

Hammond Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of October 1, 2024

Page 1

The Hammond Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, September 10, 2024, in person and via [Zoom.us](https://zoom.us).

The meeting began at 5:35 p.m.

PRESENT

Amanda Aguilera (IP)
Kevin Clutter (IP)
Laurie Czulno (IP)
Janet Evans (IP)
Patrick Swibes (IP)
Debbie McGough (IP)

ABSENT

Christopher Jones
Anne Taylor

ALSO PRESENT

Brian L. Poland, AICP
Director of City Planning

Tom Novak
Asst. City Planner

Shannon Morris-Smith
Secretary

Ray Escamilla
I.T., Zoom

PRESENT- 6

ABSENT- 2

QUORUM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Swibes called for a motion to approve the minutes for the September 10, 2024 meeting. Ms. Czulno so moved, seconded by Mr. Clutter. Roll call vote. Amanda Aguilera/yes, Kevin Clutter/yes, Laurie Czulno/yes, Janet Evans/yes, Debbie McGough/yes, Patrick Swibes/yes. 6 "Ayes", 0 "Nays", 2 "Absent", 0 "Abstentions". Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

COA Review – 24/02 5935 Hohman Avenue

Mr. Poland advised the Commissioner that a staff report and additional supplemental information regarding the standards and photographs were handed out prior to the meeting.

Lori Dedelow, Administrator, Montessori Children's Schoolhouse, 5935 Hohman Avenue, Hammond, IN 46320, represented the petitioner. Ms. Dedelow stated the request was for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the front landing. The landing was made of limestone. The limestone had water seepage that caused cracks, broken pieces, and created an uneven surface that has become a fall risk. The petitioner requested to replace the area with concrete and to saw cut the concrete to replicate the existing pattern. Ms. Dedelow further stated the concrete would be more durable and less expensive.

Nick Homan, Frasco Concrete, 8535 Madison Avenue, Munster, IN 46321, stated there was an inch and a quarter limestone that was thin. The replacement limestone would need to be much thicker. It was suggested to go this route as a more durable material.

Mr. Poland asked if the water infiltration and damage to the stones was due to settling. Mr. Homan stated it was not settling with the limestone being an inch and a quarter. The mortar joints were also heaved out. The base would be removed and compact it down. There was further discussion on the remedy and method of the repairs.

Mr. Poland reviewed the supplemental documents and photos with the Commissioners. The subject area was a 9x30 foot area up to the point of change in the material. There was a discussion on when there were previous replacements on the porch. There was a further discussion on the exploration of other options which included "stamping". Ms. Dedelow stated cost of repairs using limestone was \$30,000, and the concrete and saw cut method was \$12,000. Mr. Homan further stated that the current use of the property and the limestone method would not last as long as it did in previous years. There was another discussion on the sawcut and the tools that would be used to do the work to match the design.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. Mr. Swibes asked what was the thickness of the pad that would be sawcut. Mr. Homan stated 4" minimum. There was a discussion on the process of the repair materials. Mr. Swibes asked if there was any other part of the building underneath the front porch. Ms. Dedelow stated "No". Mr. Swibes asked if the joint lines would be the same as the drawing in the supplemental documents. Mr. Poland stated staff used this document to have a record of the pattern. There was a discussion on the pattern of the porch and the end point of the repairs before the stairs. Mr. Swibes asked what kind of finish would the repairs have. The finish would have a limestone look. The match would be taken from the newest color.

Ms. Czulno asked if the color would be embedded in the concrete or broadcasted across the surface. Mr. Homan stated "Yes" It would not be broadcasted which is typically used in stamping.

Mr. Swibes asked if there would be grout in the cut lines. Mr. Homan stated there would be sealer that would fill in the joints.

Mr. Swibes asked if there were any additional questions from the Commissioners. There were none.

Mr. Poland summarized the staff report, but it is presented in its entirety.

Background

The applicant proposes to replace the degrading floor of the front patio at the main entrance of the building, facing Hohman Avenue. This is an area measuring 9' deep x 30' wide for a surface area of 270 square feet. This area is centered on the front doorway of the building and lies between the front door of the building and the five-step staircase along Hohman Avenue. Starting on both ends of this area, the patio flooring changes to a brick paver material which will not be disturbed. The floor is currently made of relatively thin, rectangular limestone blocks installed upon a mound made of earth as its foundation. The preponderance of stones on the

interior of the flooring pattern measure 12" x 24". An exhibit attached to this staff report gives dimensions of the other stones which make up the outer bands of the flooring. Once the

limestone flooring is removed, the ground will be dug out to install and compact a gravel base. Then four inches of concrete will be poured. An one-eighth inch sawcut will be made to re-create the existing pattern of rectangular blocks. A water sealant will then be applied. The concrete used will be colored to match the existing limestone.

The Local Landmark was constructed in 1926 in the Neoclassical Style. It was designed by Childs and Smith and is rated as outstanding. The building is constructed of limestone. Purchased by Montessori Children's Schoolhouse in 1984. Local landmark status designated in July 1985. National Register designation in 2010 and the State Register.

Zoning

This particular work is not governed by Zoning Ordinance but will be required to comply with the applicable International Building Code and Indiana Amendments.

Landmark Standards

III. Standards.

2. Treatment:

Treatment shall be defined as any change of surface materials that will not alter the style or original form in any way. Such improvements, which include reroofing, glazing, resurfacing drives or landscaping lawns, involve a change that can potentially enhance or detract from the character of the landmark. A treatment change of any surface whether on the landmark or in its environment may require a Certificate of Appropriateness if it significantly changes the appearance of the landmark. The Historic Preservation Commission should review the proposed treatment for character and style consistency with the original surfaces in material selection, color, and scale.

3. Renovation and Additions

Renovation is the modification of a structure which does not alter the general massing. Any addition is a change in mass. A modification which involves the removal of a part of the landmark should be considered under demolition (see demolition.)

C. Materials Additions and improvements involving new material in the landmark shall be of the same material as originally used. It should also be of the same size, color, and texture. An alternative material may be allowed if it matches the original.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state:

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material, and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment.

Points of Consideration for Findings of Fact

-Are the material and design of the patio floor appropriate to the architecture of the building and compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment?

-Are any original or historic features of the building adversely affected by the sign?

-Is there a positive, negative or no effect on the appearance of the property?

-Is there a positive, negative, or no effect on the historic character of the property?

Mr. Poland concluded the staff report as amended.

Mr. Swibes asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. Mr. Swibes asked if the sawcut was 1/4' or 1/8'. Mr. Homan stated 1/8' sawcut.

There was a discussion on adding foam expansion joints to the repair method at the sides near the building's wall and near the stairs. The consensus was to approve the use.

Ms. McGough motioned to accept Findings of Fact regarding case 2024/02, Northern States Life Insurance Co., Montessori Children's Schoolhouse, 5935 Hohman Avenue, Hammond, IN, being heard on October 1, 2024, with the Lori Dedelow in attendance. The property was the Northern States Life Insurance Co., Montessori Children's Schoolhouse, a local landmark, National Register and State Register with an outstanding rating. The property was located as the Northern States Life Insurance Co. under restoration standards. The proposal was to replace the limestone patio landing on the west side of the building for an area measuring 9'x30' centered on the doorway with concrete and sawcut grooves to replicate 1/8' sawcut grooves to replicate the joint pattern of the original stone. The concrete color would match the existing limestone. Changes clarified at the meeting were the surface will be covered with a clear waterproofing to fill in the joints. The expansion joints on the outer perimeter of the building and the main staircase. The joints may be modified to be larger than 1/8' to compensate for the expansion joint. The expansion area would be in cut. The unique circumstances identified by the applicant was addressed by the contractor: 1. Water infiltration; 2. Correcting the hazard of the uneven surfaces; 3. Matching the Color; 4. Incorporating the Expansion joints in the drawing; 5. Most cost-effective method between Stamping and installing new limestone. Identification of specific factors and its effect on the historic integrity and character of the building and/or district were that the material is not visible from the street. There are no applicable precedents. The changes were appropriate and will have no adverse effect on the historic integrity of the property.

Motion seconded by Ms. Czulno. Roll call vote. Amanda Aguilera/yes, Kevin Clutter/yes, Laurie Czulno/yes, Janet Evans/yes, Debbie McGough/yes, Patrick Swibes/yes. 6 "Ayes", 0 "Nays", 2 "Absent", 0 "Abstentions". Motion carried.

Ms. McGough motioned to grant approval based on the Findings of Facts for case number 2024/02 that a COA shall be granted, seconded by Ms. Czulno. Roll call vote. Amanda Aguilera/yes, Kevin Clutter/yes, Laurie Czulno/yes, Janet Evans/yes, Debbie McGough/yes, Patrick Swibes/yes. 6 "Ayes", 0 "Nays", 2 "Absent", 0 "Abstentions". Motion carried.

Mr. Swibes asked when the work would begin. Ms. Dedelow stated the target was before the winter. Mr. Swibes asked how long the repair work would take. Mr. Homan stated 1-2 days. There was a discussion on Stamping the remaining brick. Mr. Poland stated the need for a further discussion with staff.

OLD BUSINESS

Educational Assistance and Communications Committee

On-line displays – Ms. Czulno stated a committee meeting was scheduled for the next day. The committee would finalize the text for Northern States Life Insurance Co. Mr. Poland stated if the change was not substantial the committee did not need to reach out to him for a new review.

Mr. Novak advised the committee that the photos they submitted to him have been received.

2024 Project/Little Red Schoolhouse – Ms. Aguilera stated she would restart going through the archives. Mr. Poland asked if she has found any documents regarding the move of the building and any agreements made with the Parks Department. Ms. Aguilera stated she has not worked in the section that she believes those documents may be kept. Mr. Poland reminded Ms. Aguilera to let the Commission when she comes across those documents.

Special Projects Committee – There were no new updates.

Designation Committee – Mr. Swibes stated the committee was not able to set up a meeting.

Design Review Committee – There were no new updates.

229 Ogden Street- Towle House – There were no new updates

CORRESPONDENCE

There was none

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

There were none.

STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Poland discussed the COA procedure with the Commissioners. It was suggested that the Commissioners think about what they could learn from the experience to improve on it.

Mr. Novak announced the Oak Hill Cemetery tour on Sunday, October 6, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.

LIAISON COMMENTS

There was none.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. McGough motioned to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Czulno. The meeting adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

APPROVED: August 5, 2025 for James S Evans
Patrick Swibes, Chairperson
Janet Evans Vice-Chairperson.

ATTEST: for Brian Poland
Shannon Morris-Smith, Secretary
Brian Poland, Dir. of City Planning