be an alternative in double hung interior windows. **Reynard Cross** added that he would like to see a report on the functionality of the windows from someone who is qualified to make the determination if the windows are unrepairable. **Karen Duffy** agreed with

Marleen Newman and **Sam DeSollar**. **Marleen Newman** suggested a site visit. **Lyndsi** said Christmas break is a good time for that. **John Simpson** stated they could leave the windows the same. But it doesn't look good. But he wants to make the home look better and make the windows uniform. **Noah Sandweiss** offered options for approval or delaying or denying.

Discussion

Sam DeSollar stated he would like to see more information before deciding. **Daniel Schlegel** would like an extension if the petitioner will delay. **Reynard Cross** asked about the time line of an extension. **William Fulk** asked exactly what the commissioners want to see presented. **Daniel Schlegel, Elizabeth Mitchell** and **Marleen Newman** stated they would be available to do a site visit. **Lyndsi Thompson** will provide a sample window and coordinate with **Noah Sandweiss**. **Karen Duffy** stated that the commission can grant an extension only if the petitioner approves. **William Fulk** clarified what the commission is wanting to see that could be provided at a site visit or at the next meeting if tabled. **Lyndsi Thompson** and **John Simpson** agreed to an extension and to table **COA 24-47** until the January 23rd meeting.

Sam DeSollar made a motion to table **COA 24-47** until the January 23rd meeting, **Daniel Schlegel** seconded.
Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

D. COA 24-50

634 N Madison St (Showers Brothers Furniture Factory HD)
Petitioner Bloomington Redevelopment Commission
Metal flashing on brick corbel along exterior perimeter

Noah Sandweiss gave presentation. See packet for details.
JD Boruff explained why they are looking to replace the flashing and what they are planning.

Questions

Jack Baker asked how the flashing is holding up on the City Hall building. It is holding up well. He asked what material is being used. It is steel with a baked finish. **Sam DeSollar** asked how the flashing will run. The flashing will be bent and turned. It will match city hall in style and color.

Comments

Sam DeSollar stated that it will be good if you get the corners correct. **Daniel Schlegel** hopes this solves all the problems with the building. **Karen Duffy** likes the project. All **Commissioners** are in agreement.

Elizabeth Mitchell made a motion to approve **COA 24-50**, **Daniel Schlegel** seconded.
Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

V. NATIONAL REGISTER

A. KOHR BUILDING

601 W 2nd St

Claire Bushemi, Heritage Consulting Group

Noah Sandweiss gave presentation. See packet for details.

Questions

Daniel Schlegel asked if the building has always been named Kohr. It was named in the late 60's. Would the National Register effect a historical marker? No it will not impact a historical marker. **Sam DeSollar** asked if the listing will impact the future changes to the building. The nomination is as the building is now. But future changes will have to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. **Clair Buschemi**

stated everything so far has been approved by the National Park Service. **Jack Baker** asked if there is any opposition to the National Register. There is none. Would listing come before any tax credits? **Marlene Newman** stated that they would have to have the nomination before they get the tax credits. Which would be in two parts. The nomination should have no problems.

Daniel Schlegel made a motion to approve **National Registry for the Kohr Building**, **Elizabeth Mitchell** seconded.
Motion carried 6-0-0 (Yes-No-Abstain)

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Sam DeSollar asked for an update on **605 S Fess AVE**.

Anna Hanson stated that the material is on a 6 to 8 month back order. **Sam** asked what this means to the 60 day time period to repair. **Sam** asked if there are any consequences. That has not be decided as of yet. It was also noted that the building has been put up for sale. **William Fulk** asked if they have called out to the company to confirm the time frame. **Anna Hanson** reach out to the company to confirm the timeline on materials. **Sam** would also like to have a discussion about maintenance and notice of violations.

There was an update on working with the City Council. Nothing has been scheduled yet, as the council has been involved with 2025 budget issues.

VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

William Fulk adjourned the meeting @ 6:21.

Video record of meeting available upon request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 1112 S Madison St (McDoel HD)
COA 25-01	Petitioner: Vera Flocke
Start Date: 12/25/2024	Parcel: 53-08-05-401-045.000-009
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered L-Plan Cottage c. 1900



Background: 1112 S Madison is a turn-of-the-century L-Plan cottage set on a cement block foundation. While the house has had some minor additions and alterations, it retains much of its historic integrity.

Request:

"My historic home (1112 S Madison Street) has two old little roofs that previously sheltered door entries underneath. The two doors have long been closed, however, and are not in use. I would like to take the two roofs down. They do not serve a function, are aesthetically unappealing, and cause additional work when painting the house.

One of the two roofs can be seen from S Madison Street, the other one is in the backyard and cannot be seen from S Madison Street.

Behind the vegetation underneath the two roofs, which you can see in the pictures, is only siding material, no doors.

There is no realistic possibility to opening the two doorways up again. One of them is blocked by kitchen cabinets from the inside and the other by a toilet."

Cedar siding will be used where new clapboard is needed.

Guidelines: McDoel Historic District

Changes behind the front 1/3 of the house, along the sides and to the rear are not as visible from the street elevation and are not considered significant changes to the home.

Staff recommends approval of COA 25-01

The proposed removal of two awnings, one at the rear of the house and one on a southern projection near the rear of the home would not have a significant impact on the building's appearance or historic character. McDoel Guidelines take a liberal view to such minor alteration.



STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 329 S Maple (Greater Prospect Hill HD)
COA 25-02	Petitioner: Chris Sturbaum
Start Date: 12/25/2024	Parcel: 53-08-05-107-001.000-009
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Severely altered L-Plan Cottage c. 1900



Background: In 2024, the Historic Preservation Commission convened a subcommittee to discuss criteria for replacing historic sidewalks that have degraded to the extent that they pose a risk to public safety and access. While the city street division retains historic paving stones that can be used for repairs, the committee agreed that stretches of sidewalk on which a significant portion of the paving stones have become seriously degraded, replacement of the sidewalk with concrete may be an appropriate and feasible alternative for property owners.

Request: Replacement of damaged limestone sidewalk with concrete. This is a 52' length of sidewalk fronting the property.

Guidelines: Greater Prospect Hill Historic District

REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL MATERIALS

Avoid removing or altering historic material or distinctive architectural features. If materials are original and in good shape, means with which to keep them intact should be explored. If the existing material cannot be retained because of its condition, document the material and its condition and apply for a COA. If the desire is to restore or renovate to a certain design or style, provide a replacement plan and apply for a COA

SAFETY AND ACCESS

The BHPC will work with residents in the design of historic building entrance ways that meet special needs, are adapted to local safety codes, or respond to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. By working together, a common solution can be developed that benefits all, takes into consideration the property owner's desire, and protects the historical integrity of the structure.

When developing a project for handicapped access, consult the specific sections of these guidelines for the areas that will be affected. Develop a plan and consult with the Bloomington BHPC before submitting a formal application for the Committee's consideration.

New staircases, fire escapes, or ramps should not disrupt the facade or cover important architectural features, such as a principal entrance stair.
Unpainted, pressure-treated lumber should not be used.

Staff recommends approval of COA 25-02

More than a third of the stones on this length of sidewalk appear to be seriously degraded. While some nearby sidewalks of the same age are in relatively good condition, this stretch is in remarkably poor shape. While replacement in kind would of course be a welcome alternative to removal, repaving this length of sidewalk with concrete is a reasonable option. The applicant will have to contract the city engineering department to coordinate further permitting and the collection of paving stones.



STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 112 E 3rd St (Fleener Building)
COA 25-03	Petitioner: Doug Bruce
Start Date: 12/30/2024	Parcel: 53-05-33-300-002.000-005
RATING: NOTABLE	Slightly altered 1928 commercial building



Background: Listed as a local historic district in 2005, the Fleener building is a mixed-use 1928 brick building adjacent to the Bloomington Transit Center. Windows on the secondary facades and second story have been replaced, but the exterior is mostly unaltered from its original appearance.

Request:

December 30, 2024

Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission
401 N Morton St
Bloomington, IN 47404

Re: New window openings for 112 East Street

Dear Commissioners:

Please accept this statement and drawings for the proposed window opening project to 112 East Third St..

Written Description of the work

The owner renovated the existing structure in 2012 and created second floor apartments and first floor commercial space. The first floor commercial space has been vacant for over a year, with no nearby parking, it has been difficult to lease. For this reason, the owner wishes to create a first floor apartment, while retaining commercial space along the Third street facade per the UDO. This conversion will require egress windows for any bedrooms. We designed a plan that minimizes the need for new openings in the existing walls. We are requesting permission for the enlargement of two window openings below existing transom windows as well as the removal of a rear storefront door for the installation of a window within the existing opening.

Our proposal is for the removal of a small amount of existing brick to install a new window unit along the west facade at the first floor and the same along the south facade below an existing transom unit. We also would like to remove and replace the existing non original storefront door along the south facade to install a new window and wood panel below the window.

Additional details for consideration, the new window units will match the 2012 replacement windows in material, type, and color as metal clad wood units. No other exterior work is planned. The attached drawings show the existing structure and the proposed changes and materials. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Doug Bruce, LEED AP, NCARB
President-Architect
Tabor/Bruce Architecture & Design, Inc.

Guidelines:

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.


Staff recommends approval of COA 25-03

The proposed alterations would not disrupt the building's existing fenestration pattern, and the proposed replacement windows would match existing replacement windows on the building. The replacement of an unoriginal door as required for code compliance would not entail the removal of historic materials or a significant change in the building's features.

THIS PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE PREPARED BY THE ARCHITECT FOR THE CLIENT'S USE ONLY. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. THE ARCHITECT'S RESPONSIBILITY IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING AS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT OR ANY OTHER SOURCE. THE ARCHITECT'S LIABILITY IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING AS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT OR ANY OTHER SOURCE.

SITE PLAN ENVELOPE

1 1/2" = 1' - 0"



1 OVERALL SITE PLAN



UTILITY NOTES

1. ALL UTILITIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE BASED ON THE LATEST AVAILABLE RECORD DRAWINGS AND FIELD SURVEY DATA. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
2. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
3. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
4. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
5. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
6. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
7. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
8. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
9. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
10. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.

THE ARCHITECT'S LIABILITY IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING AS SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT OR ANY OTHER SOURCE.

<p>SITE DATA TABLE</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>NO.</th><th>DESCRIPTION</th><th>DATE</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1</td><td>EXISTING 2 STORY BUILDING OVERLAP</td><td>10/1/2011</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>NEW 2 STORY BUILDING</td><td>10/1/2011</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>PARKING AREA</td><td>10/1/2011</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>WALK</td><td>10/1/2011</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Bike</td><td>10/1/2011</td></tr></tbody></table>		NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	1	EXISTING 2 STORY BUILDING OVERLAP	10/1/2011	2	NEW 2 STORY BUILDING	10/1/2011	3	PARKING AREA	10/1/2011	4	WALK	10/1/2011	5	Bike	10/1/2011	<p>SITE UTILITIES CONTACT INFORMATION:</p> <p>Utility Name: 10/1/2011-2011</p> <p>Utility Address: 10/1/2011-2011</p> <p>Utility Phone: 10/1/2011-2011</p> <p>Utility Email: 10/1/2011-2011</p>
NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE																		
1	EXISTING 2 STORY BUILDING OVERLAP	10/1/2011																		
2	NEW 2 STORY BUILDING	10/1/2011																		
3	PARKING AREA	10/1/2011																		
4	WALK	10/1/2011																		
5	Bike	10/1/2011																		
<p>SITE PLAN NOTES:</p> <p>1. ALL UTILITIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE BASED ON THE LATEST AVAILABLE RECORD DRAWINGS AND FIELD SURVEY DATA. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>2. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>3. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>4. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>5. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>6. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>7. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>8. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>9. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>10. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p>																				
<p>GENERAL SITE NOTES:</p> <p>1. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>2. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>3. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>4. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>5. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>6. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>7. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>8. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>9. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p> <p>10. THE CLIENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.</p>		<p>ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN</p> <p>AS101</p>																		
<p>ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN</p> <p>AS101</p>																				


A NEW RENOVATION FOR:

BLOOMINGTON PLUS, LLC

112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

TABOR BRUCE
ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC.

1101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401
TELEPHONE (317) 322-4206 WEB: WWW.TABORBRUCE.COM



1 DEMOLITION PLAN - FIRST FLOOR


DEMOLITION PLAN NOTES:

1. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
2. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
3. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
4. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
5. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
6. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
7. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
8. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
9. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
10. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.

DEMOLITION PLAN NOTES:

1. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
2. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
3. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
4. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
5. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
6. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
7. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
8. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
9. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.
10. DEMOLISH AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS TO BE DEMOLISHED.


SYMBOLS LEGEND:




TABOR BRUCE
ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC.
101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401
TELEPHONE: (317) 324-0200
WWW.TABORBRUCE.COM

A NEW RENOVATION FOR:
BLOOMINGTON PLUS, LLC
112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

AD101
EXISTING DEMOLITION PLAN
DATE: 10/1/2007
DRAWN BY: J. BROWN
CHECKED BY: J. BROWN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"






- [illegible]

A NEW RENOVATION FOR:

**BLOOMINGTON
PLUS, LLC**
112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401



AE200



1 PROPOSED ELEVATION - SOUTH
1/4" = 1'-0"

AREA OF
WORK

PROPOSED

ELEVATION KEYNOTES:

- [illegible]

A NEW RENOVATION FOR:

**BLOOMINGTON
PLUS, LLC**

112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401



BRUCE
ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC.
1101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN. 47403
P: 317.335.4358 W: WWW.BRUCEAD.COM

1101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN, 47403
TOLL-FREE 800-335-4356 WWW.TWOCORRUS.COM

ET - BLOOMINGTON, IN, 47401
WWW.BOWTFAIRBOURNE.COM

REVIEWS



10/10/2018

0.000000

Page 12 of 12

PROPOSED

EXTERIOR

ELEVATIONS

3

Also


AF-21

ATCO


•

AE202

THIS SET OF ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS IS PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT DESCRIBED HEREIN AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PROJECT WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF T&B ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC. THE ARCHITECT ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR ANY DAMAGE OR INJURY TO PERSONS OR PROPERTY ARISING FROM THE USE OF THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS. THE ARCHITECT DOES NOT WARRANT THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS.



1
EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST
(NO WORK)



2
EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)

ELEVATION KEYNOTES:

- 1. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 2. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 3. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 4. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 5. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 6. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 7. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 8. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 9. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 10. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 11. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 12. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 13. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 14. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 15. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 16. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 17. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 18. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 19. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 20. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 21. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 22. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 23. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 24. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 25. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 26. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 27. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 28. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 29. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 30. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 31. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 32. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 33. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 34. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 35. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 36. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 37. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 38. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 39. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 40. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 41. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 42. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 43. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 44. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 45. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 46. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 47. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 48. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 49. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 50. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 51. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 52. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 53. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 54. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 55. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 56. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 57. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 58. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 59. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 60. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 61. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 62. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 63. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 64. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 65. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 66. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 67. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 68. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 69. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 70. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 71. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 72. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 73. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 74. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 75. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 76. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 77. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 78. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 79. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 80. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 81. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 82. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 83. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 84. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 85. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 86. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 87. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 88. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 89. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 90. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 91. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 92. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 93. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 94. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 95. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 96. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH
- 97. EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)
- 98. EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST (NO WORK)
- 99. EXISTING ELEVATION - SOUTH
- 100. EXISTING ELEVATION - NORTH

AE203



A NEW RENOVATION FOR:
BLOOMINGTON PLUS, LLC
112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

REVISIONS



[illegible]

1 PROPOSED ELEVATION - EAST
30' = 1" ϕ
(NO WORK)

ELEVATION KEYNOTES:

- [illegible]

A NEW RENOVATION FOR:
**BLOOMINGTON
PLUS, LLC**
112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401



ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC.
1101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401
TELEPHONE: 812-352-6258 WEB: WWW.TABORRICE.COM

June 11, 2004

[illegible]

PROPOSED

ELEVATIONS

-
-
-
-

AE204

1 PROPOSED ELEVATION - WEST GALLERY

AREA OF WORK

NEW SPINE

[illegible]

1 **PROPOSED ELEVATION - WEST (ALLEY)**
30' = 11.0'

A NEW RENOVATION FOR:
**BLOOMINGTON
PLUS, LLC**
112 EAST 3RD ST.
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

 **TABOR
BRUCE**
ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN INC.
1101 S. WALNUT STREET - BLOOMINGTON, IN 47401
TELEPHONE: (317) 353-6268 WEB: WWW.TABORBRUCE.COM

AE205

PROPOSED
EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 1104 N Grant (Garden Hill HD)
COA 25-04	Petitioner: Tyler Martin
Start Date: 1/9/2025	Parcel: 53-05-33-007.000-005
RATING: NON-CONTRIBUTING	Significantly altered 1940 duplex (Demo approved)



Background: On November 14th, the Bloomington Historic Preservation Commission granted approval for a proposal to demolish a non-contributing building on this lot. The property owner is now proposing a design for a new build.

Request: New construction

Guidelines: Garden Hill Historic District

CONTEXT FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Standards and guidelines serve as aids in designing new construction that relates sensitively to the surrounding context. Therefore, the most important first step in designing new construction in any historic district is to determine just what that context is. "Contributing" properties are important to the density and continuity of the historic neighborhood, but are not individually outstanding or notable architecturally. These classifications will be available on-line. Each property in the Garden Hill Study Area is described.

Each site presents a unique context. This is comprised of “contributing” buildings immediately adjacent, the nearby area (often the surrounding block), a unique sub-area within the district, and the district as a whole.

2. ISOLATED LOT. This is usually a single vacant lot (sometimes two very small lots combined) which exists in a highly developed area with very few if any other vacant lots in view.

Context: The existing contributing buildings immediately adjacent and in the same block, and the facing block provide a very strong context to which any new construction must primarily relate.

MATERIALS

RECOMMENDED

1. Building materials, whether natural or manmade, should be visually compatible with surrounding historic buildings.
2. When hardboard or concrete board siding is used to simulate wood clapboard siding, it should reflect the general directional and dimensional characteristics found historically in the neighborhood. No products imitating the “grain” of wood should be used.
3. Brick, limestone, clapboard, cement board, wood, shingles and stucco are appropriate materials.

SETBACK

1. A new building’s setback should conform to the set-back pattern established by the existing block context. If the development standards for the particular zoning district do not allow appropriate setbacks, a variance may be needed.
2. On corner sites, the setbacks from both streets must conform to the context.
3. Structures that are much closer or further from the street than the vast majority of houses in a given block should not be used to determine appropriate setback.

BUILDING ENTRY

Entrances may characteristically be formal or friendly, recessed or flush, grand or common place, narrow or wide. New buildings should reflect a similar sense of entry to that which is expressed by surrounding historic buildings.

SPACING

New construction that reflects and reinforces the spacing found in its block. New construction should maintain the perceived regularity or lack of regularity of spacing on the block.

HEIGHT

1. Generally, the height of a new building should fall within a range set by the highest and lowest contiguous buildings if the block has uniform heights. Uncharacteristically high or low buildings should not be considered when determining the appropriate range.
2. Cornice heights, porch heights and foundation heights in the same block face and opposing block face should be considered when designing new construction.
3. Consider the grade of the lot against the grade of the adjacent sidewalk as well as the grade of the adjacent neighbor.

HEIGHT AND SETBACK

1. A new house of the same height as existing houses may be as close to them as they are to each other.
2. A new house which is taller than the house next to it must be set back further from the side property line than existing houses.

OUTLINE

1. The basic outline of a new building, including general roof shape, should reflect building outlines typical of the area.
2. The outline of new construction should reflect the directional orientations characteristic of the existing building in its context.

MASS

1. The total mass and site coverage of a new building should be consistent with surrounding buildings.
2. The massing of the various parts of a new building should be characteristic of surrounding buildings.

FOUNDATION/FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION

New construction first floor elevation and foundation height should be consistent with contiguous buildings.

FENESTRATION

1. Creative expression with fenestration is not precluded provided the result does not conflict with or draw attention from surrounding historic buildings
2. Windows and doors should be arranged on the building so as not to conflict with the basic fenestration pattern in the area.
3. The basic proportions of glass to solid which is found on surrounding contributing buildings should be reflected in new construction.
4. Window openings should reflect the basic proportionality and directionality of those typically found on surrounding historic buildings.

Staff does not recommend approval of COA 25-04

New construction on a corner lot presents challenges because both primary and secondary elevations will contribute to a District's streetscape and will have to be considered. The overall massing of this design is significantly larger than other buildings in the context of both the block and the district, particularly Contributing buildings on the block of N Grant. Some non-contributing buildings in the district approach the size of the proposed build, though these don't contribute to the neighborhood's historic context and were built before designation. There are some multi-story contributing buildings in the district including a duplex at 1213 N Washington and a number of 1 ½ story bungalows—as well as 1200 N Walnut prior to its alteration in 2012. One Contributing building at 312 E 17th approaches its site coverage with a differentiated rear addition minimally visible from the street. The total mass or the massing of a new building's parts should strive to be characteristic of the neighborhood context.





1. REPAIRING, MAINTAINING, OR REPLACING THE EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING THE COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS, FOR THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS DAMAGED BY THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED.
2. CONTRACT TO MAINTAIN OR REPAIR THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED.
3. REPAIRING, MAINTAINING, OR REPLACING THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED, INCLUDING THE COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS, FOR THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED.
4. REPAIRING, MAINTAINING, OR REPLACING THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED, INCLUDING THE COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS, FOR THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED.
5. REPAIRING, MAINTAINING, OR REPLACING THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED, INCLUDING THE COST OF LABOR AND MATERIALS, FOR THE EQUIPMENT THAT IS BEING REPAIRED, MAINTAINED, OR REPLACED.




**SMITH
DESIGN
GROUP**
CIVIL ENGINEERING • LAND SURVEYING
1405 W. Arlington Rd. Bloomington, IN 47404
317.346.4300 www.sdginc.com

JOB TITLE
1104 N GRANT STREET
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA
CROWN PARK ADDITION
LOT 31

DAY	DATE

PLAN OF RETURN:
MONUMENTAL PLANE,
WEST ZONE

VICINITY MAP
★ PROJECT LOCATIONSITE
PLAN



312 E 17th St
64'



221 E
16th St

204 E 16th St
• 3 stories



200 E 16th St
• 3 stories

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 910 N Maple St (Maple Heights HD)
COA 25-05	Petitioner: Caylan Evans
Start Date: 1/9/2025	Parcel: 53-05-32-104-009.000-005
RATING: NON-CONTRIBUTING	Lot with non-contributing garage



Background: The lot at 910 N Maple has been empty since 2002, save for a 1975 garage at the rear of the lot. In May 2024, a plan for a new build on the site was denied out of concern that the proposed design did not relate to the surrounding contributing buildings in the district, but recommended that the plan was a good start. The project architect has since met with the neighborhood design review committee to come up with a new plan that better compliments the district.

Request:
New construction of two-story residence.

Guidelines: Maple Heights Historic District

CONTEXT

ISOLATED LOT. This is usually a single vacant lot (sometimes two very small lots combined) which exists in a highly developed area with very few if any other vacant lots in view. The existing contributing buildings immediately

adjacent and in the same block, and the facing block provide a very strong context to which any new construction must primarily relate.

SIDING

1. When fiber cement board siding is used to simulate wood clapboard siding, it should reflect the directional and dimensional characteristics found historically in the neighborhood. No products imitating the “grain” of wood should be used.
2. Brick, limestone, clapboard, cement board, wood, wood shingles/shakes used decoratively.

SETBACK

A new building’s setback should conform to the setback pattern established by the existing block context. If the development standards for the particular zoning district do not allow appropriate setbacks, a variance may be needed. On corner sites, the setbacks from both streets must conform to the context.

ENTRY

1. The front entry should face the street. The entry should face the street of its designated legal address. New buildings should reflect a similar sense of entry to that expressed by surrounding historic buildings.
2. Not all of the early 20th century houses in Maple Heights had porches however, the majority of them did. Incorporating front porch elements in the design of new houses is encouraged.
3. Accessibility for all new buildings is encouraged (see “Accessibility” guidelines for New Construction).

PORCHES

1. Inclusion of a front porch is recommended.
2. Porch height - see notes regarding ornamentation
3. Lattice or visual barrier below porch - see notes about avoiding gap under porch -
4. Columns and posts should be appropriately sized for the porch roof they are supporting and for the base on which they rest. Slender posts, with large roofs and massive bases, are visually out of balance.
5. Columns and posts should be an appropriate type for the style of house. For example, thicker square tapered columns are typical on Craftsman-style houses.

HEIGHT

1. New construction at the end of a block should take into account building heights on adjacent blocks.
2. Cornice heights, porch heights and foundation heights in the same block face and opposing block face should be considered when designing new construction.
3. If the area immediately contiguous to new construction does not offer adequate context to establish an appropriate new building height, the larger historic area context should be assessed.
4. Porch height can have an impact on the height relationships between buildings and should align with contiguous porch foundation and roof heights in a similar manner to building heights.
5. Foundation and floor line heights should be consistent with contiguous properties

OUTLINE

1. The basic outline of a new building should reflect building outlines typical of the area.
2. The outline of new construction should reflect the directional orientations characteristic of the existing buildings in its context.



MASS

1. The perceived total mass and site coverage of a new building should be consistent with surrounding buildings.
2. A larger than typical mass might be appropriate if it is broken into elements that are visually compatible with the mass of the surrounding buildings.

FENESTRATION

1. Creative expression with fenestration is not precluded provided the result does not conflict with or draw attention from surrounding historic buildings.
2. Windows and doors should be arranged on the building so as not to conflict with the basic fenestration pattern in the area.
3. The basic proportions of glass to solid which is found on surrounding contributing buildings should be reflected in new construction.
4. Window openings should reflect the basic proportionality and directionality of those typically found on surrounding historic buildings.

Staff recommends conditional approval of COA 25-05 with fiber cement siding and without stone veneer.

The proposed outline, design, and footprint of the design for 910 N Maple are consistent with district guidelines and reflect architectural elements from the district's period of significance. Compared with previous plans for the site the current outline breaks up the mass into elements that are visually compatible with surrounding buildings.

Staff acknowledges neighborhood comments about fenestration on the north elevation. While additional windows toward the rear of this elevation would be more compatible with surrounding historic buildings, the bump out near the front third of this façade mitigates the visual impact from the public right of way.

The lot is in a somewhat unusual position in the middle of a block, but next to a wide alley and a considerable distance from its neighbor to the south. The plan presented is slightly taller than its immediate neighbor to the north (approx.. 20 ft), which is one story but possesses a steeply pitched roof. Houses across the street on this block are at a somewhat higher elevation and include a two-story I-house.

The architect has indicated that the stone wainscoting depicted on the primary elevation will not be included in the built design. Fiber cement siding is also recommended to meet district guidelines.

Maple Heights Guidelines Committee

Comments on 910 N Maple Street revised plan

January 16, 2025

20 West Elevation:

The petitioner told us by email on 1-14-2025 that there would be no stone on the façade, that this was an error, and that he was planning to use horizontal siding (and, at

the top, wooden shake siding). We concur that we prefer horizontal siding, not stone. However, the current plan indicates “horizontal vinyl siding”: at our December 11, 2024 meeting with the petitioner, he had said the siding would likely be fiber cement, which we prefer for new construction


01 North Elevation: At the December 11 meeting with the petitioner, we noted that there were only three windows on this side. We note the addition of several windows on the bumpout, but it appears that 2/3 of that wall is still windowless. We wonder whether additional fenestration can be added on that side. Lack of windows on half of the outer wall gives the structure a fortress-like appearance. This will be visible from the public right-of-way.

Building height: We would still like to see the total building height from ground (at grade) to roof peak. We cannot tell without more context whether this building will appear significantly taller than surrounding houses on the block, especially given that it is at the crest of a hill. Ensuring building height compatible with surrounding structures was one of the major points we discussed with the petitioner on 12-11-24.

[illegible]

MAPLE STREET

ANALOG CULTURE OF THE ROAD



01 EXISTING SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

General Notes:

VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND CALCULATIONS WITH A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER. LOCATION OF FOUNDATION PIERIS SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN THE FIELD.

ALL MEANS AND METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION AT AN INSTALLMENT MEET CODE SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR.

CABINETS TO BE DIMENSIONED, DESIGNED & COORDINATED BY OTHERS.

PLUMBING DIMENSIONS ARE PENDING CABINET LAYOUTS. PLOT THE SELECTIONS, SPECS AND IN FIELD MEASUREMENTS/VERIFICATION.

NORTH MAPLE STREET RESIDENCE

910 N. Maple Street.
Bloomington, IN 47404

Square Foot Totals
Main Level
Upper level
TOTAL

2024-25
2023-24
2022-23

No.	Revision / Issues	Date
1		
2		
3		
4		

Project Name
DESIGN SET

Date
12-06-2024

Drawing No.
Sheet No.


Sheet Title

SITE


Scale

REFER TO SHEET

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



General Notes:

VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND CALCULATIONS WITH A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER. LOCATION OF FOUNDATION PIERIS SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN THE FIELD.

ALL MEANS AND METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION AT MINIMUM MUST MEET CODE. SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR.

CABINET IS TO BE DIMENSIONED, DESIGNED, & COORDINATED BY OTHERS. FINISHING DIMENSIONS ARE PENDING CABINET LAYOUTS, ROUTINE SELECTIONS, SPECS AND IN FIELD MEASUREMENT VERIFICATION.

NORTH MAPLE STREET RESIDENCE


910 N. Maple Street.
Bloomington, IN 47404

Square Feet Totals
Main Level
Upper Level
TOTAL

459


No.	Revision / Issue	Date
1		
2		
3		
4		

A1.0



01 NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



02 EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

General Notes

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. THE LOCATION OF FOUNDATION PILES IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN THE FIELD.
3. ALL VIEWS AND VIEWS OF CONSTRUCTION AT MINIMUM MUST BE COORDINATED WITH THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR.
4. CABINETS TO BE DIMENSIONED, DESIGNED & COORDINATED BY OTHERS.
5. DIMENSIONS ARE SHOWN IN CABINET LAYOUTS, NOT IN SECTIONS AND IN FIELD VIEWS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

NORTH MAPLE STREET RESIDENCE
910 N. Maple Street.
Bloomington, IN 47404

Finished Floor Total
1,125 sq ft
TOTAL
1,125 sq ft

No.	Revisions/Issues	Date
1		
2		
3		
4		
Project Name		North Maple Street Residence
Design Set		
Scale & Notes		
Comments		
Name		
REFER TO SHEET		A1.0

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 215 E 16 th St (Garden Hill HD)
COA 25-06	Petitioner: Eric Ast
Start Date: 1/9/2025	Parcel: 53-05-33-202-049.000-005
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered house c. 1950



Background: 215 E 16th St is a minimal ranch built in the late 1940s. The exterior is little altered from its original appearance.

Request: Raised front patio on concrete block foundation, removal of front awning, 17' rear extension, changes to fenestration on primary façade, and addition of rear covered patio.

Guidelines: Garden Hill Historic District

CHANGES TO THE PUBLIC-WAY FACADE

Existing architectural details (specifically original historic elements) for windows, porches, doors, and eaves on the public-way façade shall be retained or replaced in the same style or in a design appropriate to the character of the house or streetscape.

Retain historical character-defining architectural features and detailing, and retain detailing on the public way façade such as brackets, cornices, dormer windows, and gable-end shingles.

1. Retain the proportion of original openings. Replacement of windows and doors determined to be original must duplicate the original in size and scale in ways that do not visually impact the public way façade of the house and continue to reflect the period of the house.

MASS

1. The total mass and site coverage of a new building should be consistent with surrounding buildings.

2. The massing of the various parts of a new building should be characteristic of surrounding buildings.

PORCHES

Perhaps no other detail so uniquely characterizes Garden Hill as the presence and rhythm of porches along the street. In recent years some porches may have been reduced to small receiving areas. In neighborhoods such as Garden Hill they can be considered generous additional living space. Porches define the culture of an older neighborhood as well as how it looks.


Staff recommends conditional approval of rear addition, patio, and front porch for COA 25-06

The proposed porch addition is not out of character with the minimalist style of the house, and adds an additional outdoor space that is characteristic of many of the older buildings in the district. It may however, not meet UDO setback requirements and would need a variance.

The proposed rear addition is not visible from the public right of way, and extends a pattern of fenestration from the original portion of the house. The appearance of the building's massing from the street would not change and the impact on the building's overall footprint is modest.

The proposed alterations to the primary façade include the removal of a picture window that is a defining characteristic of midcentury ranches, and so would not be recommended by staff. An offsetting of the front door to allow for changes in the interior floorplan however would not in staff's opinion have a significant impact on the house's historic character.









STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 207 E 16th St (Garden Hill HD)
COA 25-07	Petitioner: Eric Ast
Start Date: 1/9/2025	Parcel: 53-05-33-200-012.004-005
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered L-Plan Cottage c. 1900



Background: A turn-of-the-century gabled el with some minor alterations including replacement windows. A sizeable single story rear addition was added after construction.

Request: Second story and rear addition and changes to front fenestration.

Guidelines: Garden Hill Historic District

CHANGES TO THE PUBLIC-WAY FACADE

The public-way façade is defined as the side of the house that faces the street to which the house has a public postal address. In the case of corner

lots, both the postal street as well as the cross street are considered public-way façades. As noted in the Purpose section, the most important part of the facade is the front third of the building. More flexible review is suggested for modifications directly at the rear or to the obscured parts of side elevations.

Existing architectural details (specifically original historic elements) for windows, porches, doors, and eaves on the public-way façade shall be retained or replaced in the same style or in a design appropriate to the character of the house or streetscape.

Retain historical character-defining architectural features and detailing, and retain detailing on the public way façade such as brackets, cornices, dormer windows, and gable-end shingles.

1. Retain the proportion of original openings. Replacement of windows and doors determined to be original must duplicate the original in size and scale in ways that do not visually impact the public way façade of the house and continue to reflect the period of the house.

3. Retain siding determined to be original. If using alternative materials as siding, the homeowner should use materials that are compatible with the original material's character. For example, horizontal fiber cement siding with identical lap reveal is appropriate. When hardboard or concrete board siding is used to simulate wood clapboard siding, it should reflect the general directional and dimensional characteristics found historically in the neighborhood. No products imitating the "grain" of wood should be used. Brick, limestone, clapboard, cement board, wood, shingles, stucco are recommended.

5. Prioritize retention of the roof's original shape as viewed from the public way façade. Chimneys may be removed unless they are an outstanding characteristic of the property.

HEIGHT

1. Generally, the height of a new building should fall within a range set by the highest and lowest contiguous buildings if the block has uniform heights. Uncharacteristically high or low buildings should not be considered when determining the appropriate range.

2. Cornice heights, porch heights and foundation heights in the same block face and opposing block face should be considered when designing new construction.

3. Consider the grade of the lot against the grade of the adjacent sidewalk as well as the grade of the adjacent neighbor.

HEIGHT AND SETBACK

1. A new house of the same height as existing houses may be as close to them as they are to each other.
2. A new house which is taller than the house next to it must be set back further from the side property line than existing houses.

OUTLINE

1. The basic outline of a new building, including general roof shape, should reflect building outlines typical of the area.
2. The outline of new construction should reflect the directional orientations characteristic of the existing building in its context.

MASS

1. The total mass and site coverage of a new building should be consistent with surrounding buildings.
2. The massing of the various parts of a new building should be characteristic of surrounding buildings.


Staff does not recommend approval of COA 25-07


Changes proposed to the front elevation include the removal of the door on the el, a defining characteristic of this style of house, as well as the removal of a window on the west elevation near the front of the house. The combined effect of these alterations would have a significant impact on the proportion of openings for the public way façade.

The alteration to the rear addition and expansion toward the north elevation would not have an oversized impact on the property, and neighboring houses across the block are two-stories tall. Because of the roofline's distinctive shape, care should be taken to design an addition that leaves this shape intact.











STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 711 W 9th St (Near West Side HD)
COA 25-08	Petitioner: Aaron Prange
Start Date: 1/9/2025	Parcel: 53-05-32-403-013.000-005
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered c. 1925 bungalow with contributing garage



Background: Built in the 1920s, 711 W 9th St is a minimal California bungalow with some minor alterations including to side fenestration. The two-car garage on the site was likely built between 1949 and 1961 with wooden overhead doors and aluminum siding. While the house is in good condition the garage appears to have been in deteriorated condition for some time before the acquisition of the building by its current owners.

Request: Replacement of doors, windows, roof, and siding on rear garage.

“I am keeping the walls and replacing the roof structure. We will be putting new windows and cement board siding on the outside. As well as new garage doors.”

Guidelines: Near West Side Historic District

When designing a new accessory building such as a garage, accessory dwelling unit (ADU), or storage building, the context to which the designer must relate is usually defined by the principal structure on the site. For the most part, the guidelines pertaining to new construction of principal structures (see previous section) are applicable to accessory buildings as long as it is remembered that there is always a closer and more direct relationship with an existing building in this case.

SIDING

1. Clapboard, fiber cement board, wood, decorative wood shingles, or brick when there is another brick structure on the block.
2. When cement fiber siding such as Hardie board is used to simulate wood clapboard siding, it should reflect the directional and dimensional characteristics found historically in the neighborhood. Products imitating the "grain" of wood are discouraged.
3. Efforts to maintain original materials are encouraged.

ROOF MATERIAL

RECOMMENDED

1. Asphalt shingle
2. Standing seam metal
3. Each roof material should be one color.

NOT RECOMMENDED

1. Concrete shingle
2. Corrugated metal
3. Southwestern clay tile
4. Bright primary colors

FENESTRATION

1. Creative ornamentation with fenestration is not precluded provided the result does not conflict with or draw attention from surrounding historic buildings.
2. Windows and doors should be arranged on the building so as not to conflict with the basic fenestration pattern in the area.
3. The basic proportions and distribution of glass to solid found on surrounding contributing buildings should be reflected in new construction.

4. Window openings should reflect the basic proportionality and directionality of those typically found on surrounding historic buildings.

Staff recommends approval of COA 25-08

The changes proposed to the garage at 711 W 9th St should not be visible from the street, and the proposed materials and changes to fenestration are in keeping with district guidelines and compliment the primary structure on the lot. Overall the exterior changes appear minimal. Furthermore, the neighborhood design review committee has signaled its support for the proposed alterations.

711 W. 9th External Inbox x



Peter Dorfman <pwdorfman@gmail.com>

to me, Charles, William, Karen, Beth, Sandra, Karlyn, Bob, Barb ▾

Noah:


The Near West Side Design Review Committee has reviewed the revised plan for a garage at 711 West 9th Street. We find nothing to oppose in this application.


Peter Dorfman
908 391-5921


Sent from my iPhone












① Section 1
1/8" = 1'-0"



② Section 2
1/8" = 1'-0"



Reafsnyder
Garage

Elevation Views

Date	11/4/24
Drawn by	Rendi C
Checked by	Aaron P

E2

Scale 1/8" = 1'-0"

POTTER ENGINEERING
Structural Engineering
P.O. Box 5563
Bloomington, IN 47407
Phone (812) 325-8083
EMAIL- kevinbpotter@gmail.com

January 15, 2025

Charles Reafsnyder
711 West 9th Street
Bloomington, IN 47404

Re: Garage Inspection

Per your request, we recently performed a structural inspection for your detached garage located on the rear of your property at 711 West 9th Street, Bloomington, IN. The results of this inspection are summarized as follows:

1. The garage has perimeter concrete block foundation walls that extend about 3 feet above the garage floor slab. The concrete block foundation walls bear on poured concrete strip footings below grade. Wood framed walls about 5 feet in height bear on top of the concrete block foundation walls. Diagonal wood boards are attached to the outside face of the perimeter wall studs and horizontal siding is exposed on the exterior. A wood framed roof structure bears on top of the wood framed perimeter walls. The original roof sheathing also has wood sheathing boards attached to the rafters. A large section of the roof sheathing has been replaced with oriental strand board (OSB) sheathing where previous water damage has occurred. The entire roof is clad with standard fiberglass roof shingles.
2. The perimeter wood framed walls are in poor condition due to water damage and damage from wood destroying insects (WDI). Damage has occurred to the wall studs, bottom sill plate, and top wood plates as shown on the attached photos.
3. The roof framing is very uneven resulting in waves in the roof surface as shown on the attached photos.
4. Horizontal ceiling tie members bear on top of the perimeter wood framed walls. The ends of some of the ceiling members are water damaged as shown on the attached 2nd photo.
5. Two overhead doors exist in the north garage wall. The overhead doors are in poor condition as shown on attached photo #7. A total of six windows exist on the east, west, and south garage walls as shown on the attached photos 8 thru 12. The windows are dated and in relatively poor condition.
6. A bump-out storage area is attached to the northwest corner of the main garage with the roof being an extension of the garage roof. (see attached photo #10)

7. The perimeter concrete block foundation walls were found to be in good condition with minimal cracking. Foundation settlement and lateral movement in the foundation walls has been minimal. The perimeter foundation walls are supporting a few feet of earth backfill due to the garage being built into the side of a sloped area.


RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The perimeter wall framed walls are in poor condition due to damage from water and WDI and need to be replaced. The roof structure is in better condition than the perimeter wood framed walls but still has defects and has a wavy and uneven surface. In our opinion, it is not feasible to replace the perimeter wood framed walls without replacing the roof structure. Temporary supports would be required to support the roof while the walls are removed and replaced. This temporary support would either require beams and posts or continuous temporary walls to support the roof rafters while the walls are replaced.
- b. Due to the condition of the existing wood framed walls and existing roof structure, the recommended construction sequencing for upgrading the garage is summarized as follows:
 1. Remove the entire roof structure.
 2. Remove the wood framed walls above the concrete block walls on the entire south, east, and west sides. Remove the entire north garage wall from the ground to the roof. The lean-to storage area at the northwest corner should be removed entirely.
 3. Build new wood framed walls on all four sides with a treated wood plate attached to the top of the block walls. Standard 2 x 4 stud walls would then be built up to the roof bearing with a double 2 x 4 top plate. Openings would be framed into the walls for the overhead doors and for windows as required. The exterior side of the walls would be covered with 1/2 inch OSB and finished siding.
 4. The roof would be framed with engineered roof trusses spaced 24 inches apart. A layer of 1/2" or 5/8" OSB roof sheathing would be attached to the top of the trusses and then covered with either shingles or metal.
 5. Installing finish materials on the interior walls and ceiling would be at the discretion of the owner.

Please contact us if there are questions.




Kevin B. Potter
Potter Engineering



PROPOSED GARAGE SECTION

PHOTOS - 711 West 9th Street, Bloomington, IN



Termite damage wall framing



Water damaged wall framing on west wall



Damaged wall framing at southwest corner



Termite damage at bottom of west wall



Damage above south window



Damage at bottom wall plate



West half of roof looking northeast – Note humps and dips in roof framing



East half of roof looking northwest

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 1106 N Woodburn Ave
DD 25-01	Petitioner: Valubuilt Construction
Start Date: 12/5/2025	Parcel: 53-05-33-204-081.000-005
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered pyramid roof cottage c. 1900



Background: 1106 N Woodburn Ave is a pyramid roof cottage with a rear and second story addition that closely match the style of the original structure. It sits on a limestone foundation and is fronted by a half-width screen porch. The house first appears in city directories in 1916 as the residence of Vint Vines, a foreman at Central Indiana Lighting who occupied the house until 1923. Between 1924 and 1934 the house was owned by the family of Harry Dunbar, a mechanic for JM Hoadley quarry. From 1934-1991, the house was occupied by Edgar and Alverta Helms. Edgar was a freemason and World War I veteran who worked his entire career for the railroad as an agent and telegraph operator. He was survived by twenty years by his second wife,

Alverta, who passed the house on to their son John Russel Helms. John Russel and his wife, Ruth, sold the house in 1992.

Request: Full demolition

Guidelines: According to the demolition delay ordinance, BHPC has 90 days to review the demolition permit application from the time it is forwarded to the Commission for review.

Staff Recommendation: Staff Recommends release of DD 25-01

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS	Address: 321 E 10th St
DD 25-02	Petitioner: Valubuilt Construction
Start Date: 1/8/2025	Parcel: 53-05-33-210-013.000-005
RATING: CONTRIBUTING	Slightly altered pyramid roof cottage c. 1900
	
<p>Background: 321 E 10th St is a pyramidal roofed cottage fronted by a 2/3rds limestone porch. The house appears in a 1907 Sanborn Fire insurance map, although the porch is marked as wood at this date. Prior to 1939, the house was occupied by a succession of owners: telephone operator RF Schmalz 1920-1922; Horace Payne 1922-1932; and printer Howard T Parham 1932-1937. From 1939 through 1972 the house was owned by seamstress Elsie Skirvin and her husband Elbert, a machinist for Showers Furniture. The couple rented out a room during their first few years in the house. Following Elbert's death in 1972, the house has been used as a student rental more or less consistently.</p>	
<p>Request: Full demolition</p>	

Guidelines: According to the demolition delay ordinance, BHPC has 90 days to review the demolition permit application from the time it is forwarded to the Commission for review.

Staff Recommendation: Staff Recommends release of DD 25-01.