A regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, August 24, 2016, at 8:30 a.m., City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Room 400, with Chairperson Robert Powers presiding.

ROLL CALL
The following Historic Preservation Commission Commissioners were present: Deborah Dougherty, Timothy Herold, Michael Maloof, Thomas Wester, and Chairperson Robert Powers – 5. Absent: Lesley Matuszak, Geoff Smith – 2.

Staff Present: Nick Mitchell, Shannon Techie, Madeline Wolf

MINUTES
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on July 27, 2016; seconded by Commissioner Dougherty.

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
Chairperson Powers announced his abstention from the following case due to financial interest.

Chairperson Powers requested a nomination for a Chairperson pro tem as Vice Chairperson Matuszak was absent.

Motion:
Commissioner Maloof nominated Commissioner Herold as Chairperson pro tem; seconded, by Commissioner Wester.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

CASE NO. HPC 16-17
Public Hearing on the request of William and Janice Heaver of Tri County Builders to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for a freestanding sign, landscape changes, and paint improvements for the property located at 108 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-006), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-17 into the record and presented the case. Ms. Techie noted the requests have been completed; the case presented was the result of a complaint.

Commissioner Maloof requested confirmation the commission review was only the exterior of the building.

Ms. Techie said the commission review was exterior only. Ms. Techie noted that the removal of the evergreen tree and the paint colors could have been approved administratively if more information from the petitioner had been provided upon staff request.

Commissioner Maloof questioned if the paint color of the doors were included in the historic color pallet. Ms. Techie noted that similar colors did appear on historic color pallets; however, documentation was not provided by the applicant as required. Commissioner Maloof discussed a requirement for the reinstatement of the evergreen tree including the tree height.

Commissioner Dougherty questioned commission’s ability to require the reinstatement of the evergreen tree. Ms. Techie indicated that the Commission could require the reinstatement of landscaping, as a condition of approval, if that was the desire of the Commission.
Commissioner Wester inquired the reason for removing the tree.

Ms. Techie said the petitioner noted the inside of the tree was infested with bugs and dying. Ms. Techie noted staff requested documentation from an arborist that documented the condition of the tree; however, that was not provided.

Pro Tem Chairperson Herold opened the Public Hearing.

**Janice Heaver**, petitioner, said she purchased the building with intentions to offer student housing for nearby hospitals. Ms. Heaver said the proposed paint colors were part of the historic color pallet. Ms. Heaver said the tree was diseased, bug infested, and hollow; Ms. Heaver had a letter from an arborist. Ms. Heaver said the intent was to replace the evergreen tree with a maple tree because the evergreen tree visually obstructed the building. Ms. Heaver requested to install new landscaping and to resurface the concrete.

Ms. Heaver confirmed the paint color for the freestanding sign and the doors were the same, in response to Pro Tem Chairperson Herold’s inquiry.

Ms. Techie read the following two letters into the record supporting the request.

**T. Lane**, an interested citizen, submitted a letter of support for the request; Ms. Ling said the completed work has made a positive visual impact for the street and neighbors.

**Marcela Teplitz**, an interested citizen, submitted a letter of support for the request. Ms. Teplitz encouraged the continuation of work to the property as the completed improvements have reinstalled the historic integrity of the property and neighborhood.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Pro Tem Chairperson Herold closed the Public Hearing at 8:51 a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Maloof referred to the endorsement by Marcella Teplitz. Commissioner Maloof expressed concern of the removal of and the replacement of the tree.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Maloof made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition to replace the tree with a new tree at least 6' tall; and administrative approval for the roof replacement. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wester.

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

Chairperson Powers presumed the Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

**CASE NO. HPC 16-19**
Public Hearing on the request of Michael Ihlenfeldt to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a front door, and side porch and steps, for the property located at 1012 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-226-006), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

**Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department**, read Case No. HPC 16-19 into the record and presented the case.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 9:03 a.m.
David Tegg, on behalf of petitioner, Michael Ihlenfeldt, said he was present to answer questions and receive recommendations from the commission. Mr. Tegg requested a solid oak front door replacement, which was thought to be original to the home as adjacent homes built in the same era have solid oak front doors. The solid oak door would provide additional security and safety. The porch will be rebuilt with Douglass fir. The porch and steps will be brought up to code. Mr. Tegg said he and the petitioner were systematically restoring the house as a single-family residence and restoring the original aesthetics.

Mr. Tegg said the composite material will be the same color as the plank if painted, in response to Commissioner Herold's inquiry.

Commissioner Dougherty questioned the removal of the side lights and storm door. Commissioner Dougherty questioned the requirement of a hand railing for the side porch and steps. Mr. Tegg said the side lights and frame would not be removed; the replacement door fit the existing dimensions. Mr. Tegg was uncertain of the storm door. Mr. Tegg said a hand rail was not included with the request; however, the new construction will meet building code requirements.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern for losing the glass on the front door and requested evidence of the original door.

Mr. Tegg said adjacent property owners said solid oak doors were original to the homes. Mr. Tegg said the other doors on the home are solid oak.

Commissioner Maloof questioned the replacement of the existing vertical wood panels on the porch. Commissioner Maloof questioned if the vertical wood panels were original to the home.

Mr. Tegg said the original vertical wood panels intend to be replicated. Mr. Tegg said the only change in replicating the wood structure with vertical beams would be the differences in the number of vertical pieces in order to be in compliance with code.

Commissioner Wester expressed concern the proposed front door would not replicate the original quality.

Mr. Tegg referred to a previous comment regarding the original oak door. Mr. Tegg added the proposed door was high quality, custom fabricated, solid oak door.

Chairperson Powers said he was cautious to approve the request without confirmation the building plans for the porch and stairs are compliant with the building code. Chairperson Powers asked if the petitioner was amendable to the re-direction of the steps.

Ms. Techie said the side porch and steps required a deck repair permit and must meet code. Ms. Techie said Building Safety would review the plans as part of the building permit process.

Chairperson Powers proposed a deferral to consult with Building Safety prior to commission approval.

Commissioner Herold was in support of the deferral. Commissioner Herold was not in support of the reorientation of the steps.

Mr. Tegg said the contractor indicated the number of stairs were complaint with code.

Commissioner Dougherty did not support a deferral; Dougherty suggested the commission approve the plan contingent upon administrative approval of the porch and steps after Building Safety reviewed the plans.

Commissioner Herold supported approval of the porch and steps without a railing to maintain the historic aesthetic.
Ms. Techie said the commission may approve without the railing but the petitioner must adhere to the code if the railing was a building code requirement.

Charles Bobbit, adjacent neighbor to the subject property, supported the project and his Mr. Ihlenfeldt’s commitment to historic preservation for the subject property. Mr Bobbit said he has a solid oak front door.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 9:30 a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold supported the improvements and bringing the home up to code. Commissioner Herold was not in support of the removal of the glass front door or the solid oak door replacement.

Commissioner Maloof said the petitioner noted the motivation for the solid oak door replacement was to increase security and safety. Commissioner Maloof expressed concern for the petitioner’s safety.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern the solid oak door would have a negative aesthetic impact. Commissioner Herold said the side lights may be broken into with the oak door in place; therefore, he did not feel as though security was an issue.

Commissioner Wester expressed concern for the construction of the solid oak door. Commissioner Wester was in support of the request if the replacement door was built in the same manner as a solid oak door would be built 100 years ago. Commissioner Wester applauded the petitioner for the completed and continued improvements.

Chairperson Powers noted the solid oak doors of neighboring properties may not have been approved by the commission. Chairperson Powers was inclined to vote in favor due to the support provided during the Public Hearing. Chairperson Powers said he was hesitant to require the petitioner to match exactly what was there 100 years ago.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern with the approval of the door replacement. Commissioner Herold was in support to approve porch replacement with the denial or deferral of the front door request to allow the petitioner to propose a more historically appropriate design.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold made a motion to approve the application as presented, with the condition if the building code required a handrail, the handrail may be approved administratively; and to deny the request for the replacement of the front door. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wester.

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

**CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**
There were no citizens who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission at 9:53 a.m.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
**REPORT BACK ON SECTION 106 PUBLIC PROCESS**
Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, said at the July 27, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting the Commission required an advisement summary from Director Black, in response to the following request made by Karrie Alms:

1. HPC review and comment on all current and future city projects involving federal monies (i.e.) Section 106 process as utilized at the March 23, 2016 HPC meeting for the MacArthur Highway Bridge.
2. HPC be involved in the effort to engage neighborhood associations, citizens, and any of all interested parties to develop the public involvement process for the Section 106 process through engagement, consultation, and planning of projects.

3. Lack of design standards for all heritage neighborhoods.

Grants Coordinator, Nick Mitchell, Community Development Department, provided the following report:

Section 106 Requirements with Regard to Public Participation

1. The City shall seek and consider the views of the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the undertaking, its effects on historic properties and the likely interest of the public.

2. The City shall provide the public with information about an undertaking and its effects on historic properties and seek public comment and input.

3. The City shall identify the appropriate points for seeking public input and for notifying the public of proposed actions.

4. If the result of an assessment is that no adverse effect is found, then the city shall maintain a record of the finding and provide information on the finding to the public on request.

5. If the result of an assessment is that an adverse effect has been found, the city shall provide an opportunity for the public to express views on resolving adverse effects.

The City's Process for Conducting Section 106 Review with Regard to Public Participation

1. Conduct a yearly ‘Tier 1’ City-wide environmental review covering all grant activities, which includes the Section 106 process as a subpart.

2. For the Tier 1 review a public notice is issued and 15-day public comment period is held.

3. The Tier 1 review lays out the city's standard process to carry through compliance with section 106, namely, to clear individual project sites with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) (IHPA is the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); the SHPO is recognized by HUD as the primary consulting party of the section 106 process).

4. Before conducting an individual project the City sends project details to IHPA for review.

5. Should IHPA find no adverse effect with an individual project, they send an official letter to the City evidencing compliance with section 106 and the City maintains a record of the finding and provides information on the finding to the public on request.

6. Should IHPA find an adverse effect, the City consults with IHPA in order to decide how the process should unfold from that point and to decide when and how to further involve the public.

Commissioner Herold requested additional information pertaining to the Section 106 Requirements with Regard to Public Participation, Item No. 4.

Mr. Mitchell outlined the criteria for what constitutes as an adverse effect. Mr. Mitchell noted IHPA is currently developing design standards.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern the lack of design standards would conclude no adverse effect; therefore, it would be an incomplete review. Commissioner Herold referred to the issues in the North Valley when the IHPA determined there were no adverse effects while the neighborhood disagreed.

Mr. Mitchell said the details of the project are sent to the IHPA for review. The city does not provide recommendations with the project details. Mr. Mitchell said the IHPA may visit the site to make the appropriate determination, as the IHPA did in the case Commissioner Herold referenced.

Commissioner Herold discussed the North Valley. Commissioner Herold supported HPC involvement when Federal funds were dispersed in National Historic Districts (i.e.) Section 106 process as utilized at the March 23, 2016 HPC meeting for the MacArthur Highway Bridge.

Ms. Techie requested clarification from Commissioner Herold as to whether the request was specific to commission input on design in National Historic Districts or whether the commission wanted to have control of the design.
Commissioner Herold suggested to modify regulations to state any Section 106 in National Historic Districts must involve HPC review.

Discussion ensued regarding the North Valley and recent determinations by the IHPA.

Mr. Mitchell said although there were no design standards set by the IHPA, there were standards reviewed to determine adverse effects which may provide if the change, improvement, or development was appropriate.

Commissioner Maloof requested confirmation the IHPA standards pertained to the Warehouse District.

Ms. Techie confirmed Commissioner Maloof’s inquiry and provided a map of the National Historic Districts.

Commissioner Herold referred to the recent demolition at 506 E Frye. Commissioner Herold suggested if a property was non-owner occupied and bank owned, the subject property would not have to consent to be landmarked in an effort to reduce the number of demolished historic (without legal historic designation) homes.

Commissioner Dougherty supported aligning the local Historic Districts with the National Historic Districts.

Discussion ensued regarding the designation process for local historic landmarks.

Commissioner Maloof noted the difficulty of communication with bank owned properties.

Commissioner Herold questioned the process of creating a neighborhood overlay district.

Ms. Techie said the Land Development Code was separate from the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Commissioner Maloof expressed concern with the developments in the Warehouse District without HPC approval.

Ms. Techie noted the Warehouse District was a National Historic District.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern for the lack of HPC input with Federal funds provided to developers to rehabilitate the Warehouse District.

Ms. Techie requested clarification the commission strictly requested input rather than HPC approval in National Historic Districts.

Commissioner Herold referred to the HPC input for the reconstruction of the MacArthur Highway Bridge and supported that process. Commissioner Herold inquired the formation of Form Districts.

Commissioner Maloof echoed Commissioner Herold’s recommendations.

Chairperson Powers noted City Staff was providing great responses to the commission’s discussion and inquiries. Chairperson Powers suggested an expansion of existing historic districts rather than new designations. Chairperson Powers suggested the commission revisit the designation process but noted that discussion was separate from Agenda Item No. 6, Report Back on Section 106 Public Process. Chairperson Powers suggested the discussion on landmark designation be included on a future agenda.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold made a motion to receive and file; seconded by Commissioner Dougherty.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.
DISCUSSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL
An update was not provided to the commission; an update will be provided at the next commission meeting.

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

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:21 a.m.

---

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner

Madeline Wolf, Development Technician