

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: September 4, 2002

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: Council Chambers, 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rich Cahill, Liz Cardman, Sharon Irish, Alice Novak, Bill Rose, Trent Shepard

MEMBERS ABSENT: Art Zangerl

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services; Michaela Bell, Planner; Teri Andel, Planning & Zoning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: G. D. Brighton, Sarah Kanouse, David Monk, Curtis Pettyjohn

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

Urbana Historic Preservation Commission Chair, Alice Novak, called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. The roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

Mr. Shepard moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Cardman seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as corrected by unanimous vote.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- Communication from the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) regarding scholarships available for the September 12th to 14th conference that they are hosting in Chicago.

5. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Curtis Pettyjohn, of 405 West Illinois, mentioned the Historic Preservation Forum that will be held on September 25, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. at the Urbana Civic Center. He thanked the City of Urbana staff for organizing the forum. He extended an invitation to the commissioners.

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

• Discussion of “Noncontributing” Definition

Michaela Bell, Planner, presented a brief overview of the last Historic Preservation meeting that was held on August 7, 2002. She suggested that the commission draft a definition of “noncontributing”. She read the definition of “contributing” from the Zoning Ordinance, which is defined as follows:

Contributing: A building, structure, site or object that adds to the historical associations, architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, relates to the documented significance of the property, and possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period. Although most commonly used in historic district designations, this term may also be used when a property is considered for landmark status, which includes more than one resource, such as a house and a garage.

Mr. Rose had a concern about how well defined a “period of significance” was that is referred to in the definition of contributing. Ms. Novak replied that a period of significance would be the time period defined. For example, a property that may be claiming architectural significance only, the period of significance may simply be the date of construction or the completion date of the building. She suggested referring to the National Register definition of a “period of significance”.

Ms. Cardman voiced her concern about vacant lots not being included. Ms. Bell explained that vacant lots were addressed in Table 1 for Contributing Structures under “Other Works – Construction”. The definition for “construction” according to the Zoning Ordinance covers any construction on vacant lots.

After a great deal of reviewing other cities’ definitions of “noncontributing” and discussing what each commissioner preferred to include in the definition, the Historic Preservation Commission agreed upon a definition for “noncontributing”. The definition is as follows:

Noncontributing: A building, structure, site or object, which may be part of a landmark or district, but is not of historic, architectural or archaeological significance per se. However, the relationship of these buildings, structures, sites or objects to those that are contributing may be important in the preservation of the

landmark or district. Inclusion of these properties within a historic district subjects these properties to those design review standards and guidelines applicable to noncontributing properties.

- **Discussion of “Project Level of Review Tables” for Contributing and Noncontributing Structures**

Mr. Rose asked if there was a timeline or schedule for meeting the City Council’s request. Ms. Tyler stated that the City Council did not place a timeline on the Historic Preservation Commission to meet the request. Of course, a guideline handbook would take more time to complete and would need to be approved by this commission. Mr. Rose suggested having a charette workshop to get public input from the community.

The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the types of projects for contributing structures in Table 1 to determine the level of review for each. The following is what the commissioners agreed upon:

Minor Works

Change in exterior paint schemes – No Review Required

Ordinary repair of existing exterior architectural features – No Review Required

Replacement of existing outside storage – No Review Required

Landscaping – No Review Required

Site Repairs:

Walkways – No Review Required

Steps – No Review Required

Driveways – No Review Required

Additions:

Storage Sheds Less Than 100 Square Feet – No Review Required

Mechanical and Electrical Services Equipment – No Review Required

Application of same type of roofing materials – Administrative Review

Improvements, alterations, renovations not requiring a building permit (including but not limited to):

Screening to that of original – Administrative Review

Siding Replacement to that of original – Administrative Review

Erection, Alteration, or Removal of Access Ramps or Lifts to that of original – Administrative Review

Replacement of Fences to that of original – Administrative Review

Installation of, or change in:

Storm Doors and Storm Windows – Administrative Review

Screens – Administrative Review

Other Works

Demolition – HP Commission Review

Construction – HP Commission Review

Change of:

Brick Walkway – HP Commission Review

Fence – Administrative Review

Landscape Wall – HP Commission Review

Permanent Sign – HP Commission Review
Ornamentation – HP Commission Review
Colored, Leaded or Beveled Glass – HP Commission Review
Driveway – HP Commission Review
Porch/Deck – HP Commission Review
Window Configuration – HP Commission Review
Siding – HP Commission Review
Roofline – HP Commission Review
Shutters – HP Commission Review
Gutters – HP Commission Review
Roofing Material of Different Type – HP Commission Review

Certificate of Appropriateness (COA): A certificate approving of plans for alteration, relocation, construction, removal or demolition of either a designated landmark, or a building, site, structure or object within a designated historic district.

Minor Works: Repairs that do not require a building permit or exterior changes that do not involve substantial alterations, additions, or removals that could impair the integrity of the property and/or the district as a whole.

The Historic Preservation Commission then reviewed Table 2: Project Level of Review for Non-Contributing Structures to determine the level of review for each. The following is what they agreed upon:

STRUCTURES 49 Years of Age (or less)

Minor Works

Change in exterior paint schemes – No Review Required
Ordinary repair of existing exterior architectural features – No Review Required
Replacement of existing outside storage – No Review Required
Landscaping – No Review Required
Site Repairs:
Walkways – No Review Required
Steps – No Review Required
Driveways – No Review Required
Additions:
Storage Sheds Less Than 100 Square Feet – No Review Required
Mechanical and Electrical Services Equipment – No Review Required
Application of same type of roofing materials – No Review Required
Improvements, alterations, renovations not requiring a building permit (including but not limited to):
Screening to that of original – No Review Required
Siding Replacement to that of original – No Review Required
Erection, Alteration, or Removal of Access Ramps or Lifts to that of original – No Review Required
Replacement of Fences to that of original – No Review Required
Installation of, or change in:
Storm Doors and Storm Windows – No Review Required
Screens – No Review Required

Other Works

Demolition – HP Commission Review

Construction – HP Commission Review

Change of:

Brick Walkway – No Review Required

Fence – Administrative Review

Landscape Wall – Administrative Review

Permanent Sign – Administrative Review

Ornamentation – HP Commission Review

Colored, Leaded or Beveled Glass – No Review Required

Driveway – Administrative Review

Porch/Deck – Administrative Review

Window Configuration – Administrative Review

Siding – Administrative Review

Roofline – Administrative Review

Shutters – Administrative Review

Gutters – Administrative Review

Roofing Material of Different Type – HP Commission Review

STRUCTURES 50 Years of Age (or more)

Minor Works

Change in exterior paint schemes – No Review Required

Ordinary repair of existing exterior architectural features – No Review Required

Replacement of existing outside storage – No Review Required

Landscaping – No Review Required

Site Repairs:

Walkways – No Review Required

Steps – No Review Required

Driveways – No Review Required

Additions:

Storage Sheds Less Than 100 Square Feet – No Review Required

Mechanical and Electrical Services Equipment – No Review Required

Application of same type of roofing materials – No Review Required

Improvements, alterations, renovations not requiring a building permit (including but not limited to):

Screening to that of original – No Review Required

Siding Replacement to that of original – No Review Required

Erection, Alteration, or Removal of Access Ramps or Lifts to that of original – No Review Required

Replacement of Fences to that of original – Administrative Review

Installation of, or change in:

Storm Doors and Storm Windows – Administrative Review

Screens – No Review Required

Other Works

Demolition – HP Commission Review

Construction – HP Commission Review

Change of:

- Brick Walkway – Administrative Review*
- Fence – Administrative Review*
- Landscape Wall – Administrative Review*
- Permanent Sign – Administrative Review*
- Ornamentation – HP Commission Review*
- Colored, Leaded or Beveled Glass – Administrative Review*
- Driveway – Administrative Review*
- Porch/Deck – Administrative Review*
- Window Configuration – Administrative Review*
- Siding – Administrative Review*
- Roofline – Administrative Review*
- Shutters – Administrative Review*
- Gutters – Administrative Review*
- Roofing Material of Different Type – HP Commission Review*

- **Discussion of design guideline handbook**

Ms. Bell mentioned that staff researched and found another example of a guideline handbook from the City of Wichita. The handbook addresses all new construction projects and renovations to non-contributing buildings in one their historic districts. Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission consider drafting a guideline handbook similar to either the Iowa City or the Wichita example. Ms. Tyler added that the handbook could be an appendix to the Zoning Ordinance or something that could be referenced in the Zoning Ordinance. It would be more of a guideline rather than a regulatory.

Ms. Novak suggested that everyone research the website to find some good guidelines. She mentioned that there were enough good guidelines available; the Historic Preservation Commission could use a generic format and then brainstorm as much as possible on the potential problem areas that they have singled out for changes that the commission would review. Ms. Bell noted that the Secretary of Interior has a guideline handbook that is illustrated very nicely.

8. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

9. NEW BUSINESS

- **Discussion of Community Forum to Promote Historic Districts**

Ms. Bell noted that the Community Forum would be held at the Civic Center on Wednesday, September 24, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. Staff had formally invited Rebecca Lynn Hoffman from Grand Rapids, Michigan to speak at the forum. She also had contacted the City of Normal and the City of Bloomington trying to get names of potential property owners to speak about what it was like living in a historic district, their experience with the local historic preservation commission, and work that they have done on their homes as well. Ms. Tyler mentioned that Ms. Bell might want to contact the City of Decatur, since it would be closer.

Mr. Rose inquired as to what the role of the commissioners would be at the forum. Ms. Novak commented that the commissioners could collect question cards and help the forum run smoothly.

10. MONITORING OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Buena Vista Court – Ms. Cardman noted that there seemed to be some kind of exterior work being performed.

Elite Diner – Ms. Novak mentioned that it was moved the other day.

Garrett House Update – Ms. Irish commented that the potential move is over the budget, which meant that the move might not happen. Things that may make it not happen are the lack of permission to use other people’s properties to stage the move or if something else comes up that will cost more money.

Warm Air Research House – Ms. Novak noted that the property owner is currently in negotiations with the University of Illinois for an official purchase of the house.

11. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

12. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- ✓ Ms. Novak encouraged the other commissioners to attend the State Preservation Conference. She mentioned that there were two scholarships available to pay for the commissioners’ registration.
- ✓ Ms. Novak noted that Indiana University and the Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology were advertising a Historic Preservation conference as well. It will be held in Terre Haute, Indiana on Friday, September 20 and Saturday, September 21.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Rose moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Ms. Irish seconded the motion. The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Submitted,

Rob Kowalski, Secretary