

: OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS :**: OF THE CITY OF PEORIA, ILLINOIS :**

Room 400, Peoria, Illinois, April 27, 2011, a Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held this date at 8:30 A.M., at City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Chairperson Robert Powers presiding.

ROLL CALL

Roll call showed the following Historic Preservation Commission Members were present: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5; Absent: Hall, Ruckriegel - 2.

Staff Present: Kimberly Smith and Trina Bonds

MINUTES

Commissioner Masick moved to approve the minutes of the March 23, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting (as outlined); seconded by Commissioner Herold.

Approved by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith – 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

Ms. Bonds swore in the public speakers that wished to give testimony today.

Chairperson Powers explained the procedures of the Commission. He also gave an overview of the Certificate of Appropriateness Finding of Facts Worksheet.

PETITIONS, REMONSTRANCES, AND COMMUNICATIONS- THE CITY OF PEORIA

(HPC 11-04) PUBLIC HEARING on the request of Z. Vesoulis for a *Certificate of Appropriateness* to reconstruct a tower at 1010 NE Glen Oak Avenue.

Ms. Smith introduced the case and noted that a variance will also be required because of the height of the tower. She went on to say that approval would be subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Z. Vesoulis, Property Owner, reported that he has owned the subject property for three years now. He gave a brief history of the tower and stated that it is three stories tall. He went on to say that at one point it was four stories tall. He referred to photos of the original tower from 1920's that he submitted. He also referred to the computerized rendering of the proposed appearance of the new tower. He reported that he would like to reconstruct the tower to the historic photo and use similar materials instead of using limestone. He said he will be using a light weight fiber reinforced concrete and stated he actually found some that was buried in his backyard.

Commissioner Masick commented that he thinks that it is a wonderful idea for the owner to restore the tower back to original.

In discussion with Commissioner Smith, Mr. Vesoulis reported that he has a masonry restoration contractor who will also be working with an architect on the project.

There being no public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the public hearing.

Motion

Commissioner Herold moved to approve Case No. HPC 11-04, the request to reconstruct a tower at the subject property; pursuant to the Certificate of Appropriateness Finding of Facts Worksheet; seconded by Commissioner Masick.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

After the vote, Ms. Smith pointed out for clarification that the petitioner will need to submit an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals in the next month.

(HPC 11-05) PUBLIC HEARING on the request of L. Donald Luebbe and Kenyon and Associates, Inc. for a *Certificate of Appropriateness* to restore steps and add a new handrail at 703 W Moss Avenue.

Ms. Smith introduced the case and gave a brief summary of the request for the Commission.

Chris Classen, Kenyon & Associates Architects, reported that he is representing the Luebbe residence. He briefly described the request and explained that they plan to restore the steps and also add a new handrail at the subject property. He stated that they plan on putting the steps back in the same and to ensure the historic integrity is maintained. He reported that the handrail will be made of cast iron or steel, and will be black to match the existing fence.

There being no public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the public hearing.

Motion

Commissioner Masick moved to approve the request to restore steps and add a new handrail at the subject property; pursuant to the Certificate of Appropriateness Finding of Facts Worksheet; seconded by Commissioner Smith.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

(HPC 11-06) PUBLIC HEARING on the request of T. Lane for a *Certificate of Appropriateness* to make various improvements including roof reconstruction, replace a dormer with a small picture window, rebuild the porch, add a canopy, and to allow 30 months to complete the project at 116 NE Roanoke Avenue.

Ms. Smith introduced the case and reported that the petitioner is requesting to make various improvements at the subject property and to allow 30 months to complete the project. She passed around the color version of the power point presentation for the Commission to review.

Chairperson Powers reported that he would be abstaining from the vote and discussion on Case No. HPC 11-06, due to the 250 ft. conflict of interest rule.

Vice- Chair Smith proceeded to present the case.

T. Lane, Property Owner, gave an overview for the Commission. He stated that he also wanted to clarify that he would like 30 months to complete the various projects at the subject property. During his presentation, he clarified that in regards to the front porch, he did not intend to remove it entirely, he wanted to remove the top of the porch only and keep the foundation.

Commissioner Masick explained that in regards to the petitioner's request to allow 30 months to complete his projects, the Commission could only grant 24 months. He explained that the petitioner could come back at the end of 24 months to submit another application for whatever was not completed at that time.

In discussion with Commissioner Joseph, Mr. Lane reported that he will do some of the work himself, but stated he has contacted several contractors and has also received one bid to do the work. He then stated that he has also prioritized the planned work.

During more discussion, Mr. Lane reported that he had submitted additional information to Ms. Smith by email regarding his roofline change.

At approximately 9:00 a.m., Vice-Chair Smith called for a brief recess to allow Ms. Smith an opportunity to obtain the additional information.

The Historic Preservation Commission reconvened at approximately 9:10 a.m.

After the recess, Mr. Lane briefly described his intentions for the north addition. He explained that he wanted permission to remove the dormer and stall a small picture window.

Motion

Commissioner Herold moved to approve the various projects as requested, with 24 months to complete; pursuant to the Certificate of Appropriateness Finding of Facts Worksheet; seconded by Commissioner Masick.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Smith - 4;

Nays: None;

Abstention: Powers - 1.

(HPC 11-07) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION per City Council direction (Council Item Number 11-069) to explore incentives.

Ms. Smith reported that at the March 23, 2011 meeting, the HPC suggested the following incentives for consideration:

1. Resources to provide education and communication materials
2. State and local sales tax rebate program
3. Adoptable land projects
4. Waiving fees
5. Future incentives for decorative lighting or sidewalk replacement for historic districts where they City could share part of the costs
6. Community Development Block Grants to help with infrastructure issues and mothballing
7. Property tax freeze
8. Work with City Grants Coordinator on grants the Commission could create
9. Temporary waiver of fees or no fees for Certificates of Appropriateness

There being no public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the discussion.

Ms. Smith stated that in consideration that the City has limited resources, Staff suggests that the next step would be for the Commission to choose three of the suggested incentives to research, and discuss at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

During discussion among the Commissioners, the following suggestions and comments were discussed:

- Combining Incentive Nos. 4 & 9 since they are both regarding fees
- Combining Incentive Nos. 6 & 8 since they are both regarding grants
- Exploring state and local sales tax rebate program
- Exploring a property tax freeze with School District participation in order to make it worthwhile

Ms. Smith stated that she would research the incentives that were discussed.

Chairperson Powers commented that Incentive Nos. 4 & 9 related to fees are already being addressed by the City Council. Ms. Smith agreed to copy the report back to the Commission.

In discussion regarding a property tax freeze, Ms. Smith reported that after a threshold investment in a property, the taxes are frozen at the original level for eight years and then there is a thaw for an additional four years.

After more comments and discussion, Commissioner Smith moved to open back up for public discussion; seconded by Commissioner Herold and was approved by viva voce vote.

Jim Bateman, President, CILF, commented that grants are the first place everyone looks for money. He went on to say that there are grants for studies, but there are no grants for bricks and mortars. He further stated that the exception would be that local non-profit organizations can appeal to local foundations for money. He stated that it is a great idea, but unfortunately the money is just not there.

Ms. Smith stated that the Commission could simplify the motion by keeping incentive nos. 2 (related to sales tax rebate) and 7 (related to property tax freeze); and combining 5, 6 & 8 (related to grants). She stated that incentive nos. 5, 6 & 8 could be restated as "Exploring grants for the public realm and private residences."

Motion

After more comments, Commissioner Herold moved to explore all incentives as revised, which excludes incentive nos. 1, 3, 4 & 9 and includes 2 and 5 through 8, with 5, 6, & 8 combined as stated; seconded by Commissioner Masick.

Ms. Smith asked the Commission to forward any additional information to be used for the Council Memo to her by May 11th.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

(HPC 11-08) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION to clarify requirements for Certificates of Appropriateness process.

Ms. Smith summarized how the City has streamlined the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) process in the past few years. A few additional clarifications were requested by Staff to ensure alignment between the Commission and Staff.

Margaret Cousin, asked for clarification on air conditioners that would not require a COA. She stated that her concern has to do with whether or not Staff is referring to window units that might begin to pop up on front or side facades or central air condition units that would be placed on the exterior of residences.

Ms. Smith commented that it could be clarified by saying air conditioners that are not on the front façade would not require a COA.

There being no more public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the discussion.

In discussion among the Commission, Chairperson Powers commented that he thought utility placement was exempt from the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

In response to Chairperson Powers's comments, Ms. Smith explained that the reference is to public utilities.

After a lengthy discussion, the Commission agreed upon the following:

No COA required

- Addition of storm doors and windows
- Rehabilitation projects that are maintenance, and will not constitute an alteration
- Roof replacement that entails a change from 3-tab to 5-tab shingles, same color

Administrative COA

- Handrails
- Satellite dishes in front yards
- Window replacement (with new material or pattern)
- Door replacement (with new material or pattern)
- Wheelchair ramp

Major COA

- Any work that requires complete removal of a substantial feature of a structure, even if it will be reinstated or reconstructed when the project is complete (such as a tower, spire, or chimney).
- Siding replacement (with new material or pattern)

Motion

After comments, Commissioner Masick moved **to approve** the clarifications for requirements of Certificates of Appropriateness as amended; seconded by Commissioner Herold.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

REQUEST TO RECEIVE AND FILE:

- Report from Staff regarding Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness issued.
- Report from Staff regarding enforcement case status.

Motion

After brief comments, Commissioner Herold moved **to approve** the request to receive and file Staff Reports; seconded by Commissioner Masick.

Motion **APPROVED** by viva voce vote.

Yeas: Herold, Joseph, Masick, Powers, Smith - 5;

Nays: None;

Abstention: None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

T. Lane, Historic District Property Owner, commented that a sales tax rebate would be a good idea to keep it within the City. He went on to say that on the other hand there are a lot of historic items that cannot be purchased in the City of Peoria.

ADJOURNMENT

The April 27, 2011 Historic Preservation Commission meeting adjourned at approximately 10:03 A.M.

Kimberly Smith, AICP, Senior Urban Planner

tb