WELCOME!

If you plan on speaking, please complete a Blue Speaker Form

For each case the following sequence will apply:

1. Chairperson proceeds with swearing in procedures
2. Chairperson announces the case
3. Staff enters case into the record
   a. Staff presents the case
   b. Staff answers questions from the Commission
4. Petitioner presents case and answers questions from the Commission
5. Chairperson opens the meeting to the public
6. Public comments – Chairperson may ask for response/input from staff and petitioner
7. Petitioner presents closing statements
8. Public testimony is closed (No further public comment)
9. Commission deliberates and may consult staff
10. Commission prepares findings, if applicable
11. Commission votes

All comments and questions must be directed to the Commission
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2016
CITY HALL, ROOM 400 – 8:30 A.M.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 27, 2016 MINUTES

4. REGULAR BUSINESS
   Deliberations will be held at the end of each case after public comment has been closed. No public comment is allowed during deliberations.

   **CASE NO.**  HPC 16-02
   Public Hearing on the request of Chad J Withers for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate and repair porch railings, fence, and windows for the property located at 1217 W Moss Ave (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-201-017) Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

5. CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION

6. ADJOURNMENT
A regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, January 27, 2016, at 8:30 a.m., City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Room 400, with Chairperson Robert Powers presiding.

ROLL CALL

The following Historic Preservation Commissions Commissioners were present: Robert Powers, Deborah Dougherty, Timothy Herold, Michael Maloof, Geoff Smith – 5. Absent: Lesley Matuszak, Stephen Pierz – 2.

Staff Present: Leah Allison, Madeline Wolf

MINUTES

Commissioner Herold moved to approve the minutes of the special meeting held on November 10, 2015; seconded by Commissioner Maloof.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS

Speakers were sworn in by Staff Member Madeline Wolf.

REGULAR BUSINESS

CASE NO. HPC 15-14

Public Hearing on the request of Robert Howard for Jumer Real Estate Company, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Replace Windows for the property located at 1725 W Moss Ave (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-152-030), Peoria, IL (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Leah Allison, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 15-14 into the record and presented the request.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 8:33 a.m.

Robert Howard, representing the Jumer Real Estate Company, LLC, stated his request. Mr. Howard introduced Jeremy Dalton and Andrew Lochbaum of Pella Windows. The apartments of 1725 W Moss Avenue experienced water damage in the ceilings and walls. Jumer’s request satisfied a long-term solution for building repairs. Mr. Howard said the cost to replace the windows was $75,000. In response to Chairperson Powers’ inquiry, Mr. Howard said the condition of the current windows are not air tight and show wear and tear.

Andrew Lochbaum, representing Pella Windows, responded to Commissioner Herold’s inquiry regarding the proposed window style. Mr. Lochbaum explained that the style of windows on the north and south side of the structure varied so the replacement windows will be consistent to the current grid pattern. Mr. Lochbaum emphasized the one-to-one exchange.

In response to Commissioner Maloof’s inquiry, Mr. Lochbaum said the color of the window frame was black and the material was aluminum. Mr. Lochbaum said the current window frame and the installation of the proposed window frame will be visually equal. Mr. Lochbaum said the proposed windows are more energy efficient.

Discussion:

Commissioner Herold was concerned of losing the existing French doors on the six balconies of the structure. Herold said he supported the project as long as it was clarified in the motion that the replacement windows must have the same dividing lines.
Chairperson Powers expressed his appreciation for the petitioner’s thorough application submittal. Mr. Powers said the project may qualify for historical preservation tax credits which may provide an opportunity to recapitalize on the petitioner’s investment.

Motion:
Commissioner Maloof moved to approve the request to replace the windows providing the one-to-one exchange; seconded by Commissioner Herold.

Commissioner Herold read the Findings of Fact.

The motion was approved by roll call vote.
Nays: None.

CASE NO. HPC 16-01
Public Hearing on the request of Kathleen Groark for Parallel Infrastructure for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 105-foot tall stealth flagpole wireless communication tower for the property identified as Parcel Identification No. 14-34-200-006 with an address of 3014 N Prospect Road, Peoria, IL and commonly known as Springdale Cemetery (Council District 3).

Senior Urban Planner, Leah Allison, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-01 into the record and presented the request.

Kathleen Groark, representing Parallel Infrastructure, explained the intent of the request was to provide Peoria with the best possible (wireless) coverage. Ms. Groark said individuals are eliminating landlines; therefore, more 911 calls are made from cell phones. The location was selected because it fulfilled the identified coverage gap. The surrounding area provided natural screening and did not disrupt future plans for Springdale Cemetery.

In response to Commissioner Maloof’s concern, Ms. Groark confirmed the Springdale Cemetery Board of Directors approved the color and style of the vinyl fence in the rendition presented to the commission.

In response to Commissioner Smith’s inquiry, Ms. Groark said other providers would be allowed to collocate on the proposed tower.

In response to Commissioner Herold’s inquiry, Ms. Allison explained the proceedings of the request if approved or denied.

Chairperson Powers asked the commission if the color and material of the flag pole and fence should be included as a condition in the motion.

Kathleen Groark said she was willing to discuss colors aside from the proposed rendition. Ms. Groark said the Springdale Cemetery Board of Directors supported the color and material presented.

In response to Chairperson Powers’ concern, Ms. Groark said the gravel surface would be inside of the fence; a gravel road was not proposed.

There were no citizens interested in providing public testimony; Chairperson Powers closed the public hearing at 9:00 a.m.

Discussion:
Commissioner Herold was in support of the project. He supported the color white for the flag pole and fence. Mr. Herold supported the vinyl fence proposed.

Commissioner Smith supported the project. Mr. Smith’s only concern was the material of the fence.
Chairperson Powers discussed the financial expense of the large flag necessary to complement the large flag pole; he suggested not to include a condition for the color of the flagpole.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold moved to approve as requested, with the color of the flagpole and fence to be approved administratively; seconded by Commissioner Smith.

Commissioner Herold read the Findings of Fact.

The motion was approved by roll call vote:
Nay: None.

**CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

There were no citizens who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission.

**ADIJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Herold moved to adjourn the Historic Preservation Commission Meeting; seconded by Commissioner Smith.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:11 a.m.

Leah Allison, Senior Urban Planner
TO: Historic Preservation Commission  
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner  
DATE: February 12, 2016  
CASE NO: HPC 16-02  
SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Chad J Withers for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate and repair porch railings, fence, and windows for the property located at 1217 W Moss Ave (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-201-017), Peoria, IL (Council District 2). (COUNCIL DISTRICT 2)  

NOTIFICATION:  
Mailed notification was provided to surrounding 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 renovate and repair porch railings, fence, and windows for the property located at 1217 W Moss Ave  

Please refer to the attached application for more detailed information.  

DISCUSSION:  
The Commission should consider the criteria in Historic Preservation Ordinance Section 16-64 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.
Certificate of Appropriateness Application
Historic Preservation Commission

Property Information: (The property the work will be performed on)
Address: 1217 W MESS AVE
Tax ID Number: 18-08-201-017
Architectural Style:

Applicant: (The person/organization applying)
Name: CHAO J WEIHRS
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: 1217 W MESS AVE
City: PEORIA State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (815) 675-7051 Email: CHAO J WEIHRS EMAIL
Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/16/15

Owner: (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)
Name: 
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: 
City: State: ZIP: 
Daytime Phone: Email: 
Owner Signature: [Signature] Date: 

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)
Name: 
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: 
City: State: ZIP: 
Daytime Phone: Email: 


Project Description:

Provide a detailed description of the work to be done. Include material types, colors, style, and methods of construction. If the work involves removal of material or structure, indicate how the historical value and visual quality of the structure will be retained and ensure the integrity of the landmark or district. You may attach separate sheets if desired.

Narrative of proposed work:

SEE ATTACHED MATERIAL.
Overall Project Description

Renovation and repair of the following exterior elements is anticipated over the next 12-18 months:

- Installation of iron railings on front porch steps by Kelley Ironworks (by May 2016)
- Sanding and repainting of existing iron fence in front of home. (by May 2016)
- Removal and repair or replacement of exterior storm windows on first floor in side bay and rear; (by Nov. 2016)
- Removal and replacement of basement windows with custom Anderson windows consistent in appearance with current windows, but with improved insulation and energy efficiency. (by Nov. 2017)

Work on railing to be completed by May 2016; windows may continue for 12-18 months; permission is requested for this work to continue through 2017.
**Installation of Iron Fence Railings**
On the front porch, custom iron railings will be fabricated by Kelley Ironworks, which designed and installed the existing front fence. The railing will incorporate the ‘vine leaf’ design element in the front fence into the design of the railing. The railing will greatly enhance the appearance of the front porch as well as greatly increasing safety for occupants, mail carriers, and others during winter weather.

**Sanding and Repainting of existing Fence**
The existing fence will be wire brushed and sanded to remove loose paint and repainted by Janie Nelson of See Jane Paint using electrostatic application.
Repair and/or Installation of Storm Windows

The majority of the windows in the home (~85%) have recent-vintage low profile storm windows. However, some windows have no storm windows at all, while 3 others have older storm windows (solid wood, single pane) which have significant damage and are in need of repair and/or replacement. Detailed photos are below.

Where possible, existing older storm windows will be repaired and repainted; where repair is impractical, new storm windows consistent with those already on the remainder of the house will be installed. In all cases, the work will be done in such a way as to minimize visible changes and maintain consistency with existing windows.

Right: Rear dining room window missing storm.

Left: Rear facade. Middle two storms on first floor require repair or replacement. All other windows shown have modern white storm windows. (Rear DR window is cut out to right of this picture - the radon stack is visible in both pictures)

Bottom Left and Bottom: Deteriorated storm window in side bay; anticipate replacement will be required due to extensive rot.
Installation of Replacement Windows in Basement

Basement windows in the home are significantly deteriorated and are mostly without storm windows. Basement windows will be replaced with new custom Anderson windows to match the existing profile and facade of the house - no changes to the size, placement, or location of any windows is planned. One or more windows may be egress-type windows for safety purposes. Photos below are representative of the condition of these windows, although each window (thirteen in total) is not shown.
The commission shall consider, where applicable, the following criteria in determining whether or not proposed work is compatible and appropriate:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. In the event that 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 conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>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, materials and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Whenever possible, new additions or alterations shall be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. The proposed work conforms to the following design criteria as well as any specific guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Height. The height of the proposed structure or additions or alterations should be compatible with surrounding structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Proportions of structure’s front facade. The proportion between the width and height of the proposed structure should be compatible with nearby structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Proportions of openings into the facility. The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Relationship of building masses and spaces. The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjoining structures should be compatible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Landscape and appurtenances. Landscaping and the use of appurtenances should be sensitive to the individual structures, its occupants and their needs. Further, the landscape treatment should be compatible with surrounding structures and landscapes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Directional expression from elevation. Street facades should blend with other structures with regard to directional expression. When adjacent structures have a dominant horizontal or vertical expression, this should be carried over and reflected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Architectural details. Architectural details and materials should be incorporated as necessary to relate the new with the old and to preserve and enhance the inherent characteristics of that area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION: __________________________________________
_________________________________________________
INITIATED BY: _____________________________________
SECOND: _________________________________________

SIGATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson Robert Powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Deborah Dougherty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tim Herold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Michael Maloof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Leslie Matuszak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Stephen Peirz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Geoffrey Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE: Approved _________ Denied ___________ ________ to ________