



The District was voluntarily submitting the Old Village School (OVS) partial demolition request, and at a future meeting would voluntarily submit the OVS site plan proposal for HDC review/feedback.

The School representatives present this evening were here to provide a brief overview and respond to any questions regarding this first phase of the application, which was limited to the partial demolition of the Old Village School. The demolition request was just for the walkway and elevator shaft, both of which were late additions, and were of no historic value.

Mr. Hamilton pointed out that they had discussed this partial demolition at an earlier HDC meeting. Tonight was about timing. They had brought documentation to show when the connector link and elevator tower were built.

Using her iPad, Ms. Raatz showed documentation that dated the construction of the walkway and elevator shaft to 1979. The framework for the breezeway was constructed prior to 1979, but the windows and the roof were added in 1979. In any event, those portions were added well after the original building was constructed in 1916.

Since Ms. Raatz only had the documents on her device, Chair Allen asked for 11 x 17 copies to be submitted for HDC records.

Mr. Hamilton said they needed to move forward quickly, in order to beat the winter weather, and also to prove access into the building at the demolition location.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mr. Hamilton said they were going to weatherize the building until they could come back for overall plan approval. The intent was for the area of the demolition to look exactly like the original building.

In response to a question from Commissioner Murdock, Mr. Hamilton said that the actual retaining wall would remain, and would be shown on the drawings presented for the December 20 HDC meeting. The landscape block retaining wall would be removed.

Chair Allen advised that all drawings for the December 20 meeting needed to be to scale, and the applicants should bring in sample materials, with colors, brands, chip samples, window and door manufacturers, etc.

Commissioner Field noted that tonight's approval was for the partial demolition as outlined only.

Mr. Hamilton said that the walls behind the partial demolition would be patched, with matching brick as shown on the schematics presented this evening.

Referring to page 2 of the supplemental information, Commissioner Field asked who had recognized that the existing connecting link and elevator/ramp were non-original? Ms. Raatz said that the documentation provided this evening demonstrated that those elements were non-original.

Chair Allen asked if there was going to be parking in front of the building. Mr. Hamilton said there would not be parking in front.

In response to a question from Commission Murdock, Planning Consultant Elmiger indicated that the application was complete.

**MOTION Murdock, support by Gudritz**, to accept the application as complete. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION Field, support by Murdock**, that the elements to be demolished, including the connecting walkway structure between Old Village School and Main Street School, as well as the ramp and elevator shaft from the rear of Old Village School, are not historically or architecturally significant, do not constitute a contributing resource, and therefore this partial demolition application does not require a public hearing. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION Gudritz, support by Field**, to approve the demolition of, and issue a Notice to Proceed for the connecting walkway structure between Old Village School and Main Street School, as well as the ramp and elevator shaft from the rear of Old Village School, based on the finding that the resource is not in the best interest of the majority of the community. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS:** None.

**9. DISCUSSION:**

2018 Calendar

Since the November HDC meeting was scheduled the day before Thanksgiving, it was the consensus of the Commission to change the date of the November 21, 2018 HDC meeting to November 28, 2018.

Discussion regarding process for demolition requests

A short discussion was held regarding process as outlined in the Guidelines for demolition requests. The following questions and points were raised:

- An attorney’s interpretation should be sought regarding when buildings must be offered for sale.
- The language in the application should refer to Ordinance and Guidelines language.
- If a property was hazardous, and couldn’t be fixed, how could it be offered for sale?
- If a resource was not in the interest of the majority of the community, it didn’t matter who owned it.
- Decisions of the HDC could be appealed to the State Historic Preservation Office.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that she was in contact with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding some of these questions and issues. Chair Allen said he would also be speaking with the City Attorney.

In response to a question from Commissioner Field, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the demolition Guidelines were referred to by the Ordinance but they were not in the Ordinance. The Guidelines were adopted by the City and by the HDC. The Ordinance stated that the HDC *shall* follow the Demolition Guidelines as follows (Section 42-27(4)(a):

The *commission shall issue a notice to proceed for approval of moving or demolition only if any of the preceding conditions [listed in subsection] 42-27(3) prevail, as more fully explained in the guidelines for the consideration of applications for the demolition or moving of structures, and if in the opinion of the commission the proposed changes will materially improve or correct these conditions.*

Commissioner Field thought that if a structure was found to be not contributing, or not architecturally or historically significant, it did not need to meet any of the conditions for the bases for demolition.

Commissioner Murdock asked how 2 different structural engineer reports – as had been completed for 341 E. Main, for instance – could be reconciled.

Mayor Roth cautioned against any conversation regarding the merits of that case.

General discussion followed. Any moving party – or applicant – had the burden of proof, i.e., the applicant had to rebut any material contrary to the original submission. In the case of demolitions, the City-approved structural engineers were chosen specifically because they were experienced with historic structures. The role of the HDC was to defend historic properties in the Historic District. The original presumption was *no* for any demolition request; the applicant had to prove why a property should be demolished.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Allen adjourned the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 01/17/2018