

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** June 7, 2000

**TIME:** 7:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Urbana City Building  
400 Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alice Novak, Liz Cardman, Lachlan Blair,  
Richard Cahill, Trent Shepard, Paul Ecklor.

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Art Zangerl

**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Tyler, Asst. City Planner  
Rob Kowalski, Senior Planner  
Pat Tarte, Recording Secretary

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM**

The meeting was called to order by Urbana Historic Preservation Commission Chairperson Alice Novak at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was declared present.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Mr. Kowalski presented the changes to the Agenda with an amended Agenda that he passed out at the meeting.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Shepard moved that the Minutes for May 17, 2000 be approved as presented. Ms. Cardman seconded the motion. The minutes were approved, as presented, by unanimous voice vote.

#### **4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

#### **5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### **HP007-T-00 Historic Preservation Text Amendment**

Mr. Kowalski presented an overview of the three main points to be discussed.

1. Multiple owners / fifty percent (50%) for district designation and protest: Section XII-4-A-2 and XII-4-E-1b.
2. City Council Action: Section XII-4-G-5, 6 and XII-5-F-2.
3. Building Permits Previously Issued: Section XII-8.

Mr. Kowalski concluded the presentation with a staff recommendation for approval of the Amendment.

Ms. Cardman suggested that she would prefer that the word “majority ” of owners be substituted for the 75 % figure recommended by the City Legal Department. She felt there would be less confusion. Mr. Kowalski pointed out that in the case of two equal owners it would take 100% to be a majority. He also said staff had determined that the figure needs to be higher than 50%. Mr. Shepard stated that there might be a possibility of confusion over whether the words were referring to people or to the percentage of ownership. During the discussion of this subject it was decided that the consensus of the Commission was that they preferred the use of the word “majority” to a stated percentage, so long as it met the approval of City Legal staff.

Mr. Cahill stated that in the Certificate of Appropriateness review he would like to see included on page 219 and page 222 that an owner should be made aware that an application has been submitted on his property and additionally should be told, that during the notification period, he is subject to that process and can make no changes to his property until the application process is completed. He felt it should also apply to a structure in a proposed Historic District. He noted that the people in the district should be told that they would need a Certificate of Appropriateness in order to do anything to their structures. Mr. Kowalski agreed that an owner probably would not know of these restrictions unless he or she was familiar with the Ordinance. He said language could be added to the Amendment that would state something to the effect that the notification process would include details that would explain that a Certificate of Appropriateness would be required for any alterations.

Mr. Shepard asked if the Landmark designation application, as described under Section 1-A, page 221 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, is submitted by the property owner, has to go before the City Council. He explained that his understanding was that if the application is for a Landmark designation and is submitted by the owner it can be approved or denied by the

Commission. Ms. Novak agreed that was correct. Mr. Cahill suggested that subsection B could be combined with subsection A to relieve confusion.

Mr. Shepard suggested that the second line on page 222 under the Previously Issued Permits paragraph which reads “the date the Secretary receives an application” should be changed to read “the date the Secretary receives a *completed* application”. Ms. Tyler said that from the time the application is submitted Staff has (5) days to complete the process and that during that time no new building permits can be issued for the property. She noted that if the change in language is made it could cause more confusion.

Ms. Novak asked what had been decided during the previous meeting on defining what a complete application is. Mr. Kowalski answered that the Commission had decided that they would not get into the details in the Ordinance and that it would be left to the discretion of the Secretary. He added there would be a checklist included with the application that would explain what is expected.

Ms. Novak referred to page 217 of the Ordinance and asked if there is still a problem with having multiple owners for a parcel and the need for agreement by a majority of the owners per parcel for a protest. Mr. Kowalski noted that this was explained in Section 1-b. Ms. Tyler suggested that the wording could read a majority of at least 40% of the multiple owners.

Ms. Novak noted that there were three changes to the revised document. She said that there was the correction to the example on page 217, Section 1-b changing 75% to “majority”. And on page 219, Section B-b adding clarification on the requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness and on page 215 that District owners would also have to be notified of an application.

Mr. Cahill moved that HP007-T-00 be forwarded to the Plan Commission with a recommendation for approval of the Amendment. Mr. Blair seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

## **6. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **HP006-C-00 Certificate of Appropriateness for Ricker House**

Mr. Shepard recused himself from any discussion on this case due to a possible conflict of interest. Mr. Kowalski presented an overview of the case, which is a request from the Preservation and Conservation Association (PACA) to allow the removal and replacement of a basement entrance

structure from the Ricker House located at 612 W. Green Street. He concluded his presentation with a staff recommendation for approval of the requested Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Novak noted that the owner of the property was also an applicant for the Certificate. Mr. Daniel Leasure, a volunteer working on restoring the house, spoke in favor of approval of the request. He said that the old entrance structure was rotting and falling off the house.

Mr. Blair moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness be granted in order to restore the basement entrance to its original circumstance. Seconded by Mr. Cahill. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

## **10. STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Tyler pointed out that case HP007-T-00 will be forwarded to the Plan Commission for hearing at their July 6, 2000 meeting. She also noted that the Plan Commission is the hearing body for Text Amendments while the Historic Preservation Commission is the hearing body for Certificates of Appropriateness.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

April D. Getchius, Secretary  
Urbana Historic Preservation Commission