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
AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 23, 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 16-08
   Public Hearing on the request of Amy Eid of Alcyone, LLC, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows and doors for the property located at 107 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-328-007), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

   CASE NO. HPC 16-09
   Public Hearing on the request of Fulvio Zerla to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows for the property located at 245 NE Randolph Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-015), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

5. CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION

6. REPORT BACK ON THE LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT REHAB PROGRAM

7. DISCUSSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL

8. ADJOURNMENT
A regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, March 23, 2016, at 8:31 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, Lesley Matuszak, Chairperson Robert Powers – 5. Absent: Steven Pierz, Geoff Smith—2.

Staff Present: Stephen Letsky, Shannon Techie, Kimberly Smith, Madeline Wolf

**MINUTES**

Commissioner Herold requested to amend the February 24, 2016 meeting minutes to reflect the motion for Case No. HPC 16-02 to read as follows, “an extension of 12 months for a total of 24 months to complete the work,” rather than, “an extension of 24 months to complete the work.”

Commissioner Herold moved to approve the amended minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on February 24, 2016; 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.

Chairperson Powers requested to move the Election of Officers to the next item of business.

Commissioner Matuszak made a motion to move Elections of Officers prior to Regular Business; seconded, by Commissioner Herold.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**Vice Chairperson:**
Commissioner Maloof moved to elect Lesley Matuszak as the Vice Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The election for Commissioner Matuszak as Vice Chairperson was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

**Chairperson:**
Commissioner Herold moved to reelect Robert Powers as the Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The reelection of Chairperson Powers was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

**REGULAR BUSINESS**

Chairperson Powers stated he was a resident within 250 feet of the property of 104 NE Roanoke Avenue; therefore, he announced his abstention from Case No. HPC 16-03.

Vice Chairperson Matuszak presumed the commission meeting.
CASE NO. HPC 16-03
Public Hearing on the request of Michael Levan, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for front porch, roof, and gutter improvements for the property located at 104 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-019), Peoria, IL (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-03 into the record and presented the request.

Vice Chairperson Matuszak opened the Public Hearing at 8:39 a.m. 
Michael Levan, petitioner, explained his request. Mr. Levan said he requested to use copper as the material for the replacement of the roof and gutters because of the sustainability and longevity of copper. The replacement of the roof impacted the existing gutters; therefore, he had to replace the gutters.

Without further interest in the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 8:41 a.m.

Commissioner Maloof requested information from Ms. Techie in regard to the petitioner’s application noting that the City wanted the work done now.

Ms. Techie said the property was currently in Housing Court due to housing violations. Housing Court required improvements to be made in order to be in compliance with the City Code.

Commissioner Herold asked Ms. Techie if the request included replacing the railings on the front porch.

Ms. Techie said the application did not include replacing the railings.

Commissioner Herold made a motion to reopen the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Maloof.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

Chairperson Pro-tem Matuszak opened the Public Hearing.

Michael Levan addressed Commissioner Herold’s inquiry regarding the replacement of the railings and the material to be used. Mr. Levan said he was required to replace the front porch steps and the railings to meet code requirements. Mr. Levan said he would use white pine for the front porch steps, which was the original material. Mr. Levan verified the railings would be constructed of wood. Mr. Levan said he wished to appease Housing Court and bring the dwelling structure up to code.

With no interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing.

Motion:
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the request as proposed, with the inclusion of the replacement of the railing with a wood railing; seconded by Commissioner Maloof.

Chairperson Pro-tem Matuszak read the Findings of Fact.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

Chairperson Powers presumed the commission meeting.

CASE NO. HPC 16-04
Public Hearing on the request of Jeff Bergfeld of Farnsworth Group, Inc. for Nathan Fredrick, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for driveway, fence, and landscape improvements for the property located at 1634 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-156-007), Peoria, IL (Council District 2).
Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-04 into the record and presented the request. Ms. Techie said the request included the addition of brick piers, which required commission approval, as the piers meet the definition of improvement per the Historic Preservation ordinance.

In response to Chairperson Powers’ inquiry regarding a front yard fence, Ms. Techie said the dwelling structure obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2010 for the approval of a rod iron and chain link fence in the rear yard. Ms. Techie said the proposed changes met the Land and Development Code requirements and confirmed that a front yard fence was not part of the current request.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 8:54 a.m.

Jeff Bergfeld, Landscape Architect representing Nathan Fredrick, spoke in support of the request. Mr. Bergfeld said 1634 W Moss Avenue and 1628 W Moss Avenue share the driveway. He said the existing driveway required repairs and the replacement of the driveway will be completed concurrently. Mr. Bergfeld provided detail of the proposed improvements as outlined in the memo.

Commissioner Maloof questioned the location for the proposed solid wood fencing. Maloof expressed concern the fence would be visible from Moss Avenue.

Commissioner Matuszak questioned if the fence would be located in the front yard.

Jeff Bergfeld distributed a color diagram of the site plan to illustrate the location of the solid wood fence. Mr. Bergfeld confirmed the proposed fence was in the rear yard and not visible from Moss Avenue. The proposed fence was 250 feet from Moss Avenue.

With no interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 9:02 a.m.

Discussion:
Commissioner Herold supported the project.

Motion:
Commissioner Matuszak moved to approve the request as presented; seconded by Commissioner Herold.

Chairperson Powers read the Findings of Fact.

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

Chairperson Powers stated he was a resident within 250 feet of the property of 107 NE Roanoke Avenue; therefore, he announced his abstention from Case No. HPC 16-05.

Vice Chairperson Matuszak presumed the commission meeting.

CASE NO. HPC 16-05
Public Hearing on the request of Amy Eid to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows for the property located at 107 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-328-007), Peoria, IL (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-05 into the record and presented the request.

Chairperson Pro-tem Matuszak opened the Public Hearing at 9:10 a.m.
Sam Eid said he requested to replace all of the windows with the exact same type of the existing windows. He said the existing windows are either broken, installed improperly, and/or sealed shut. Mr. Eid said the requested windows were energy efficient and historically accurate for a traditional home.

Commissioner Herold asked Mr. Eid if the windows in the attic would be replaced. Herold questioned the proposed design for the new attic windows. Herold questioned the proposed design for the case mount windows.

Sam Eid clarified all windows will be replaced. Mr. Eid said the design of the existing windows will match the new windows. Mr. Eid confirmed he would comply with the commission’s requirements.

Commissioner Herold expressed concern the petitioner maintained the aesthetic of the historic structure.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 9:14 a.m.

Discussion:
Commissioner Herold said he appreciated the investment in the structure.

Motion:
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the request with the condition the same design must be used, whether the window was casement and/or double hung windows; seconded by Commissioner Dougherty.

Chairperson Pro-tem Matuszak read the Findings of Fact.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

Chairperson Powers presumed the commission meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

MacArthur Highway Bridge

Request from the City of Peoria Public Works Department for Advisory Comments from the Commission regarding whether to maintain a similar architectural look for the MacArthur Highway Bridge, over Romeo B Garrett Drive, for reconstruction in Year 2018. The State Historic Preservation process to obtain environmental clearance for a bridge reconstruction required this community solicitation.

Civil Engineer II and Engineering Project Manager, Stephen Letsky, Department of Public Works, referred to the memo. Mr. Letsky stated the Historic Preservation Commission was solicited to provide Advisory Comments to the following questions:

1. Is the existing, deficient bridge structure, its walls, its stairs, and lack of an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) pathway of historical significance that warrant the deficient structure to remain?
2. Although no current concepts have been investigated at this time, is modernization of architectural form recommended if the opportunity exists to replace the bridge?

Commissioner Matuszak expressed concern a higher bridge clearance would impact the nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Letsky said the additional clearance height proposed would not create a trucking route. Mr. Letsky said the additional height would provide clearance for certain buses, moving trucks, and commercial trucks that are unable to clear the existing bridge clearance.

Commissioner Maloof expressed concern of losing the historical and architectural value of the existing bridge design and aesthetic. Maloof requested for the architects to consider the characteristics of the existing bridge with the design for the new bridge. Maloof noted the bridge was the gateway to Moss Avenue’s Historic District.

Mr. Letsky said the architects would look into implementing the aesthetic and design of the existing bridge.
Commissioner Herold agreed with Maloof. Herold noted the bridge was the gateway to Moss-High Historic District and West Bluff National Historic District. Herold addressed Question #1 and said he did not find a need to stop the MacArthur Highway Bridge replacement process. Herold recommended incorporating Art Deco elements to maintain the existing design and aesthetic. Herold expressed concern for the removal of the stairway next to the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Letsky noted to keep stairs on the east side of the bridge.

Commissioner Dougherty noted the bike lane addition in 2015. Dougherty expressed concern the bridge reconstruction would add more traffic lanes and increase the width of the bridge. Dougherty preferred the reconstruction of MacArthur Highway Bridge to remain a two-lane road.

Mr. Letsky responded the proposed reconstruction would maintain the two-lane road with a bi-directional bike path.

Margerie Klise, an interested citizen and resident near the MacArthur Highway Bridge, said the bridge was important to the neighborhood. She said the bridge was the entrance to the neighborhood. Ms. Klise said the bridge was a psychologically important part of the neighborhood. Ms. Klise wanted clarification the reconstruction would not create additional traffic. She suggested further discussion with the neighboring Home Owner’s Association.

Chairperson Powers referred to the requested advisory comments. Powers agreed with commissioners that the historical significance of existing bridge structure did not warrant the bridge to remain.

Commissioner Dougherty expressed concern for increasing traffic with the additional height and width of the reconstruction of the bridge.

Commissioner Matuszak shared Dougherty’s concern. Matuszak suggested the City have discussions with the Moss/Bradley Home Owner Association prior to creating the design for the reconstruction of the bridge.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 9:38a.m.

**CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

There were no citizens present who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission at 9:38a.m.

Commissioner Herold requested information on the grant program for the Owner Occupy in the Historic District to be presented at the next regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40a.m.

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
TO: Historic Preservation Commission  
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner  
DATE: May 10, 2016  
CASE NO: HPC 16-08  
SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Amy Eid of Alcyone, LLC, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows and doors for the property located at 107 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-328-007), Peoria, IL. (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 replace windows and doors for the property located at 107 NE Roanoke 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, 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: 107 NE Roanoke
Zip Code: 61606
Tax ID Number: __________________________ Architectural Style: ______________________________

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: Amy Eid
Company/Neighborhood Association: Alcyone
Address: 1245 W Man
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (630) 747-0416 Email: eidamyj@gmail.com
Applicant Signature: __________________________ Date: 4/19/2016

Owner: (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)
Name: Sam Eid + Bob Eid
Company/Neighborhood Association: Alcyone
Address: 1245 W Man
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (309) 472-6803 Email: sam@oneworld-cafe.com
Owner Signature: __________________________ Date: 4/19/2016

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)
Name: Ed Gabriel
Company/Neighborhood Association: Window World
Address: 688 High Point Lane
City: East Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61611
Daytime Phone: (309) 698-3910 Email: ed.gabriel@windowworldstl.com

For Front Steps:
Pate 10 Zephyr Dr
Bloomington, IL 61701

Addendum: Sam Lowes
201 Riverside Dr
East Peoria, IL 61611
Apologize for the lighting on these photographs.

These five photos represent the 5 existing differing styles for the 12 total windows that are to the left and right of the fireplaces.

All the other different windows were covered in our last application. However, it was an oversight on our end to not include the windows that are to the left and right of the fireplaces. We apologize.

That being said, we are now looking for direction on how to proceed. If we are trying to keep it preserved in its current condition, we are not sure if that would mean having to order 5 different styles that are all mismatched?

Our preference would be for them to be uniform throughout the building. Our preference would be to do a single panel picture window that is non opening. We think choosing the uniform panel that is non-opening will be the most aesthetically pleasing (since all those rooms have opening patio doors for fresh air) and restoring the uniformity will bring it closer to its original look. 7 out of the 12 windows, do not currently open.

The window most similar what we would like to replace it with is the one below this text. Below are product features on the exact window we would like to use:

**Picture Window Features**

Window World’s Picture Windows are the perfect choice to frame a beautiful view. Custom-made in countless shapes, these windows transform aged, unsightly openings into works of craftsmanship fit for any home. Timeless style, combined with state-of-the-art technology: it’s simply the Window World Way.

- Varied sizes and shapes suit designs from traditional to contemporary.
- Combined with other window units, can dramatically increase exposure to natural light.
- ENERGYSTAR qualifying glass packages.
- Multi-chambered mainframe design ensures thermal efficiency.
- Fusion welding on mainframe enhances durability.
- Warm-Edge spacer system improves window seal and keeps edge-of-glass-temperatures consistent.
- High-quality vinyl components never chip, peel, crack or warp like wood.

Limited lifetime warranty.**

Proposed picture window.

Picture window that is used for 3 of the 12 windows. We would like this to be one we match others to.
Proposed Patio Door

We would use this door, which roughed in will be 77 inches. That will leave approximately 19 inches remaining, which we will frame out. The entire thing will be painted the same color as it is currently, a light beige. They will be French doors that swing out, the same as is currently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door Material</td>
<td>Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Insulation</td>
<td>Dual-pane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement/Swing</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle Set Included</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Included</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherstripping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty</td>
<td>Limited lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>Primed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Opening Height (Inches)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Opening Width (Inches)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockset Bore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Width (Inches)</td>
<td>4.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified Northern Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified North/Central Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified South/Central Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified Southern Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Handle Finish      | N/A (no handle)      |
| Hinge Finish       | Polished brass       |
| Brickmould Included| Yes                  |
| Actual Door Width (Inches) | 71.5               |
| Actual Door Height (Inches)  | 79.5                |
| Color              | Clear                |
| Handle             | Left                 |
| Glass Type         | Tilt and raise       |
Existing Front Door

The windows above front door and to the left and right will all remain intact without changes.

Manufacturer: Therma-Tru - Seal-Rite Rockford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Millwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Entry/Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Material</td>
<td>Woodgrain Fiberglass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Rated</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Type</td>
<td>Fiber-Classic Mahogany Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Single Door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab Width</td>
<td>36-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Height</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab Height</td>
<td>79 4/85-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Style</td>
<td>3/4 Lite Two Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Style</td>
<td>Granite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Grids</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>FCM32XN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handing</td>
<td>Right Outswing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sill</td>
<td>Mill Finish Public Access Sill with Thermal Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Width</td>
<td>37 1/2-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Height</td>
<td>80 13/16-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits Opening Width</td>
<td>38 1/4-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits Opening Height</td>
<td>81 3/16-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish</td>
<td>Unfinished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Size</td>
<td>4 9/16-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Type</td>
<td>Stain Grade Jamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamb Finish</td>
<td>Unfinished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore</td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge Type</td>
<td>Non Removable Pin (Outswing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge Finish</td>
<td>Oil-Rubbed Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sill Pan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-Day Stain Kit</td>
<td>Mahogany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stain Kit Quantity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression Weather Strip</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmould</td>
<td>Yes (Attached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Time</td>
<td>21 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>211516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are only proposing changing the actual door. This will provide an actual seal to prevent pests or insects, as well as provide a safer entrance for tenants. This door is the same 3/4 panel glass.
Current Front Entry Steps

We would like to add a thin layer of quick set concrete to patch the holes in the front stairs. Also to improve the appearance.

We will not change the landscaping, but we will make sure the existing bushes are trimmed and uniform.
Back Entry Door

Current back door is boarded up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hinge Finish</th>
<th>Polished brass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Width (Inches)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Height (Inches)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Casing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sill Finish</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Width (Inches)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Opening Width (Inches)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Style</td>
<td>6-panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Height (Inches)</td>
<td>81.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Opening Height (Inches)</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Insulating core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty</td>
<td>Limited lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Insulation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe's Exclusive</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with Iris</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab or Prehung</td>
<td>Prehung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified North/Central Zone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified Northern Zone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified South/Central Zone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Qualified Southern Zone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the door we are proposing replacing the existing entry with.

The finish will match the front entry door and overall match the house closer to original restoration, compared to the boarded up state it is currently in.

The door is primed and ready to be painted, so we will paint it to match color of front door, which is seen on previous page, a dark brown.
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
Findings of Fact Worksheet

The commission shall consider, where applicable, the following criteria in determining whether or not proposed work is compatible and appropriate:

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.

6. 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 on conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

7. 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.

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.

9. 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.

10. 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.
11. The proposed work conforms to the following design criteria as well as any specific guidelines:

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**

a. Height. The height of the proposed structure or additions or alterations should be compatible with surrounding structures.

b. Proportions of structure's front facade. The proportion between the width and height of the proposed structure should be compatible with nearby structures.

c. Proportions of openings into the facility. The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing structures.

d. Relationship of building masses and spaces. The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjoining structures should be compatible.

e. Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.

 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.

f. Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.

 g. 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.

h. 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.

MOTION: ____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

INITIATED BY: ______________________________________________________

SECOND: ___________________________________________________________________

SIGNATURES  

Chairperson Robert Powers _______________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Deborah Dougherty ___________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Tim Herold ________________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Michael Maloof ______________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Leslie Matuszak ______________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Stephen Peirz ________________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____
Commissioner Geoffrey Smith ______________________________ Yea _____ Nay _____

VOTE:  Approved ____________  Denied ____________  _____ to _____
TO: Historic Preservation Commission

FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner

DATE: May 10, 2016

CASE NO: HPC 16-09

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Fulvio Zerla to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows for the property located at 245 NE Randolph Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-015), Peoria, IL. (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 replace windows for the property located at 245 NE Randolph 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, 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: 295 NE Randolph
Tax ID Number: 18-04-329-015 Architectural Style: Stick
Zip Code 61606

Applicant: (The person/organization applying)
Name: Fulvio N. Zeda
Company/Neighborhood Association:
Address: 315 S. Whittaker St.
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61603
Daytime Phone: (309) 657-8725 Email: coolplaces@ZedaProperties.com
Applicant Signature: Date: 9/19/2016

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: Date:

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

1 of 3
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:

- Replace wooden windows with vinyl replacement windows of same size and same number of lights per sash.
- Other moldings (interior) will not be replaced.
- The appearance of the structure as seen from the street will not be altered.
The commission shall consider, where applicable, the following criteria in determining whether or not proposed work is compatible and appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>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 on conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></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>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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION:**

**INITIATED BY:**

**SECOND:**

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

**VOTE:** Approved _________ Denied ___________ _______ to _______
LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT REHAB PROGRAM
*PILOT* PROGRAM GUIDELINES AND APPLICATION

Effective immediately, no housing services will be provided to any address that has a clear environmental code violation on the property. The violation may include any item cited in Chapter 13 of the City Code and/or the most recently adopted version of the International Property Maintenance Code.

REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES PRIOR TO HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The following items must be resolved prior to housing assistance being made available.

- All garbage, debris, old appliances, & dilapidated furniture must be removed from the exterior.
- Garbage and debris within the structure must be removed.
- Motor vehicle parts (including batteries and tires) must be removed.
- All grass and weeds must be less than 10 inches high.
- All bushes, shrubs, or trees blocking the public way must be cut back.
- All unlicensed vehicles must be removed from the property or properly licensed.

Below is an outline of the guidelines for the pilot Local Historic District Rehab Program using CDBG funds:

1) **Eligible Applicants**: Homeowners, whose annual adjusted gross income is less than or equal to 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Using the 80% AMI cap, the maximum income for a family of four would be $55,600. This cap would be adjusted based upon the annual release of the AMI for Peoria County.

2) **Eligible Properties**: Owner-occupied, single family properties located in local historic districts. Properties must be current on property taxes, mortgage and homeowner insurance. Contract for deed properties are not eligible.

3) **Amount of Assistance**: A maximum amount of $15,000 per property. No dollar match contribution is required by the homeowner.

4) **Eligible Rehab Costs**: Exterior only improvements can be addressed with this program. Project’s scope of work will be approved by the City’s Historic Preservation Commission and Rehab Staff.

5) **Continued Program Compliance**: During the first year following project completion, the homeowner cannot vacate and lease the property; turning the property into a rental property. Additionally, if the homeowner sells the property within the first year following project completion and as a result of the resale makes a profit, the homeowner will owe back to the City a portion of the CDBG funds provided. 1/12th of the total assistance provided will be forgiven each month. Special permitted transfers are allowed within the first year that addresses the issue of foreclosure, death of owner, etc. A deed covenant/restriction will be recorded against the property to secure the one year provision. The homeowner will pay the recording fees of the deed covenant/restriction.

All applications must include the following documents:

1. Proof of income for all persons age 18 and over in the home
   - IRS Tax Returns (1040) showing income for the past two years.
   - Social Security 1099 (annual income for previous year) and printout of current monthly income.
   - Payroll check stubs showing income for the last two months

2. Complete the attached IRS Form 4506-T Request for Transcript of Tax Return for everyone in the household 18 years or older (make additional copies if needed). (This will be faxed to the IRS requesting a transcript of your Income Tax Returns or verification of non-filing for the previous 2 years).

3. Driver’s License or a valid State ID for all in the home age 18 & over and a letter from school or medical card for all others to verify address.

4. Copy of a recorded deed as proof of property ownership.

5. Insurance declaration page as proof of insurance.

6. Paid receipt or escrow statement as proof of paid property taxes.

Return application and copies of documents to: City of Peoria Development Center, 419 Fulton St, Room 300, Peoria, IL 61602-1217.

Questions – please contact Nicole Frederick, Grants Manager (309) 494-8606 or nfrederick@peoriagov.org
LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT REHAB PROGRAM APPLICATION

Applicant Name:  
Date of Birth:  Social Security #:  
Co-Applicant Name:  
Date of Birth:  Social Security #:  
Address:  # of Bedrooms:  
Home Phone and/or Cell Phone:  Work Phone:  
Race: (Please circle)  
White  Black/AfrAm  Asian  Amer. Indian  Native Hawaiian  
Amer. Indian & White  Asian & White  
Amer. Indian & Black/AfrAm  
Black/AfrAm & White  Other Multi-Racial  
Are you? (Please circle)  
Hispanic Ethnicity:  YES  NO  
Elderly:  YES  NO  
Female Head of Household:  YES  NO  
Disabled: (Either you or a member of the household)  YES  NO  
Single Parent Household:  YES  NO  

YEAR 2016 INCOME ELIGIBILITY CHART (Total maximum yearly allowable income per household)  
Family Size 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  
Low Income (80% or less than AMI) $38,950 $44,500 $50,050 $55,600 $60,050 $64,500 $68,950 $73,400  

LIST ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS (INCLUDING APPLICANTS; use additional paper if necessary)  
NAME  AGE  RELATIONSHIP  ANNUAL INCOME  SOC. SEC. #  

Return application and copies of documents to: City of Peoria Development Center, 419 Fulton St, Room 300, Peoria, IL 61602-1217. Questions – please contact Nicole Frederick, Grants Manager (309) 494-8606 or nfrederick@peoriagov.org
Homeowner Certification:

I(WE) CERTIFY THAT I(WE) ARE THE OWNER-OCCUPANTS OF THIS PROPERTY AND THAT ALL STATEMENTS MADE ON THIS APPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY(OUR) KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. I(WE) UNDERSTAND THAT ANY WILLFUL MISSTATEMENT OF FACT OR THE FAILURE TO PROVIDE MATERIAL INFORMATION WILL KEEP THIS APPLICATION FROM BEING CONSIDERED. I(WE) UNDERSTAND THAT THE SUBMISSION OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT I(WE) WILL BE GIVEN A REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE. I(WE) HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE CITY OF PEORIA TO INSPECT THE PROPERTY AND TO OBTAIN VERIFICATION FROM ANY SOURCE NAMED IN THIS APPLICATION.

Signatures: (All owners must sign):

____________________________________________________   Date: ______________

____________________________________________________   Date: ______________

All incomplete/ineligible applications will be denied.

City Staff Use Only

____________________________________________________

Staff Approval: ________________________________   Date: ______________