



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Planning Division

m e m o r a n d u m

TO: The Urbana Historic Preservation Commission

FROM: Rebecca Bird, Historic Preservation Planner

DATE: April 30, 2008

SUBJECT: HP 2008-COA-05, Certificate of Appropriateness to Repair and Replace Porch Gutters and Downspout at #1 Buena Vista Court, a Contributing Building in a Historic District

Introduction and Background

On March 25, 2008, Marya Ryan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to rework and replace the gutters and downspout on the porch area of #1 Buena Vista Court.

The bungalows at #1 through #8 Buena Vista Court were designated a local historic district by the Urbana City Council on July 14, 2004, Ordinance Number 2004-07-082. (For map of historic district see Exhibit A, for Ordinance see Exhibit D). The Ordinance lists the subject property as contributing to the historic district. Section XII-6.A of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance requires a COA for any alteration, relocation, construction, removal, or demolition that affects the exterior architectural appearance of any building within a historic district. Table XII-1 specifies that for contributing buildings. Change of gutters requires review by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Buena Vista Court is a bungalow courtyard style development, unique to the Midwest in the early 20th century. The bungalows, built in 1926, are a combination of Spanish Colonial Revival and Craftsman architectural styles. The bungalow at #1 embodies elements of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Originally, it had a white brushed stucco exterior with white-painted header brick along the parapet and window sills. In 2002, the exterior was covered in Dryvit. The courtyard or east façade of this bungalow has a rectilinear stepped parapet that ascends from each end to a rounded arch in the middle, accented by vertical stretches extending down from each step of the parapet to the bungalow's roof line. This parapet, along with the one on the west façade, is a re-creation of the original, as the original was deemed structurally unsound and removed.

Description of the Proposed Changes

According to the application, the porch roof leaks where the porch joins the house. The applicant is requesting permission to replace the existing painted steel gutters and downspout with slightly larger copper gutters and downspout to improve drainage (see Exhibit B: the Application for a picture of the proposed work). The proposed new gutters and downspout would better coordinate the copper coping

already present on the top of the parapet walls and with the scupper located on the west side of the bungalow.

Discussion

The petitioner is proposing the work outlined in the application to remedy a leaking porch roof. There is currently a leak that pours into the porch. Additionally, water gets between the porch roof and the house.

Requirements for a Certificate of Appropriateness

According to Section XII-6.B.2 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, the criteria to be used by the Preservation Commission in making its determination for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall include:

- 1) *The maintenance of the significant original qualities or character of the buildings, structures, sites or objects including, if significant, its appurtenances. The removal or alteration of any historic or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.*

The proposed changes will not affect original characteristics of the bungalow. The gutters, downspout, and Dryvit are not original to the house. The change of materials for the gutters and downspout will improve the historic integrity, as copper was a commonly used building material in the period of significance for the historic district. Additionally, it will better match the existing copper coping on the top of the parapet walls. The proposed changes will not affect the significant original qualities or the character of the building.

- 2) *The compatibility of proposed new additions and new construction to the original architecture of the landmark shall be evaluated against general guidelines of height, proportions of the structure's front façade, proportions of openings into the facility, the relationship of building masses and spaces, roof shapes, appurtenances, the scale of building or structure, and the directional expression of front elevation.*

None of the proposed changes in the application would affect the original architecture of the bungalow in terms of height, proportions of the front façade or of the openings, relationship of building masses and spaces, roof shapes, appurtenances, scale, or directional expression of the front elevation. This criterion, therefore, does not apply.

- 3) *The Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Historic Preservation Projects," as revised from time to time.*

The final criterion relates to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of historic properties. The proposed work meets all of the Secretary's of the Interior's Standards.

Options

The Historic Preservation Commission has the following options in this case:

1. Grant any or none of the changes proposed in the requested Certificate of Appropriateness.
2. Grant any or none of the changes proposed in the requested Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to certain conditions.
3. Deny the requested Certificate of Appropriateness. If the Commission finds the application is inconsistent with the criteria and denies the application, the Commission should provide the reasons for denial and may recommend to the applicant ways to comply with the criteria.

Should the Historic Preservation Commission choose to deny this application, the petitioner would have three options: (1) in case of a denial accompanied by a recommendation, she may amend her application for a Certificate of Appropriateness within 60 days, (2) appeal to City Council within 30 days, or (3) apply for a Certificate of Economic Hardship with evidence that denial of this application is financially infeasible.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the findings outlined herein, and without the benefit of considering additional evidence that may be presented at the public hearing, City staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission **GRANT** the requested Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed changes to the gutters and downspout as being consistent with the review criteria of Section XII-6.B of the Zoning Ordinance.

Attachments: Exhibit A: Location Map
 Exhibit B: Application
 Exhibit C: Photographs of #1 Buena Vista Court
 Exhibit D: Ordinance Enacting Buena Vista Court Historic District

cc: Marya Ryan
 Gordon Skinner, Building Safety Division Manager
 Elizabeth Tyler, CD Director



Location Map

EXHIBIT "A"

F



HP Case: HP 2008-COA-05
Subject: Certificate of Appropriateness
Location: #1 Buena Vista Court
Petitioner: Marya Ryan

-  Subject Property
-  Historic District



Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Historic Preservation Commission

Submit Application to: Zoning Administrator
 Community Development Services
 400 South Vine Street
 Urbana, IL 61801

Date application Received by the Zoning Administrator: _____

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. APPLICANT INFORMATION

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION (please print or type):

NAME(S): Marya Ryan PHONE (daytime): 217-265-9176
 ADDRESS: 1 Buena Vista Ct.
 CITY: Urbana STATE: IL ZIP CODE: 61801-3130

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- Applicant is the owner of the subject property
- Applicant is the contract purchaser of the subject property
- Applicant is acting on behalf of the owner(s) with written power of attorney. Please attach a copy of the written power of attorney.
- Applicant is none of the above.

2. SUBJECT PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS of property for which a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS is being requested:

1 Buena Vista Ct.

PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 92-21-17-110-010

CHECK THE APPLICABLE DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTY:

- Historic Landmark
- Historic District

NAME AND ADDRESS OF PROPERTY OWNER (IF DIFFERENT FROM APPLICANT):

Same as applicant.

3. PROPOSED WORK FOR WHICH CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS IS BEING REQUESTED

- (a) Describe and/or illustrate fully the proposed work to be done: (Plans associated with building permit applications can be referenced. If approval of an addition or detached accessory building is requested, submit a site plan showing the measurements of the lot, the existing buildings and proposed changes and the front, back and side yard setbacks. If approval of a demolition is being requested, submit a site plan of the property and the structure(s) to be demolished.)

Rework and replace gutters and downspout on porch area. Replacement gutters & downspout will be copper rather than the existing painted steel. They may be slightly larger than the existing ones, ~~and~~ since the project is being undertaken to improve drainage.

- (b) Describe how the proposed work will change, destroy, or affect any external feature of the structure or site:

The new gutters and downspout will coordinate better with the copper coping along the tops of the parapet walls and with the copper downspout and scupper at the back of the building. They may be slightly larger than what is there, and the Dry vit will be re-arranged to accommodate the work and improve drainage.

- (c) How will the proposed work affect the preservation, protection, perpetuation and economic use of the structure or district?

The work will help preserve the structure by stopping water from pouring into the porch and stopping the leakage where the porch joins the rest of the house. The economic use of the structure is as an owner-occupied, single-family home.

- (d) Attach a statement indicating how the proposed work meets each applicable criterion provided in "EXHIBIT A", which is attached to this application form.

- (e) State any additional information which you feel the Zoning Administrator or the Historic Preservation Commission should consider in issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work:

The gutters, downspout, and Dryvit that will be altered are all items added to the house after its original construction and do not likely affect its historic value.

APPLICANT SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

03/09/08

- Check here if you are attaching other documents as part of this application.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

ZONING ADMINSTRATOR AND CHAIR REPORT

Minor Works Determination:

- The proposed work described in Section 3 of this application, and/or illustrated in drawings or plans attached as part of this application constitute minor works as defined by the Zoning Ordinance.

- The proposed work described in Section 3 of this application, and/or illustrated in drawings or plans attached as part of this application do **not** constitute minor works as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. This application for Certificate of Appropriateness is hereby forwarded to the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission for review and determination.

Zoning Administrator (or designee): _____ Date: _____

DESIGN REVIEW DETERMINATION FOR MINOR WORKS:

- The minor works described in Section 3 of this application, and/or illustrated in drawings or plans attached as part of this application conform to the review criteria established in the Zoning Ordinance in the manner described.

A certificate of Appropriateness is hereby issued for work described in this application only.

- The minor works described in Section 3 of this application, and/or illustrated in drawings or plans attached as part of this application do not conform to the review criteria established in the Zoning Ordinance in the manner described.

A Certificate of Appropriateness is hereby denied. At the request of the applicant, this application may be forwarded to the Historic Preservation Commission for review and consideration.

Zoning Administrator (or designee): _____ Date: _____

Commission Chair: _____ Date: _____

******* Please note, for your convenience, this application may be notarized at the Department of Community Development Services. *******

Exhibit "A"

(Please respond to the Criteria a through h, indicated by the underlined text)

Review Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness.

In making a determination whether to issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness, if the proposed activities cannot be considered "minor works" as identified in Table XII-1 and Table XII-2, the Historic Preservation Commission shall consider, among other things, the effect of the proposed alteration, relocation, construction, removal or demolition upon the exterior architectural features and upon the historic value, characteristics and significance of the landmark or of the historic district.

The criteria to be used by the Preservation Commission in making its determination shall include, but not be limited to:

1. The maintenance of the significant original qualities or character of the buildings, structures, sites or objects including, if significant, its appurtenances. The removal or alteration of any historic or distinctive architectural features should be avoided whenever possible.
2. The compatibility of proposed new additions and new construction to the original architecture or the landmark or styles within the historic district shall be evaluated against the following general guidelines:
 - a. Height: The height of the proposed building or structure or additions or alterations should be compatible with surrounding buildings or structures.
 - b. Proportions of structure's front façade: The proportion between the width and height of the proposed building or structure should be compatible with nearby buildings or structures.
 - c. Proportions of openings into the facility: The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing buildings and structures.
 - d. Relationship of building masses and spaces: The relationship of a building or structure to the open space between it and adjoining buildings or structures should be compatible.
 - e. Roof shapes: The design of the roof should be compatible with that of adjoining buildings and structures.
 - f. Appurtenances: Use of appurtenances should be sensitive to the individual building or structure, its occupants and their needs.
 - g. Scale of building or structure: The scale of the building or structure should be compatible with that of surrounding buildings or structures.
 - h. Directional expression of front elevation: Street façades should blend in with other buildings and structures with regard to directional expression when adjacent buildings or structures have a dominant horizontal or vertical expression.

Exhibit "A" Continued

(Please feel free to respond to the Criteria a through j, if they are applicable)

The Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Historic Preservation Projects", as revised from time to time, as follows:

- a. Every reasonable effort shall be made to use a property for its originally intended purpose, or to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, site or object and its environment.
- b. The distinguishing historic qualities or character of a building, structure, site or object and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
- c. All buildings, structures, sites and objects shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.
- d. Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, site or object and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
- e. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure, site or object shall be treated with sensitivity.
- f. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever feasible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings, structures, sites or objects.
- g. The surface cleaning of buildings, structures, sites or objects shall be undertaken utilizing the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that may damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.
- h. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.
- i. 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.
- j. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to buildings or structures shall be done in such manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building or structure would remain unimpaired.

Marya Ryan
1 Buena Vista Court
Gutter Replacement
Certificate of Appropriateness Application
Exhibit A

Review Criteria

Criterion #1: No historic or distinctive architectural features will be removed or altered. Non-original gutters and a non-original downspout will be removed and replaced.

Criterion #2a: There will be no effect on the height of the building.

Criterion #2b: The proportions of the front facade will not be affected, except that the gutter and downspout will be slightly larger than what is currently there.

Criterion #2c: The project does not include any doors or windows.

Criterion #2d: The project will not affect the relationship of building masses and spaces.

Criterion #2e: There will be no effect on the shape of the roof.

Criterion #2f: The gutters and downspout to be installed will be very similar to what is already there but slightly larger. The material (copper) will coordinate better with the copper coping along the top of the parapet walls than does the current painted metal.

Criterion #2g: The scale of the building will not be affected.

Criterion #2h: The directional expression will not be affected.

Standards for Historic Preservation Projects

Standard a: The new gutter system is intended to mitigate current drainage issues that affect the long-term structural integrity of the house and therefore help to preserve it for its original and current use as a single-family residence.

Standard b: No historic material or distinctive architectural features will be removed or altered.

Standard c-h: N/A

Standard i: The gutters and downspout will be contemporary, as are the existing ones. They will not destroy significant historical, architectural, or cultural material and will be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.

Standard j: N/A.

Marya Ryan

1 Buena Vista Court

Gutters and downspout to be replaced with larger system in copper

Circled items are the ones to be replaced



Exhibit C: Photographs of #1 Buena Vista Court

Existing Porch Gutters & Downspout



Close-up of Gutters and Downspout



2 copies

ORDINANCE NO. 2004-07-082

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE DESIGNATION
OF THE "BUENA VISTA COURT HISTORIC DISTRICT" UNDER THE
PROVISIONS OF THE URBANA HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE**

(#1 through #8 Buena Vista Court)

WHEREAS, an application has been submitted for nomination of a historic district pursuant to the Urbana Historic Preservation Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the district nomination is commonly referred to as the "Buena Vista Court Historic District" and contains the properties of 1-8 Buena Vista Court; and

WHEREAS, the owners of the subject properties as well as the petitioner have been duly notified of the nomination and each have registered a preference related to the nomination; and

WHEREAS, the owners of 1,4,5,6, and 7 of Buena Vista Court have signed the owner consent to register a favorable preference for the nomination; and

WHEREAS, after due publication and notice to all parties as is required under the Historic Preservation Ordinance, a public hearing was held by the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission on July 7, 2004 concerning the historic district nomination; and

WHEREAS, following the public hearing, the Historic Preservation Commission voted to approve historic district designation for the subject parcels by a vote of 4 ayes, 0 nays, and 0 abstentions, and made a recommendation accompanied by a report summarizing the evidence presented at the hearing, with an explanation of its recommendation, which said recommendation and attachments was forwarded to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission evaluated the designated criteria as documented in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and

made the following findings of fact for designation of the Buena Vista Historic District:

1. The Buena Vista Court Historic District contains a significant number of buildings, structures, sites or objects meeting the standards as follows:
 - a. The Buena Vista Court Historic District is a significant value as part of the architectural heritage of the community. Properties yield high integrity and value in terms of architecture, community planning and design, community cohesiveness, and social heritage. Contributing structures and objects have a combination of Spanish Colonial Revival and Craftsman architectural styles that are significant to the community.
 - b. The Buena Vista Court Historic District is representative of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type inherently valuable for the study of a period, style, craftsmanship, method of construction or use of indigenous materials and which retains a high degree of integrity. The combination of Spanish Colonial Revival and Craftsman architectural styles are evidenced in features of the proposed district and retain high levels of integrity.
 - c. The Buena Vista Court Historic District is identifiable as an established and familiar visual feature in the community owing to its unique location or physical characteristics. The exclusivity as the only Spanish Colonial Revival style bungalow court in Urbana and the only bungalow court with an original functional

common-courtyard in Urbana-Champaign distinguishes it as an identifiable and familiar feature within the entire community.

2. The Buena Vista Court Historic District is an area containing a contiguous grouping of properties having a sense of cohesiveness expressed through a style, period or method of construction. The proposed district includes eight contributing bungalow structures, two contributing structures (birdbath and entrance arch) and one contributing site (courtyard), all of which are contiguous and grouped with a strengthened sense of cohesiveness expressed through the Courtyard style of development. The layout allows the residents a community within their surrounding neighborhood, with seclusion, privacy and a smaller network of community within the courtyard district.

Although each structure is unique, they all relate to each other as each bungalow incorporates different elements and characteristics of the Spanish Colonial Revival and Craftsman architectural styles that strengthen the "community cohesiveness" of the proposed district.

3. The Buena Vista Court Historic District is an area of sufficient historical integrity to convey a sense of historical time and place. The district conveys historical integrity with importance of the historical time in US history at the turn of the century when bungalows and the courtyard bungalow style of developments were popularly used. Although construction of the Buena Vista Court was completed in 1926, Bungalow courtyards were common layouts built in the early 20th Century in the south and southwest of the United States of America. They are unique to the Midwest region. The

proposed court follows in function and form associated with the rise of the bungalow as a residential unit in the United States. These factors strengthen the district by providing a sense of historical time and place.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF URBANA, ILLINOIS, THAT,

Section 1: The Urbana City Council hereby adopts the findings of the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission presented above and hereby determines that the subject historic district nomination for property commonly referred to as 1-8 Buena Vista Court along with two contributing objects including the birdbath and archway is hereby designated as a historic district, pursuant to the Urbana Historic Preservation Ordinance.


Section 2. The City Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance in pamphlet form by authority of the corporate authorities. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in accordance with the terms of Chapter 65, Section 1-2-4 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes (65 ILCS 5/1-2-4).

PASSED by the City Council this 19th day of July, 2004.

AYES: Chynoweth, Hayes, Huth, Otto, Patt, Whelan, Wyman

NAYS:

ABSTAINS:


Phyllis D. Clark, City Clerk

APPROVED by the Mayor this 28th day of July, 2004.


Tod Satterthwaite, Mayor