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, JULY 27, 2016
CITY HALL, ROOM 400 – 8:30 A.M.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MAY 25, 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 16-12**

   **CASE NO. HPC 16-13**
   Public Hearing on the request of T. Lane for a Certificate of Appropriateness for various improvements, including but not limited to, dormer, window, roof, porch, gutter, and architectural detail improvements, water table installation, and an extension of time to complete proposed work, for the property located at 116 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-001), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

   **CASE NO. HPC 16-14**
   Public Hearing on the request of Tom and Deborah Dougherty for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a paver walkway, landscaping, and column addition for the property located at 1600 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-176-004), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

5. CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION

6. DISCUSSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL

7. ADJOURNMENT
A regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, May 25, 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: Timothy Herold, Michael Maloof, Lesley Matuszak, Geoff Smith, and Chairperson Robert Powers – 4. Absent: Deborah Dougherty, Steven Pierz, —3.

Staff Present: Shannon Techie, Madeline Wolf

**MINUTES**

Commissioner Herold requested to correct the spelling of Marjorie Klise in the March meeting minutes.

Commissioner Herold moved to approve the amended minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on March 23, 2016; seconded by Commissioner Maloof.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

**SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS**

Speakers were sworn in by Staff Member Madeline Wolf.

**REGULAR BUSINESS**

Robert Powers announced his abstention from Case No. HPC 16-08 due to financial interest. Vice Chairperson Matuszak presumed the Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Commissioner Smith entered Council Chambers at 8:35 a.m.

**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).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-08 into the record and presented the request as outlined in the memo.

Vice Chairperson Matuszak opened the Public Hearing at 8:35 a.m.

Sam Eid, petitioner, said he requested to replace two or three original windows that were in poor condition. Mr. Eid said the proposed replacements would be consistent with the existing windows, including the windows that do not open. Mr. Eid said replacing windows with the original material and style was expensive; the proposed windows maintained the original aesthetic value.

Mr. Eid said the 26” door was not available as a standard door size; therefore, he requested to remove the original, rotted door frame, reframe the doors, and install a 36” door with a 40” door frame. The requested door met fire code and maintained the original aesthetic value. Mr. Eid said the back door was boarded up; he requested to replace the boarded door with fire rated safety doors.
Commissioner Herold requested clarification the proposal included removing the double hung windows on either side of the French door of the patio.

Mr. Eid clarified the windows on either side of the patio door would be removed. Mr. Eid said the standard French door is 32” which take up most of the available space. The original doors had smaller frames.

Commissioner Maloof questioned if the side lights and window on top of the fireplace would remain. Maloof questioned the size of the proposed picture windows.

Mr. Eid said the side lights and window on top of the fireplace would remain. Mr. Eid clarified the size of the proposed picture windows; 2’ by 2’, or 18”. Mr. Eid said the double hung windows were the same price; he preferred the proposed style for the aesthetic value.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 8:45 a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold expressed concern the request would detract from the original aesthetics. Herold preferred the replacement fireplace casement windows to have a vertical member with two lights; he did not have a preference if the window would open. Herold supported the sliding window to have a vertical member. Herold supported the proposed front and back door. Herold supported two double hung windows and two 24” French doors; he did not support the proposed patio door set.

Commissioner Smith agreed with Commissioner Herold.

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

The motion was approved viva voce vote 4 to 0.

Mr. Eid said 24” doors were not available as a standard size; the 24” size would be a custom order. Mr. Eid said the original wood was rotted and warped and needed to be removed and replaced. Mr. Eid said the proposed door would be more energy efficient and safe with locks.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 8:53 a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold supported the request to approve the window replacements. Herold supported restoring the existing aesthetics and suggested finding a patio door replacement which maintained the existing two 24” doors; Herold did not support the proposed patio door replacement.

Commissioner Maloof questioned if the petitioner would be able to find two 24” French doors.

Commissioner Smith supported Herold’s suggestion. Smith said the proposed patio door was not a fair trade.

Commissioner Matuszak suggested to approve the window replacements and to allow additional time to find 24” French patio doors.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Maloof made a motion to approve the windows on the sides of the fireplace as side by side casement with or without sliding as long as the windows include a vertical member, approve the front doors and two back doors, and to defer the request for replacing the patio doors. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herold.
Vice Chairperson Matuszak read the Findings of Fact.

Ms. Techie referred to the Ordinance and noted that the ordinance did not address the deferral of a portion of the request. As a result, she explained that it would be better to take action on all parts of the request, with the option of administrative approval on certain items if needed.

Commissioner Maloof amended the motion to address the patio doors.

Commissioner Maloof made a motion to approve the windows on the sides of the fireplace as side by side casement with or without sliding as long as the windows include a vertical member, approve the front doors and two back doors, and if the petitioner can find French doors for a one for one exchange, the patio door may be approved administratively, if not, a new case and request must come before the Historic Preservation Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herold.

The motion was approved by roll call vote 4 to 0.
Nays: None.

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).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-09 into the record and presented the request.

Vice Chairperson Matuszak opened the Public Hearing at 9:11 a.m.

Fulvio Zerla, petitioner, said the request was a one for one exchange. Mr. Zerla said the double hung window replacements enhanced the efficiency and maintained the aesthetics of the home.

In response to Commissioner Herold’s requested clarification, Mr. Zerla clarified the request did not include door replacements. Mr. Zerla confirmed the window replacements will be a one for one exchange in accordance with the same number of lights, including the porch windows with 6 lights over 1.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 9:13 a.m.

Discussion:
Commissioner Herold supported the one for one exchange.

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

Vice Chairperson Matuszak read the Findings of Fact.

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

Chairperson Powers presumed the Historic Preservation Commission meeting.
CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Sam Eid, petitioner for Case No. HPC 16-08, requested clarification of the approval for Case No. HPC 16-08.

Valerie Ackerman, new member of Central Illinois Landmark Foundation (CILF), introduced herself to the commission.

Timothy Herold, commissioner, recognized Marjorie Klise and her work on Moss Avenue. Herold said her passing was a tremendous loss for the City.

There was no further interest from citizens who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission at 9:25 a.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REPORT BACK ON THE LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT REHAB PROGRAM

Commissioner Herold had requested information on the grant program for owner occupied properties located in local historic districts to be presented at the next regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Ms. Techie provided and presented a report of the local Historic District Rehab Program to the commission. Ms. Techie referenced the information that went to council as outlined in the memo. Ms. Techie provided a review of the applicants for the program.

Commissioner Herold thanked Ms. Techie for her report. Herold was concerned with the lack of applicants.

Chairperson Powers expressed concern for lack of community outreach for the program and supported stronger community outreach with the program.

Ms. Techie reviewed the requirements for eligibility to participate in the program. Ms. Techie referred to the program information on the City website.

Commissioner Herold suggested sending information to the registered Historic Neighborhood Associations.

Commissioner Matuszak suggested sending a general press release to the community.

Motion: Commissioner Matuszak made a motion to receive and file; seconded, by Commissioner Herold.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

Chairperson Powers adjourned for recess at 9:31 a.m. The meeting resumed at 9:36 a.m.

DISCUSSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL

Ms. Techie referred to the 2016 Historic Preservation Work Plan. The work plan included education related to local historic preservation. Ms. Techie suggested creating educational cards to distribute to property owners in the local historic districts. Ms. Techie distributed an example from the Community Development Department’s educational material for Property Maintenance.

Commissioner Matuszak supported Ms. Techie’s suggestion. Matuszak suggested to highlight successful results of properties that obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Herold encouraged commissioners to use Peoria Cares to report a good neighbor or job well done, specifically in the local historic districts.
Commissioner Smith supported Ms. Techie’s suggestion and the example from the Community Development Department. Smith supported Matuszak’s suggestion.

Ms. Techie referenced the “good job door hangers,” that the Community Development Department distributes to well-maintained properties. Ms. Techie offered to deliver the good job door hanger if members of the commission wanted to recognize a well-maintained property to mention it to her during the commission meeting, E-mail, or through Peoria Cares.

In response to Commissioner Matuszak, Ms. Techie referred to the weekly city Issues Update and suggestion the option for an issues update with local historic preservation.

Chairperson Powers suggested commissioners provide comments for the educational material within the next 10 days to city staff. Powers encouraged the educational material to show the simplicity of working with the Ordinance.

Commissioner Matuszak made a motion to open the Public Hearing for public input in regard to the educational material; seconded, by Commissioner Smith.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 9:47a.m.

With no interest from citizens to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 9:47a.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:48a.m.

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: July 19, 2016
CASE NO: HPC 16-12

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Wil Helmick of PCM + Design Architects for a Certificate of Appropriateness for enhancements to the main entrance of the cemetery, and the addition of flag poles, a landscaped garden, and accent lighting, for the property commonly known as Springdale Cemetery and located at 3014 N Prospect Road (Parcel Identification Nos. 14-34-200-006, 14-34-132-002, 14-27-476-001, 14-35-101-001), Peoria, IL. (Council District 3).

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 for enhancements to the main entrance of the cemetery, and the addition of flag poles, a landscaped garden, and accent lighting, for the property commonly known as Springdale Cemetery and located at 3014 N Prospect Road.

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.
Certificate of Appropriateness Application
Historic Preservation Commission

Property Information: (The property the work will be performed on)
Address: 3014 N Prospect Rd., Peoria, IL
Tax ID Number: 699948048507
Architectural Style: a variety including Romanesque, and gothic elements

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: Wil Helmick AIA
Company/Neighborhood Association: PCM + Design Architects
Address: 300 E. Washington St. suite 3
City: East Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61611
Daytime Phone: (309) 694-5014 Email: whelmick@pcmplusd.com
Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 6/22/2016

Owner: (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)
Name: Mark Matuszak
Company/Neighborhood Association: Springdale Cemetery
Address: 3014 N Prospect Rd
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61603
Daytime Phone: (309) 681-1400 Email: mark@springdolecemetery.com
Owner Signature: [Signature] Date: 6/22/2016

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)
Name: to be determined
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:

Springdale Cemetery is planning a new entry element to replace the existing 1960's stone walls and fencing with a complete new entry feature. The concept is derived from the design of the split granite fieldstone monuments flanking the original Perry street entrance from the 1850's (see exhibit #1) which had fallen in disrepair and was demolished some time ago. The work will include all of the following:

- a new entry road, including boulevard and curbs
- a central pedestal/ column at the island of the boulevard
- fencing and intermediate stone columns on each side of the entry
- 3 new flag poles and landscaped garden
- new concrete drive and curbs with pavers inset at gate
- asphalt top coat at existing drive near building
- locations for new accent lighting at the monuments and flagpoles
- a new landscape plan for all these areas

The new granite fieldstone shown in exhibit #2 will match the original stone pedestals. In addition, we plan to reuse the original stone cap/ sphere at the top of the new pedestal. A bronze plaque will be used as signage for Springdale on the face of the pedestal.

The new flag garden will flank the entry to the right with seating and evening illumination. The wrought iron fences and gates will be built with a maintenance free aluminum substitution.
Exhibit #1 - Springdale Cemetery- original Perry St. entry
Exhibit #3- entrance feature
Exhibit #5- site civil plan
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:

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.

YES  NO  N/A  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 than conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  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:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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:**

**SIGNATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson Robert Powers</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Deborah Dougherty</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tim Herold</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Michael Maloof</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Lesley Matuszak</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Geoffrey Smith</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Thomas Wester</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTE:**

Approved _________ Denied _________ _______ to _______
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: July 19, 2016
CASE NO: HPC 16-13

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of T. Lane for a Certificate of Appropriateness for various improvements, including but not limited to, dormer, window, roof, porch, gutter, and architectural detail improvements, water table installation, and an extension of time to complete proposed work, for the property located at 116 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-001), 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 for various improvements, including but not limited to, dormer, window, roof, porch, gutter, and architectural detail improvements, water table installation, and an extension of time to complete proposed work, for the property located at 116 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: 116 NE Roanoke
Zip Code: 61606
Tax ID Number: 18-043-290-01 Architectural Style: Victorian/Gothic Revival

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: T. Lane
Company/Neighborhood Association: Randolf Neighborhood Association
Address: 
City: State: ZIP: 
Daytime Phone: Email: 
Applicant Signature: Date: 6-21-16

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: 
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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:

Detailed in PowerPoint e-mailed to Shannon Tchie
116 NE Roanoke

- Tax ID: 1804329001
- Architectural Style: Victorian w/ Gothic Revival influence
- Owner/Applicant: T. Lane
- Neighborhood: Randolph/Roanoke
116 NE Roanoke
Purpose for COA

- Renewal of unfinished items from 2011 certificate of appropriateness
- Additional requests
Foundation issues

- Brick foundation has become compromised over time
- Studs & sheathing have suffered from dry rot over the years
How Did This Happen?

- No gutters
- Poor water run off
- Improper construction
- Neglect by previous owners
When the north side addition was added many years ago, the shed dormer next to it should have been removed or re-located. The awkward placement of it has caused a large current of water to rush down the corner valley which has resulted in dry rot around the window and possibly beneath the siding and has caused severe damage to the brick foundation below it. Over the years, roof tar was put on to patch holes.
North side dormer
Foundation damage
Rotted window sill

6/23/2016

116 NE Roanoke
Water Table

- The bottom edge around the perimeter of the house show signs of having once had a water table to divert water from the edge of the foundation. It appears to have been removed or covered up when the cedar shingle siding was added in the mid 20th century.
Experts have recommended removal of the dormer and install a proper copper valley flashing where the cross gables meet in order to save the structural integrity of the house. This was approved in 2011, but not completed.

During dormer removal, request replacement of the inappropriate vinyl window with a small picture window (leaded or stained glass.) The final window & trim decision will depend on availability of architectural salvage.

Add a painted wood water table around the perimeter of the house to divert water.
Mock-up of dormer removal
This front porch does not appear to be original. The concrete foundation is evidence of this. When first purchased, the front porch had numerous locations which leaked and caused dry rot to set in. It caused some rot issues on the house as well which were of major concern.

Many of these concerns were addressed in 2011 when the previous COA was applied for, but because of numerous other unexpected issues with the house, not all the work was completed in a timely fashion.
Front Porch in 2011
Rotten beam & threshold
Recommendation & Request

- Most of the porch was in remarkably bad shape and not original to the house. There were many cases of leaks from bad roof patching and a consistent use of improper woods & fasteners for exterior exposure during previous repairs which were rotting & rusting away after only a few years of use.
- In 2011, I requested permission to tear down the entire porch and re-assemble a new one that mimics the architectural features of the current one with a low-pitched rubber roof. The 3 classical support beams in front were salvaged along with an attempt to mimic Victorian features. A large part of the handrail and spindle system have rotted away due to improper installation and use of wood that is not rot and insect resistant.
Continuation of Porch repair
Recommendation & Request

Mr. Spindle is a manufacturer of replica historic porch and deck parts. I would like to use the spindles & rails shown below to finish the porch which roughly match the current dimensions on the porch and maintain current city code for railing height.
The tower at one time had a series of corbels and Victorian embellishments as shown in the following photo from the 1960s.

The window trim appears to have had some architectural embellishments as well as decorative pediments below the drip caps. The drip caps were sawn off each window when Aluminum siding was put on in the mid/late 20th century.

I would like to re-install these features, making the best possible attempt to match with era-appropriate salvaged or re-produced wood parts.
Tower & North bay corbels

Peoria Historical Society Collection
Bradley University Library

6/23/2016
116 NE Roanoke
Tower Details
Note the lack of a drip cap above the window which causes water to leak onto the sheathing.

Note the ghost line from where the corbels and Victorian embellishments were once fastened.
I believe the tower, at one time, had a piece of Eastlake stick trim to frame it off from the rest of the house. I want to add this back.
All the dormers and eave lines once had decorative corbels which helped divert water from entering around exposed nail heads.
Most of these architectural details were not merely cosmetic. In the majority of cases, they were part of the flashing system that kept water from seeping through nail holes & crevices or sitting on level surfaces and leading to dry rot.

They were removed at some point to add aluminum siding to the house. A previous owner removed the siding and painted the house, but did not re-install these important details.
I also plan to put traditional 5” half round gutters around the perimeter of the house as I continue with replacement of the slate roof in sections.

Renew request to add a small architecturally appropriate roof over rear porch.

Renew Request to add decorative bargeboard and inverted finial over front and side gables where ghost lines, nail holes and Dado cuts show evidence they once existed.
Example of barge board with inverted finial
Evidence of bargeboard & finial
Additional requests

- Request an extension of the maximum time allowable for all projects to be completed.
- The projects on this house require a great deal of time and financial burden because of the poor condition in which it was left by previous owners.
- The large number of incorrect repairs done by previous owners has added a great deal to the length of time and cost required to complete fundamental repairs.
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.

YES  NO  N/A  b. Proportions of structure's front facade. The proportion between the width and height of the proposed structure should be compatible with nearby structures.

YES  NO  N/A  c. Proportions of openings into the facility. The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing structures.

YES  NO  N/A  d. Relationship of building masses and spaces. The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjoining structures should be compatible.

YES  NO  N/A  e. Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  g. Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

YES  NO  N/A  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.

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 Lesley Matuszak _______________________________ Yea ___  Nay ___
Commissioner Geoffrey Smith _________________________________ Yea ___  Nay ___
Commissioner Thomas Wester ______________________________________ Yea ___  Nay ___

VOTE:  Approved _________   Denied _________   _____  to  _____
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: July 19, 2016
CASE NO: HPC 16-14

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Tom and Deborah Dougherty for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a paver walkway, landscaping, and column addition for the property located at 1600 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-176-004), 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 install a for a paver walkway, landscaping, and column addition for the property located at 1600 W Moss 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: 1530 W. MOSS AVE. Zip Code: 61606
Tax ID Number: 18-08-176-004 Architectural Style: RANCH

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: Tom + Deborah Dougherty
Company/Neighborhood Association: Moss-Brookley
Address: 1530 W. MOSS AVE.
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (309) 397-2772 Email: tdevry@sbcs1000.net
Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 7/1/16

Owner: (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)
Name: Same
Company/Neighborhood Association: Same
Address: 1530 W. MOSS AVE
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: Same Email: Same
Owner Signature: [Signature] Date: 7/1/16

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)
Name: Good Earth Landscaping, Inc.
Company/Neighborhood Association:
Address: 4901 S. Becker Dr.
City: Bartonville State: IL ZIP: 61407
Daytime Phone: (309) 697-6277 Email: [email]

[Signature] Date: [Signature] Date: [Signature] Date: [Signature] Date: [Signature] Date:
**Good Earth Landscaping**
4901 S. Becker Drive  
Bartonville, IL 61607

**PROPOSAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Estimate #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>10134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dougherty/Replinger  
1690 West Moss Avenue  
Peoria, Illinois 61606 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due on receipt</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil, Black &amp; Fertile</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Poly Downspout Adaptor 4&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Poly Corrugated Solid Drainage Tile 4&quot;</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS Pop-Up Emitter 4&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford F-550 Dump Truck</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermeer (mini skidsteer) with Attachments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stihl Concrete Saw Diamond Blade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate Compactor Tamper</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal/disposal of existing walk</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavate for walk base material and column frost footing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of 2 downspout drainage systems with NDS Pop-up</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of column frost footing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of column and limestone cap</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of paver walk as per specifications</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of topsoil, grade</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of outcroppings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of flagstone steppers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of plant material</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Preen and hardwood mulch</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean-up and restore job site</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's been a pleasure working with you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Fax #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>309.697.6277</td>
<td>309.697.0772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Web Site**

www.goodearthlandscaping.org
Good Earth Landscaping
4901 S. Becker Drive
Bartonville, IL 61607

Name / Address
Dougherty/Replinger
1600 West Moss Avenue
Peoria, Illinois 61606

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As per GOOD EARTH LANDSCAPING design sketch and specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Material:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbud Eastern 1.5&quot; BB (RB)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxwood Green Velvet 21&quot; BB (BG)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxwood Green Mountain 24-30&quot; BB (BM)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning Bush Compacta 24-30&quot; BB (BB)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetspire Little Henry # 5 Container (SL)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Grass Karl Foerster # 3 Container (OG)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylily Stella de Oro # 1 Container (DL)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape Material:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Hardwood Mulch, Screened and Double Shredded</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Compost Screened</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preen Pre-Emergent Weed Preventer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Stimulator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstone, Fond du lac Steppers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcropping, Fond du Lac</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels Paver Full 7X8.25X2.75&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels Paver Half 4.25X7X2.75&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels Paver XL 4.25X13X2.75&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels Dimensional Stone 4X8X12&quot;</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Cap, Indiana 24X24X2.25&quot; Rough Face</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-6 Compactible Crushed Gravel Non-Frost Susceptible, Well Graded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sono Tube for Footings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Adhesive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mix 80 lbs bag</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's been a pleasure working with you!

Phone # | Fax #  
---|---
309.697.6277 | 309.697.0772

Web Site
www.goodearthlandscaping.org
DOUGHERTY RESIDENCE • PEORIA • ILLINOIS

SCALE: 1" = 10' - 0"  •  SUMMER 2016  •  T. DOUGHERTY
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:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. | YES | NO | N/A |
| Proportions of structure’s front facade. The proportion between the width and height of the proposed structure should be compatible with nearby structures. |

| c. | YES | NO | N/A |
| Proportions of openings into the facility. The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing structures. |

| d. | YES | NO | N/A |
| Relationship of building masses and spaces. The relationship of a structure to the open space between it and adjoining structures should be compatible. |

| e. | YES | NO | N/A |
| Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures. |

| f. | YES | NO | N/A |
| 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. |

| g. | YES | NO | N/A |
| Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures. |

| h. | YES | NO | N/A |
| 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. |

| i. | YES | NO | N/A |
| 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson Robert Powers</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Deborah Dougherty</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tim Herold</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Michael Maloof</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Lesley Matuszak</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Geoffrey Smith</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Thomas Wester</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTE:**

Approved  ______   Denied  ______

______  to  ____

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---