HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2016  
CITY HALL, ROOM 400 – 8:30 A.M.  

AGENDA  

1. CALL TO ORDER  

2. ROLL CALL  

3. APPROVAL OF JULY 27, 2016 MINUTES  

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

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

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

5. CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION  

6. REPORT BACK ON SECTION 106 PUBLIC PROCESS  

7. REPORT BACK ON THE CREATION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS  

8. ADJOURNMENT
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
A regularly scheduled Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, July 27, 2016, at 8:32 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, Lesley Matuszak, Thomas Wester, and Chairperson Robert Powers – 5. Absent: Michael Maloof, Geoff Smith – 2.

Staff Present: Shannon Techie, Madeline Wolf

MINUTES
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the amended minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on May 25, 2016; seconded by Commissioner Matuszak.

The motion was approved viva voce vote 5 to 0.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKERS
Speakers were sworn in by Staff Member Madeline Wolf.

REGULAR BUSINESS

CASE NO. HPC 16-12
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).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-12 into the record and presented the request as outlined in the memo. Ms. Techie provided a narrative of the proposed work as outlined in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Matuszak left the Council Chambers at 8:39 a.m.

Wil Helmick, petitioner, said he was present to answer questions and provide additional details. Mr. Helmick said the front entrance pillars would reflect the original columns at the gatehouse.

Commissioner Matuszak re-entered the Council Chambers at 8:41 a.m.

Commissioner Herold questioned the removal of the existing front gate, the material of the proposed fence, and if the original stones were available to use with the reconstruction of the front entrance.

Wil Helmick said the front gate would be removed and replaced with an aluminum black fence. Mr. Helmick said the most of the original stones were unavaiable; however, the proposed material was similar to the original.

Commissioner Herold said the approval for the removal of the gatehouse was conditioned to ensure the original stones of the gatehouse were buried for future use (Case No. HPC 09-10). Herold questioned if the gatehouse was buried on site.

Mark Matuszak, General Manager of Springdale Cemetery, said there were not enough original stones available for the construction of the columns. Mr. Matuszak said the stones consisted of river rocks, long, oblong, and oval shapes making it difficult to implement current construction methods. Mr. Matuszak said the granite façade stones will have the same appearance as the original material.
Mr. Matuszak was not aware of the burial site for all the stones; he said he would check with the Springdale Historic Preservation Foundation.

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

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold supported the project. Herold said he preferred use of the original stones. Herold encouraged the same design concept be implemented in the future at the Perry Street entrance to Springdale Cemetery.

Chairperson Powers seconded Herold’s comments.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold made a motion to approve the request as presented with the stipulation to use as much of the original river rock from the gatehouse as possible; seconded by Commissioner Dougherty.

Chairperson Powers read the Findings of Fact.

The motion was approved by roll call vote 4 to 0 with 1 abstention.


Nays: None.

Abstention: Matuszak – 1.

Chairperson Powers announced his abstention from the following case as his residence was within 250 feet of the subject parcel.

**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, IL (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-13 into the record and presented the request to renew the Certificate of Appropriateness from 2011 (Case No. HPC 11-06). Ms. Techie said the water table installation and the architectural detail improvements are the additions to the original request. Ms. Techie noted the petitioners’ request for a time extension to complete the proposed work.

**Tom Lane**, petitioner, referred to the presentation submitted with the application that was distributed to the commission. Mr. Lane said 50% of the work had been completed from the approval of Case No. HPC 11-06. Mr. Lane said foundation issues arouse, causing a delay in completion of the projects.

Commissioners Herold and Dougherty requested additional details of the window improvement request.

**Tom Lane** explained the water run off issue at the corner of the house resulting in the wood rotting on the inside and outside of the window. Mr. Lane’s intention was to replace the window; he was unsure of the size of the replacement as the original casing or seal had previously been removed.

In response to Commissioner Wester’s inquiry, Tom Lane said the window in discussion was for the bathroom and it was the only bathroom window.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Vice Chairperson Matuszak closed the Public Hearing at 9:04 a.m.
**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold had no opposition to the plans. Herold expressed concern for the 2 year extension request and referred to the 2 year extension granted in 2011. Herold said he understood how issues arise when restoring historic properties; however, Herold had received complaints from neighbors in regard to the renovation.

Commissioner Herold inquired the resulting actions if the requested improvements were incomplete after the two year period, Ms. Techie referred to the Ordinance, Section 16-63(c).

Commissioner Matuszak said he understood the difficult economic time. Matuszak said she preferred the property to have more curb appeal throughout the renovation process.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the request as presented including the additional two year extension to complete the improvements with the stipulation the work must be completed by the two year extension; seconded by Commissioner Wester.

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.

Commissioner Dougherty announced her abstention from the following case due to financial gain and interest in Case No. HPC 16-14.

**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, IL (Council District 2).

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 16-13 into the record and presented the request. Ms. Techie explained the request came before the commission because the column addition met the definition of improvement in the Ordinance.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 9:15 a.m.

Tom Dougherty, petitioner, referred to the elevation in the agenda packet. Mr. Dougherty said the column addition would act as a railing for the one step to the front door. The column was freestanding and 42” tall with a limestone cap.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 9:16 a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold supported the project.

Chairperson Powers said the proposed column should be considered for design and not in terms of a railing.

Chairperson Powers read the Findings of Fact.
Motion:
Commissioner Matuszak made a motion to approve the request as presented; seconded, by Commissioner Herold.

The motion was approved by roll call vote 4 to 0 with 1 Abstention.
NayS: None.
Abstention: Dougherty – 1.

CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Karrie Alms, of 1005 NE Perry Avenue, prepared the following requests for the commission to consider:
1. HPC review and comment on all current and future city projects involving federal monies (i.e) Section 106 process as utilized at the March 23, 2016 HPC meeting for the MacArthur Highway Bridge.
2. HPC be involved in the effort to engage neighborhood associations, citizens, and any or all interested parties to develop the public involvement process for the Section 106 process through engagement, consultation, and planning of projects.
3. Lack of design standards for all heritage neighborhoods.

Timothy Herold, commissioner, echoed Ms. Alms’ comments.

Chairperson Powers requested an advisement summary from Director Ross Black in regard to the discussion at the next meeting.

There was no further interest from citizens who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission at 9:28a.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
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 requested input from the commission for the content of the flyer.

Commissioner Herold suggested replicating the example from the Community Development Department’s educational material for Property Maintenance and pertain the content to the historic preservation Ordinance compliance.

Commissioner Dougherty suggested information in regard to requirements for window replacement.

Commissioner Matuszak requested the material include a visual of a “before and after” of historic preservation improvements. Matuszak supported demonstrating how curb appeal enhances community development.

Chairperson Powers suggested commissioners provide comments to city staff within the next 7 days.

Ms. Techie said she would provide an update at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

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 9:40a.m.

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: August 24, 2016
CASE NO: HPC 16-17
SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of William and Janice Heaver of Tri County Builders to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for a freestanding sign, landscape changes, and paint improvements for the property located at 108 NE Roanoke Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-329-006), Peoria, 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:
1) Install a 3 ft x 4 ft wood sign
2) Replace roof
3) Replace exterior concrete
4) Paint exterior doors and trim

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: 108 ROANOKE, PEORIA, IL Zip Code: 6161
Tax ID Number: 36-334 Architectural Style: 

Applicant: (The person/organization applying)
Name: William & Janice Heaver
Company/Neighborhood Association: Tri County Builders
Address: 3703 Grandview Court
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61554
Daytime Phone: (309) 696-9802 Email: sandblaster@grics.net
Applicant Signature: William / Janice Heaver Date: 7-21-2016

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: Tri County Builders Bill Heaver
Company/Neighborhood Association: Tri County Builders
Address: 3703 Grandview Court
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61554
Daytime Phone: (309) 696-5051 Email: sandblaster@grics.net
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:

* **Building Colors:** with off white trim and teal doors, 3 coats applied of Diamond Vogel paint. Exterior - doors - trim -

* **Exterior Structures:** new roof 30 year warranty, weatherwood color, new concrete to be poured over existing concrete. All new doors painted teal and letters placed new exterior lights

* **Sign:** placed in front of building with building name and color match to building, approximately 36" x 46", made of wood.

* **Interior Structures:** flooring replaced with laminate flooring gray/brown color. All walls painted, doors replaced, bathroom cabinets, toilets and mirrors replaced, kitchen cabinets replaced. All new appliances and fixtures, including switches and outlets.

* **Colors chosen off of a historical color list per online to hopefully help with value and quality to ensure integrity and ambience of this historical landmark.
**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather than conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, materials and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Whenever possible, new additions or alterations shall be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Commissioner Deborah Dougherty
Commissioner Tim Herold
Commissioner Michael Maloof
Commissioner Lesley Matuszak
Commissioner Geoffrey Smith
Commissioner Thomas Wester

Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____
Yea _____ Nay _____

VOTE: Approved ____________ Denied ____________ _____ to _____
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: August 24, 2016
CASE NO: HPC 16-19

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Michael Ihlenfeldt to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a front door, side porch and steps, for the property located at 1012 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-226-006), 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 a front door, side porch and steps.

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: 1012 W. MOSS AVE. Zip Code 61606
Tax ID Number: 18-08-226-006 Architectural Style: CELEBRAL 2 FREDKLEIN ARCHITECT

Applicant: (The person/organization applying)
Name: MICHAEL THIEFMLOT
Company/Neighborhood Association: MOSS - BRADLEY
Address: 1012 W. MOSS AVE.
City: PEORIA State: IL ZIP: 61606-1769
Daytime Phone: (309) 674-6020 Email: JHLENFLOT@YAHOO.COM
Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 8/3/2016

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: PHILLIP PERKINS - OWNER
Company/Neighborhood Association: RAINBOW INTERNATIONAL
Address: 321 E. MAIN ST.
City: PRINCETON State: IL ZIP: 61609
Daytime Phone: (309) 256-9069 Email: PCPERKINS@FRONTIER.COM
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:
Filing Instructions and Information

1) Completed applications must be received at least 28 days prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be included on the agenda.

2) The following information is required to be submitted with the application:
   a) One color photograph of the structure as seen from the street. (Two are needed for corner properties.)
   b) Color photographs of the portion of the site/buildings to be modified.
   c) Site plans, building elevations, and/or renderings, drawn to scale, illustrating the proposed improvements. All submitted drawings must be folded no larger than 9"x12".
   d) Site plans shall include the following:
      i) Property lines, existing streets and adjacent curb lines, north arrow and scale.
      ii) Locations of all buildings, structures, and sidewalks
      iii) Locations and dimensions of walks, fences, and exterior lighting structures.
      iv) If landscaping is proposed: A landscape plan showing exact location, size, quantity and type of all existing and proposed landscaping. Lawn areas should be indicated as seed or sod.
      v) Square footage of all existing and proposed buildings.
   e) Brochures, colors and/or samples of the product material to be used.
   f) Any other information that may assist the commission in making an informed decision.
   g) Application fees:
      - Commission and Administrative cases $25.00
      - Local historic district designation cases $200.00
      - Local historic landmark designation cases $50.00

3) The applicant and all historic district properties within 250 radial feet of the subject property will receive notice of the meeting 15 days prior to the meeting.

4) The Historic Preservation Commission has regularly scheduled meetings the fourth Wednesday of each month at City Hall, 419 Fulton St, Room 400, Peoria, IL at 8:30 AM.

5) The format for the meeting follows:
   1. Chairperson proceeds with swearing in procedures
   2. Chairperson announces the case
   3. Staff enters case into the record
      a. Staff presents 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

Application and inquiries should be submitted to:

   Historic Preservation Commission Staff  Phone: 309/494-8600
   City of Peoria Development Center  Fax: 309/494-8680
   419 Fulton Street, Room 300
   Peoria, IL 61602-1217
Attachment: Certificate of Appropriateness Application: Ihlenfeldt, Michael A.

Address: 1012 W. Moss Ave., Peoria, IL 61606  Parcel No.: 18-08-226-006

This application is for two separate repair projects to be carried out concurrently by the same contractor, Phillip Perkins of Rainbow International, as listed in the application. We are hoping to work on these projects late August – early September 2016.

**First Project: Front Door replacement.** (Denoted with letter 'A' on attached site plan.)

Even though construction of this house was started in September 1916, it went through a period in the 70's and 80's we believe, when it had been converted by the previous owner into five apartments and used as a rental property. The current owner; Michael Ihlenfeldt, has, since he bought the property, been converting it back into a single residence; and has tried to ensure that restoration was inline as much as possible with the original plans of the house.

The current door on the house is, we are certain, from the days when it was being used by renters. The present door has a large plate glass window in the middle of it, surrounded by a painted hardwood frame. This is the type of door that is not intended as a primary security deterrent, and is certainly not consistent with the design of the rest of the house.

In order to determine what the original door looked like on this house, we consulted with Tim Hartneck, neighborhood historian for the Moss-Bradley Residential Neighborhood Association. He showed us two other houses, also on Moss, that all though were not by the same architect as ours, Fred Klein, they were none the less, built within a few years of this one. Also they both still have their original front doors.

Based on what we observed in the other two homes, the original front door of this house would have been solid oak, with two short coffers, or panels at the top, two longer ones in the middle, and two shorter ones at the bottom which match the top. These also have applied molding around the panels or coffers. We intend to replace the front door of this house with a door as I have described. We will transfer the lock hardware from the old door to the new one, and also intend to install a brass door knocker, which is also in keeping with the style of the early 1900's. The replacement door will be of the same outer dimensions as the present one. The frame for the door will not be changed.
Second Project: Kitchen porch and steps replacement. (Denoted with letter 'B' on attached site plan.)

The present kitchen porch on the side of the house, as far as we can determine, is original to the design. It is obvious however that the steps have been replaced before. The contractor took measurements and pointed out that the steps there now, which are probably about 30 years old, are not to code and were not installed very well. They are made of wood which is rotting. The actual elevated floor of the porch is of interlocking planks of Douglas Fir, which is still in fairly good condition. The actual porch section adjacent to the kitchen door has a decorative surround measuring 7' in height and consists of several vertical 1.5” x 1.5” vertical pieces that measure 7’ in height with a distance between each of 1.5”. This is for privacy and safety, as well as a decorative aspect. We intend to replace all of the wood on the porch and steps, and follow or replicate as much as possible, the original design as is. The only adjustments we intend to make are those that will make the structure more secure or stable, as well as those that ensure it complies with current building codes. We intend to replace the actual deck with Douglas Fir planking which I am told is still available, however with the steps and main vertical supports, we plan to use a material called Miratek, (a composite), which unlike treated lumber, will allow you to paint as soon as construction is complete and will not crack or split like treated lumber does.

Please note that even though this property is owned by Michael A. Ihlenfeldt, that I (David Tegg) am the one coordinating with the contractor to have the work done. If there is some aspect of this application that I have overlooked, or that you feel needs clarifying, please feel free to call or email me at the following. You are also welcome to contact Phillip Perkins the contractor, who has been to the house a number of times now and is well acquainted with our intentions.

David Tegg
309-674-6620
dtegg1959@yahoo.com
Historic Preservation Commission Case # HPC 16-19           Date: 8/24/2016

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural feature should be avoided when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All buildings, structures and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Changes that may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence rather on conjectural design or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, materials and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Whenever possible, new additions or alterations shall be done in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

VOTE

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 _____