AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF JUNE 28, 2017 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 17-10**
   Public Hearing on the request of Richard Zaluska of Zaluska Construction, for Lindsey Ma, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish and rebuild the carriage house, for the property located at 1316 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-133-006), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

   **CASE NO. HPC 17-11**
   Public Hearing on the request of Patricia Jackson, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace basement windows, for the property located at 1206 N Ellis Street (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-304-008), Peoria, Illinois (Council District 2).

5. CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION

6. DISCUSSION ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION EDUCATION MATERIAL

7. 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
The regularly scheduled meeting for the Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was held on Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at 8:30 a.m., City Hall, 419 Fulton Street, Room 400, with Chairperson Robert Powers presiding and with proper notice having been posted.

ROLL CALL
The following Historic Preservation Commission Commissioners were present: Timothy Herold, Michael Maloof, Lesley Matuszak, Geoff Smith (Arrived at 8:33 a.m.), Thomas Wester, and Chairperson Robert Powers – 6. Absent: Deborah Dougherty – 1.

Staff Present: Shannon Techie, Madeline Wolf

MINUTES
Commissioner Herold moved to approve the minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on May 24, 2017; seconded by Commissioner Wester.

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
It was announced that Commissioner Matuszk would abstain from Case No. HPC 17-6 due to personal interest.

CASE NO. HPC 17-6

Senior Urban Planner, Shannon Techie, Community Development Department, read Case No. HPC 17-6 into the record and presented the case as outlined in the memo.

Commissioner Smith entered Council Chambers at 8:33 a.m.

Chairperson Powers inquired if the request was considered a hardscape repair.

Ms. Techie said the request was more than a repair with potential material and visual changes. Per code, the steps are considered an improvement and the request was, by definition, an alteration to an improvement; therefore requiring Commission approval.

Chairperson Powers opened the Public Hearing at 8:36 a.m.

Jack Gove, Springdale Historic Preservation Foundation Chair and member of the Monument Restoration Committee, spoke in favor of the request on behalf of petitioner, Bob Meals, who was unable to attend. Mr. Gove noted the time and expenses associated with the restoration of the steps. Mr. Gove requested approval of the project as presented.

Commissioner Wester inquired about the total square footage of marble that was missing and would be replaced with concrete.

Mr. Grove said, in total, the landing area was 205 square feet and the step area was 152 square feet. Mr. Grove said each step represents 48 square feet and there were four (4) steps. Mr. Grove noted a $25,000 to $35,000 cost difference for replacing the missing tiles with concrete versus marble.
In response to Commissioner Smith’s inquiry, Mr. Grove noted the contractor doing the repair and restoration has worked with monument repair at Springdale for several years.

Commissioner Herold requested confirmation of the cost difference with marble versus concrete for the missing pieces.

Mr. Grove said the total cost for the project as requested was $50,000; with new marble for the missing pieces, the project total was estimated to be $75,000 to $80,000.

With no further interest from the public to provide public testimony, Chairperson Powers closed the Public Hearing at 8:42a.m.

**Discussion:**
Commissioner Herold expressed concern the proposed concrete material replacement on the steps and walkway did not meet the Criteria No. 6 on the Findings of Fact Worksheet for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Commissioner Herold supported rebuilding the walkway with stamped concrete and restoring and/or replacing the missing marble pieces on the entire width of the four steps.

Chairperson Powers noted his appreciation to the applicant and city staff for the preparation and the presentation of the request. Chairperson Powers echoed Commissioner Herold’s comments. Chairperson Powers supported the reuse of the available marble tile and to only use concrete for the upper walkway, which was less visible.

Commissioner Wester agreed with Commissioner Herold and Chairperson Powers noting the consideration of the cost and the importance of the marble tile restoration and replacement of the steps.

Chairperson Powers noted the labor cost involved with the restoration and installation of the marble tiles and the potential issues with water run-off.

Commissioner Smith agreed with Commissioner Herold.

Commissioner Maloof requested Commissioner Herold specify the preferred location for concrete.

Commissioner Herold noted the application indicated there were not enough marble tiles to restore and repair the entire width of the landings of the four stairs; Herold preferred the petitioner purchase new black and white tiles if necessary to fill the four landings and to apply brushed concrete to the walkway at the top of the stairs rather than use the restored tiles for the upper walkway and add concrete to the four landings.

In response to comments by commissioners, Ms. Techie clarified that some of the tiles were cemented into the ground and some were on dirt; the tiles on the first two landings were cemented in and may be more difficult to remove and reuse.

Commissioner Maloof questioned if Commissioner Herold was proposing a deferral to provide the applicant more time for consideration of the commissioner’s suggestions.

Commissioner Herold did not support a deferral as that would delay the project. Commissioner Herold noted the upper walkway tiles looked complete and encouraged the reuse for the four landings. Commissioner Herold said it looked as though the walkway provided enough tiles for the landings, but in the case there are not enough tiles to be restored, he preferred the petitioner replace missing tiles with new black and white marble tile.

**Motion:**
Commissioner Herold made a motion to approve the request with the condition that only marble may be used on all four stair landings and to allow poured, stamped concrete on the upper walkway to match the existing design/imprint; seconded by Commissioner Wester.

Commissioner Maloof questioned if there was a time limit for the applicant to reapply if they were unable to meet the conditions of the motion.

Ms. Techie noted the applicant may submit an application for a new request at any time.
The motion was approved by roll call vote 5 to 0 with 1 abstention.
Nays: None.
Abstention: Matuszak – 1.

CITIZENS’ OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tim Herold, an interested citizen, supported the improvements and restorations at Springdale Cemetery.

Allen Andrews, an interested citizen, spoke to his involvement with Springdale Cemetery which included: involvement with "Rescue" of Springdale since 1999, 3 years as the Volunteer Coordinator for Springdale Cemetery, SHPF Board Member since 1999, original appointee to the Cemetery Authority Board from its inception in 2002 until May 2017, managed non-customer operations of the cemetery under the receivership for 3+ years, and managed all cemetery affairs under the Authority for 7 months in 2008. Mr. Andrews spoke of his personal opinion, not that of the board, and suggested the Commission consider an amendment to the Historic Preservation Ordinance or approval of an overall plant to consider Springdale Cemetery as a unique historic district and/or landmark and to define what may be approved administratively and what must be approved by the commission which would embrace the concept of the Cemetery Authority.

Lesley Matuszak, an interested citizen, expressed concern for the approval or disapproval of items that may ultimately hinder the completion of the project due to costs associated with the commission's conditions. Ms. Matuszak said good points were made by public comments.

There was no further interest from citizens who wished to address the Historic Preservation Commission at 9:07a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was approved viva voce vote 6 to 0.

The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:07a.m.

Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
Madeline Wolf, Development Technician
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: August 23, 2017
CASE NO: HPC 17-10

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the request of Richard Zaluska of Zaluska Construction, for Lindsey Ma, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish and rebuild the carriage house, for the property located at 1316 W Moss Avenue (Parcel Identification No. 18-08-133-006), Peoria, Illinois (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 demolish and rebuild the carriage house, for the property located at 1316 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: 1316 W Moss Ave Zip Code
Tax ID Number: 18-08-133-006 Architectural Style:

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: Lindsey Mc
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: 1316 W Moss Ave
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (309) 370-5093 Email: lma@mtco.com
Applicant Signature: __________________________ Date: 7/12/17

Owner: (Skip this section if the applicant and owner information is the same)
Name: Lindsey and Kathy Mc
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: 1316 W Moss Ave
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61606
Daytime Phone: (309) 370-5093 Email: lma@mtco.com
Owner Signature: __________________________ Date: 7/12/17

Contractor Information: (If available, not required)
Name: __________________________
Company/Neighborhood Association: 
Address: __________________________
City: __________________________ State: __________________________ ZIP: __________________________
Daytime Phone: (__________) __________________________ Email: __________________________
Rebuilding existing garage size 46" x 22':

* foundation to be reused
* existing roof removed
* 8" high existing brick corners and possibly stucco saved
  * wall top plates removed and new studs added to existing for new wall height 12'0"
  * if existing stucco cannot be saved new fibercement stucco board installed with 1x4 wood batten 48" O.C. painted to color of limestone
* wall brick corners 8" high to be capped with 4" thick limestone matching house
* wall above 8' to be finished with T&G cedar painted bronze (same color like house) windows
* new roof with 4/12 pitch (hip style slopped all sides) and 24" overhung
* roof shingle to match house shingles
* soffit material stucco board (similar to house) with 20x30 vents matching house
* Marvin windows 48x30 awning style with divided lights carriage house style bronze color clad
* garage overhead doors 16'-0x8'-0 and 8'-0x8'-0 steel insulated carriage house style
* ThermaTru service doors (double 6'0x8'-0) similar carriage house style
CROSSECTION

- Ridge Vent
- 30 Year Architectural Shingle
- Ice Shield
- 1/2" OSB Roof Sheeting
- Roof Truss 24" O.C.
- Drip Edge
- 5" Aluminum Gutter
- Stucco Board
- 2 20x30 Per Side Soffit Vents
- 2x4 Stud 16" O.C.
- 7/16" OSB Wall Sheeting
- Double 11-7/8" Lvl Header
- Vertical T&G Cedar / Fiberglment
- Stucco Board Exterior Finish
- Garage Door R10
- 2x4 Stud 16" O.C.
- 2" Polystyrene Insulation
- 1/2" Moisture Resist Drywall
- 2x4 Pressure Treated Plate
- Existing Foundation and Garage Floor
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Shannon Techie, Senior Urban Planner
DATE: August 23, 2017
CASE NO: HPC 17-11
SUBJECT: Public hearing on the request of Patricia Jackson, to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace basement windows, for the property located at 1206 N Ellis Street (Parcel Identification No. 18-04-304-008), 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 foundation windows, for the property located at 1206 N Ellis Street

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: 1206 N Ellis St. Zip Code 61603
Tax ID Number: 18-04-307-008 Architectural Style: 

Applicant: (The person/organization applying.)
Name: Patricia Jackson
Company/Neighborhood Association: JACKSON@490gmail.com
Address: 1206 N. Ellis St.
City: Peoria State: IL ZIP: 61603
Daytime Phone: (309) 222-0339 Email: 
Applicant Signature: Date: 8-1-2017

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 existing windows in the foundation with sliding vinyl white replacement windows. Please see attached picture regarding style and color of window to installed.
Style and color of window to be installed at 1206 N Ellis St.
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.

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**  **4.**  Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**  **5.**  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**  **6.**  Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**  **7.**  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.

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**  **8.**  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**  **9.**  Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project.

**YES**  **NO**  **N/A**  **10.**  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**  **11.**  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:

<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>YES</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>YES</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>YES</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>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Roof shapes. The design of the roof should be compatible with adjoining structures.</td>
<td>YES</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>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Scale of structure. The scale of the structure should be compatible with surrounding structures.</td>
<td>YES</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>YES</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>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIATED BY: ____________________________________________

SECOND: ____________________________________________

SIGNATURES

Chairperson Robert Powers  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Deborah Dougherty  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Tim Herold  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Jan Krouse  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Michael Maloof  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Lesley Matuszak  Yea  Nay
Commissioner Geoffrey Smith  Yea  Nay

VOTE: Approved _________ Denied _________ to _______
Josh,

Per discussion at the HPC meeting, the Commission would like to see a simple colorful handout capturing the following:

- They want to replicate the example from the Community Development Department’s educational material for Property Maintenance (the card style but a brochure would be fine if the card is not an option) and focus the content to the historic preservation Ordinance compliance.
  - The thought was to have a house from here in Peoria and call out specific types of improvements and highlight the review process for each.
- They want specific information related to review requirements for window replacement. Roofs, driveways, porches, and landscaping are common items for review.
- They would like a visual of a “before and after” of historic preservation improvements. A demonstration demonstrating how curb appeal enhances community development. They want to include pictures from Peoria.

If you can find out from Adco the timing and let me know what else you need from me on this.

Thanks,
Shannon

Here’s the current ordinance requirements and process for Certificate of Appropriateness:

- (a) Types of certificates of appropriateness.
  1. No certificate of appropriateness required:
     a. Removal of vegetative materials except trees that meet the definition of significant landscaping
     b. Installation of plant materials including flowers, shrubs, lawns, hedges and trees.
     c. Maintenance, including pruning trees and thinning plants.
     d. Removal of trees prohibited by City of Peoria Code Appendix B and C.
     e. Removal of dead trees.
     f. Yard fixtures when confined to the rear yard.
     g. Grading and filling consistent with surrounding grades.
     h. Paint applied to existing painted surfaces.
     i. Paint that results in a maximum of three colors for the primary structure - may include one contrasting color (from the three permitted colors) to accent trim details and doorways only.
     j. Paint that matches a generally accepted historical color palate.
     k. Gutters and downspouts that meet the following: Original gutters and downspouts, such as boxed or built-in types, shall be repaired and replaced whenever possible. If built-in gutters are covered over, and new half-round or K-style gutters are added, the cornice shall remain in profile and not be completely removed, so they appear similar from the street. New gutters and downspouts shall be located with minimal visual impact and shall blend in color with the trim or body of the structure. Downspouts shall be placed on the side or rear of the house and shall be used in conjunction with splash blocks to avoid water damage to the structure. When visible, hang-on type gutters and downspouts shall match the original design.

(2) Administrative certificate of appropriateness: Administrative certificates of appropriateness are certificates reviewed by the director of planning and growth management for non-permanent or easily altered
improvements to structure, property or landscaping as determined by the commission such as but not limited to: painting, specific commission determined landscaping issues, unhealthy and/or dying trees that meet the definition of significant landscaping, rear yard fencing, driveway improvements that comply with applicable Land Development Code or Zoning Ordinance requirements, and roof replacement based on previous commission precedent. Applications that are determined to be beyond what may be administratively approved will be heard by the commission as a major certificate of appropriateness at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Process: The director of planning and growth management shall review the application and after consultation with the chairman of the commission or his designee may grant a certificate of appropriateness if the proposed work meets the requirements of Articles I through IV of this chapter and any rules or regulations adopted by the commission and is clearly appropriate and in accordance with the applicable criteria set forth in sections 16-62 and 16-64 and the purposes of Articles I through IV of this chapter. A final decision must be made within seven business days of the date of submittal. The granting of a certificate of appropriateness shall be the final administrative decision. If the proposed work does not meet the above requirements, the director of planning and growth management will send written notification of his or her findings to the applicant. The decision will be final unless the applicant files a written request in accordance with section 16-63(c). The director of planning and growth management will report a list of administratively issued certificates during the preceding month to the commission at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

(3) Major certificate of appropriateness (public hearing): Major certificates of appropriateness are certificates reviewed by the commission. Improvements and alterations that are not identified in section 16-63(1) in historic districts and all improvements or alterations to local landmarks will be reviewed as major certificates of appropriateness.
Porches are one of the most important architectural features of historic structures. Original historic porches, columns, detailing and steps shall be maintained. If replacement is necessary, the same design, materials and patterns shall be used.

Other guidelines include:
- Existing original porches shall not be removed, enclosed or altered in design.
- Porch roofs shall have the same roofing material and eave detailing and be compatible in style with the main structure.
- Porches may be screened if the supporting framework is minimal and the open appearance is maintained.
- Screen panels may not hide decorative details of the porch or cause the removal of original porch material.
- Steps leading to a porch shall be wood if the porch is wood unless documentation shows stone or concrete was previously used.
- Railing height shall be appropriate to the structure. If a shorter railing was used, contact the city Building Inspections Department for approval of any variation from building codes.

For more complete information about the Historic Preservation Commission, please contact: Planning and Growth Management Division at (309) 494-2273
Rehabilitating a house located within a Historic Preservation District is NOT like doing work on a home in a newer subdivision. The district was established so that the houses within it will forever be preserved to their original look.

This requires specific guidelines established by the City of Peoria Historic Preservation Commission, based on the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

A partial list of those standards includes:

1. The historical character of a property shall be retained and preserved.
2. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use.
3. Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
4. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced whenever possible.
5. New additions, alterations of related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

Most rehabilitative work, particularly work that will change the appearance or material of a structure, requires a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Some of the most common items brought to the Historic Preservation Commission for review are window replacement, roofs, driveways, porches and landscaping. On the following pages are guidelines for each of these; for others, contact the HPC.

**Window Replacement**
Original windows, casing and surrounds shall be maintained. If the original windows have been altered, restoring them to their original size, style and material is encouraged.

Other guidelines include:
- Window openings shall not be blocked or reduced; new opening shall not be created where there were none originally.
- Replacement windows, when necessary, shall match the size, style, material, finish and glass patterns of the original.
- Windows of decorative glass, if original, shall be preserved in their original size and location.
- Interior storm windows are encouraged. If exterior storm windows are used, their visibility should be minimized.
- The appearance of exterior aluminum storm windows and aluminum framed screens shall be minimized.

**Roofing**
Original pitch and shape of roofs shall be retained, along with original materials and features when possible.

- Original roofing materials such as wood shake, slate, tile and metal shall be maintained because they are significant features of a historic structure. If original materials are not available or cost prohibitive, appropriate substitute materials may be used.
- When partially re-roofing, new materials shall match the composition, size, shape, color and texture of the deteriorated materials.
- Roof alterations such as dormers, decks, balconies, greenhouses and solar panels are discouraged. If they are added, it should be to the rear of the structure and not visible from the street.
- Original skylights and vents shall be preserved. New ones shall not be added if they are visible from the street.

**Driveways**
In neighborhoods with an alley system, new driveways shall be constructed off the alley unless there is historic evidence one existed coming off the street.

Other guidelines include:
- According to city zoning ordinance, new driveways must be surfaced with all-weather, durable and dustless, asphaltic, inter-locking concrete paver or brick, or cement pavement materials.
- Asphalt is an appropriate paving material. For homes built after 1910, concrete is an appropriate option and can be tinted to blend with the home or older concrete.
- Pea gravel or Wabash gravel is recommended to maintain legally non-conforming gravel driveways (those built before 1972).

**Landscaping**
While no certificate of appropriateness is required for installation of flowers, shrubs, lawns, hedges or trees, the commission may review significant landscaping plans. Please contact the HPC for more information.

Items that do not require review include:
- Removal of vegetative materials except trees that meet the definition of significant landscaping.
- Removal of dead trees or trees that are prohibited by the City.
- Yard fixtures confined to the rear yard.
- Grading and filling that is consistent with surrounding grades.