: 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 Certificote 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 rending 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 ot 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

Kimberly Smith, AICP, Senior Urban Planner

tb

CITY OF PEORIA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

TO: Historic Preservation Commission

FROM: Kimberly Smith, AICP, Senior Urban Planner

DATE: May 18, 2011

RE: **HPC CASE NO. 11-09: PUBLIC HEARING on the request of Robert Davis, Reliable Construction, on behalf of Tiffany and Junius Hawkins for a *Certificate of Appropriateness* to make various improvements and repairs to the roof, main porch, second story porch, soffit and fascia, fill in basement entry door, and windows at 1517 W. Barker Avenue.**

NOTIFICATION:

Mailed notification was provided to all local historic property owners within 250 radial feet of the subject site and no less than 15 days prior to the review.

REQUEST SUMMARY:

The petitioner is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to make various improvements and repairs to the roof, main porch, second story porch, soffit and fascia, fill in basement entry door, and windows at 1517 W. Barker Avenue.

Please refer to the attached application for more detailed information.

DISCUSSION:

The Commission should consider the criteria in Historic Preservation Ordinance Section 16-64, Criteria when determining if the proposed work is compatible and appropriate.

OPTIONS:

- Approve the application as requested.
- Modify and grant the application.
- Deny the application.

If denied, the petitioner will not be able to submit an application for the same improvements until it is modified to fit the Commission's requests, or a period of 1 year has elapsed.

Process as: Comm: ☒ Adm ☐ For Office Use Only	Date 4-7-11 Time 4pm Initials: CLS For Office Use Only

Certificate of Appropriateness Application

Historic Preservation Commission

Property Information: (The property the work will be performed on)

Address: 1517 W. Barker, Peoria, IL Zip Code _____

Tax ID Number: 18-08-127-014 Architectural Style: Transitional Queen Anne style with Colonial Revival Influences

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)

Name: Robert Davis

Company/Neighborhood Association: Moss Bradley

Address: 21074 N. US. Hwy 24

City: Canton State: IL ZIP: 61520

Daytime Phone: (309-224) 8273 Email: _____

Applicant Signature: Robert Davis Date: 4-4-11

* **Owner:** (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)

Name: Tiffany & Junius Hawkins

Company/Neighborhood Association: _____

Address: [redacted]

City: [redacted] State: [redacted] ZIP: [redacted]

Daytime Phone: ([redacted]) [redacted] Email: _____

Owner Signature: Tiffany Hawkins & Junius Hawkins Date: 4-4-11

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)

Name: (Same as Applicant)

Company/Neighborhood Association: Reliable Construction

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Daytime Phone: (_____) _____ Email: _____

Updated: March 16, 2009 – JN

Reliable
Construction
21074 N US HWY 24
Canton, IL, 61520
(309) 224-8273

Mar 29 / 11

Tiffany Hawkins
[redacted]

Proposal 1 To Remove 2 -- 2nd story pitched roofs. Remove shingles, plywood decking and joists. Install new 2 x 6 joists with a slite pitch, ½ " osb decking and drip edge. Install ½" recovery board screwed with plates, glue and install rubber. Rubber to be turn barred to house and drip edge. Rubber to be .060 mil. Roofs are approx. 9' x 15'.
Please note there is no way to know what is damaged under these 2 roofs. These will be treated as open items. Unforseen damage.

Proposal 2 - 2nd story porch area. Approx. 14' x 14' Remove and replace approx 8' x 8' of 1 x 4 porch decking. Remove approx 8' of front rim joist, 8' of side rim joist and approx. 8' of floor joists [x 4] Jack porch roof up and reattach decorative pillar. Note pillar has wood rot and corbel also has damage. These 2 items [If Possible] will be repaired. In the event they cannot be repaired , 2 New pillars to be installed or made to historic specifications. This will be an open item.
Joists are also part of main porch ceiling . Main porch ceiling.-- Remove approx 8' x 8' of ceiling 1 x 4 's and replace.

Soffit and fascia -- Remove and reuse vented soffit approx. 150 lf. Remove and replace approx 150 lf of aluminum fascia. Note fascia will be custom bent and installed. Soffit j channel to be reused but reattached to brick with masonry fasteners. [tapcons] Note in the event brick and or mortar joints are deteriorated and cannot withstand New tapcon fasteners they will be either replaced or re tuck pointed. This is an open item. We will not install with any guarantee if at any

point, corners are asked to be cut. We will only guarantee proper reconstruction of your project. Please don't ask. All Extras will be discussed and a signed change order by the homeowner and Robert Davis [Owner] will be excepted before there is any deviations from this proposal
Main porch area. Remove approx. 8' x 4' of 1 x 4 decking. This is to get new porch beam material into crawl hole. Jack up approx. 30' of porch joists, dig approx. 26"s deep, 2' wide holes in the ground and install concrete, 4 x 4' treated posts every 8', and a 2 x 10 double beam down the center. Replace approx.8' x 8' of 1 x 4 decking. Please note that altering any settled deck, foundation or structure, can lead to issues in other areas. Such as handrails , pillars, plaster, drywall, windows, doorways , etc. Please note this to all of your home improvement projects.

Note 1 x 4 tongue and groove deck boards can only be purchased [at least at rp lumber] in bulks of 48 boards @ 8'. So on that, recommend using the remaining boards to replace other rotted deck boards. This is not in my proposal. Leftover deck boards to remain with homeowner.

This proposal is an estimate only! Work will be based on a time and material basis @ $ 30.00 per man hour plus material x's 8% . Meaning if cost is under what has been estimated, Homeowner to be credited the difference at the end of the project.

Remove and replace 1 basement entry door. Door to be approx. 30" Solid core wood. Note this entry door is odd and not a factory product. Custom door to be cut down and door jamb to be custom framed and wrapped with aluminum sheet goods. Note door entry cannot be seen from road. Hinges and locksets to be custom cut. Painting or staining of door to be included with paint bid. In the event homeowner chooses to have someone else paint. Note new door shall not be painted upon installation, as well as any other repairs that are being made. Please note! I recommend a steel entry door. Location of door shows obvious area where snow does build up! Which means wood rot eventually. Inevitable.

All Peoria Il. Historic rules , regulations and codes will be followed.

4-17-11

In addition to Repairs and upgrades we would like to REplace or REPair windows that are NEEDED

and have the whole house or top part with window frames and trim painted that meets the historical specifications on paint

TAX ID 18-08-127-014

1517 W Barker AVE