

**DRAFT MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING,
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2017 5:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE ST.
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Sherry Graehling, Ms. Lea Cline,
Mr. John Elterich, Ms. Ann Bailen, Mr. Paul Scharnett, Ms.
Georgene Chissell-arrived at 5:15PM

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Levi Sturgeon

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Katie Simpson, City Planner; Izzy Rivera, Assistant City
Planner

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Graehling called the meeting to order at 5:05 P. M.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simpson called the roll. Three members were present and
quorum was established.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

MINUTES: The commission reviewed the minutes of the November 16, 2017 meeting.
Chairperson Graehling corrected scrivener’s errors on page 1 and 2. Mr. Elterich motioned to
approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Cline seconded the motion, which was **approved** 5-0
with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Mr. Elterich—yes, Ms. Cline—yes, Mr.
Scharnett—yes; Ms. Bailen—yes; Chairperson Graehling –yes.

REGULAR AGENDA:

**BHP-24-17 Consideration, review and approval of a request submitted by Janina King for
the addition of a shed in the south west corner, remove brick, and add a deck at 901 E
Jefferson St. **TABLED FROM 10-19-17 MEETING****

Chairperson Graehling introduced case BHP-24-17. Mr. Curtis Robson, 901 E Jefferson, was
present to speak on behalf of the petitioner for case BHP-24-17. He stated his name and address
for the record.

Ms. Simpson presented the staff report. She stated staff is recommending in favor of the
Certificate of Appropriateness, conditioned upon the commissioners being satisfied with the
materials and the façade being proposed. Staff had no objections to a shed on the property as
long as it would not take away from the character of the principle structure.

Ms. Simpson stated the property is zoned R-3A and a portion of which is zoned M-1, with the S-4 Historic District overlay. Built in 1906 in a cross gabled vernacular style, a John Harwood house. The work being proposed is a 10'x20' shed in the back southwest corner of the property behind the garage. The shed is somewhat visible from the street and will have double sliding barn doors. She stated according to description of work, patio brick will be used to lay the ground for the shed.

Mr. Robson stated he was unsure where the brick was from, when he bought the home, the brick was already present. The brick was placed on top of mud, there was warping present which is why he pulled the brick he needed from the ground to use as the ground for the shed. He stated he will also adjust and redo the patio.

Ms. Simpson stated staff reviewed the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and found the standards were met. She stated staff would like to note that all accessory structures should be recognized as products of their own time. Staff recommended in favor of Case BHP-24-17. Ms. Rivera added there was a picture of the shed taken from the constitution trail in the updated packet, and after a site visit, staff noticed various properties with an additional structure. Therefore adding a shed would not be uncommon in the area.

Chairperson Graehling opened the floor for discussion and asked Mr. Robson if he wished to make any additional comments.

Mr. Robson stated the style of the shed would be a carriage house style, he plans to add more features, those of which he is undecided about. He stated his intentions were to build the shed to look like the principle structure.

Ms. Bailen stated a tree planted in back yard would also help block the view of the retail location across the street. Mr. Robson stated that there were some trees that would need to be cut down as they are dead.

Mr. Scharnett asked if there were site plans for the shed construction. Mr. Robson stated he did not, but he is looking at pictures of the time period when the house was originally built. Mr. Scharnett asked if this was something being constructed by Mr. Robson. Mr. Robson stated yes.

Mr. Elterich asked if the construction was a prefabricated kit. Mr. Robson stated no, he is building as he goes, basing the construction on carriage houses he has seen. The pictures he provided are a basic look at what he intends to build.

Ms. Simpson stated there was construction already underway. Mr. Robson stated the pictures were only a rendering.

Chairperson Graehling asked if the doors would be sliding doors, Mr. Robson stated yes, there would be 2 doors and they would slide.

Ms. Cline asked about the brick that would be taken out from the patio. Mr. Robson stated the brick had already been pulled out and he has placed gravel down. The original brick patio was

built sloped back to toward the house, when there is rain, water pools there. He stated the gate was not moved and is still in the location is was when it was originally installed.

Mr. Scharnett asked if there was a proposed pathway that would lead to the shed. Mr. Robson stated that there was not. The garage that is already there, faces a shared driveway, there is a sidewalk that goes from the house to the garage, and the shed will be behind the garage. He stated that there is a fence that goes up to the garage, with a gate, that will allow access to the shed. There is not a stone pathway.

Mr. Scharnett asked if the shed would be placed on a foundation. Mr. Robson stated no, the leftover brick would be used for the ground of the shed. Mr. Scharnett asked if there would be a wall that would go below grade, Mr. Robson stated no. There was dirt, sand and gravel put down first, then the brick on top. He stated the exterior walls would be treated lumber that are placed above the ground. There will be 4x4 concrete posts, with slots on each side. Mr. Scharnett asked if the structure would be floating, Mr. Robson stated that it would be sitting on top of the post that are in the gravel. Chairperson Graehling asked if there were posts supporting the structure. Mr. Robson stated yes.

Mr. Scharnett expressed his concerns for anchoring the structure. Mr. Robson stated that his intentions are to have a 4x4 post with concrete in the ground, inside the shed, that provide the anchoring.

Ms. Cline asked if the red wood would be left as is. Mr. Robson stated he would like to match the color to the house.

Mr. Scharnett asked what material the roof of the shed would be. Mr. Robson stated the roof would be ½ inch plywood. He had not decided on the shingles. Mr. Robson stated he will try to match the color shingles to the home's roof. He stated he was unsure if he could find the same type of shingles that are on his home currently. Mr. Scharnett suggested looking at different manufactures, in order to find a close match. Mr. Robson agreed, and stated his wife's desire to have the shed look like the house.

Chairperson Graehling asked if he had gotten a building permit. Mr. Robson stated that he went into the Community Development office to file a permit and to his knowledge the permit was accepted. Chairperson Graehling stated her concerns are with the structure and ensuring that it will be built to code, and has the support necessary to be a solid structure. Ms. Simpson stated the permit has been paid for, however, has not been issued nor approved. The Historic Preservation Commission needs to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness first in order for the building permit to be issued.

Ms. Simpson stated the commission has the right to add conditions to the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Cline stated important aspects of this project were reusing the brick and matching the shed construction to the principle structure. She stated a condition she would place on the Certificate of Appropriateness would be that the color, paint and roofing match the structure of the house.

Mr. Scharnett asked if the garage was built as a carriage house. Mr. Robson stated the garage seemed fairly recently built. He stated there was a foundation next to the garage that led him to think there was a carriage house there at some point. Chairperson Graehling stated the garage was fairly new, as she lived in the area in the past. Mr. Scharnett stated his concerns with access to the shed, and if a better alternative would be to extend the garage. Mr. Robson stated it was an option for him, however, there is a tree right against the garage.

Mr. Scharnett asked if the brick that will be reused is original and in good condition. Mr. Robson stated that he is unaware how old the brick is, but he is finding it all over the yard and around the home. Mr. Scharnett suggested a good way to showcase the brick, would be to place it on the exterior with concrete, this would also provide some support for the structure.

Ms. Cline motioned to approve case BHP-24-17 with three conditions: first that the shed will not be substantially different from what was presented to the commission; second, the shed should be painted to match the house; and third, that the roofing material should be the closest match to the original structure. Mr. Elterich seconded the motion.

Mr. Scharnett added the motion could include all exterior materials be substantially similar to the house, and eliminate condition 2 and 3. The motion was approved 6-0 with the following votes cast in favor on roll call: Ms. Cline –yes; Mr. Elterich –yes; Ms. Chisel –yes; Mr. Scharnett –yes, Ms. Bailen –yes; Chairperson Graehling –yes.

Ms. Simpson stated staff would send the approved and signed Certificate of Appropriateness.

BHP-25-17 Consideration, review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness submitted by Judy Sterns for replacing roofing shingles at 1015 E Jefferson.

Chairperson Graehling introduced case BHP-25-17 and Mr. Rodney Phillips from Action Roofing stated he would speak on the case. He also stated he brought samples of the roofing materials that will be used on the project. Mr. Phillips stated roofing work had been done previously on the property.

Ms. Rivera presented the staff report. She stated staff is recommending in favor of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The property is located in the Davis Jefferson Historic District, an Elizabeth Clark Home. In 2014 Action Roofing submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to tear off and reroof the upper south portion of the roof due to a leak the case was BHP-37-14. She stated the proposed work would be a continuance of the work done previously, to prevent further damage to the interior. The petitioner will be removing and replacing the lower shingles in the rear to match the upper shingles. Ms. Rivera stated the petitioner specified that IKO shingles will be used, these shingles target heritage homes. The petitioner is familiar with the home, as he did the work in 2014. She stated things to consider for the project would be maintaining character of the home, and since there would be no structural changes, staff is recommending in favor of case BHP-25-17.

Chairperson Graehling asked to see the samples that Mr. Phillips brought. Mr. Phillips stated the materials are IKO Cambridge, which are the same type of shingles that are on the home currently.

Mr. Scharnett asked what the warranty on the shingles was. Mr. Phillips stated they are limited lifetime warranty. Mr. Scharnett asked if the shingles were asphalt or fiberglass. Mr. Phillips stated they were a combination of material. Mr. Scharnett asked what would be done with the valleys. Mr. Phillips stated there were no valleys in the portion he would be working on. Mr. Scharnett asked what flashing would be used, Mr. Phillips stated step flasher and that none would be exposed. Mr. Scharnett's concern was with the roof against the wall; Mr. Phillips stated there may be some exposure of the galvanized metal in place for the step flashing. The entire project is taking place in the back of the property.

Mr. Scharnett stated his concern with open or closed valleys. Mr. Phillips stated he could not recall exactly what was done in the upper roof portion but he believed they closed the valleys.

Mr. Elterich asked if this portion was to finish the initial project in 2014. Mr. Phillips stated that it was. He stated the last time he went through the process he did not get a Certificate of Appropriateness first and he had to get the permit after some work on the roof had already been done.

Ms. Bailen asked if the entire roof will be one complete piece. Mr. Phillips stated it will be after these repairs, except for one section of roof in the front of the home. This portion has three tab shingles from what he can recall. Ms. Bailen stated she was aware that portion also needs to be replaced. Mr. Phillips stated that it did need to be addressed but was not part of this project.

Ms. Chissell asked where the flat roof was located. Mr. Phillips stated it was in the front. He is unaware of any leaking in that area, and the homeowner has mentioned another project with that portion. None of that area will be addressed in this project.

Ms. Cline motioned to approve case BHP-25-17. Mr. Elterich seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0-1 with the following votes cast on roll call: Ms. Cline –yes; Ms. Chissell – yes; Mr. Scharnett –yes; Ms. Bailen –abstain; Mr. Elterich –yes; Chairperson Graehling –yes.

Ms. Cline stated to the new members, that when petitioners request Funk Grant money, there are more standards to analyze. This is to ensure that the projects are within the Funk Grant guidelines. She explained that asphalt shingles are not reimbursable under the Funk Grant.

OLD BUSINESS:

Heritage Awards

Ms. Simpson stated there is some money left that can be allocated towards awards. In the past a certificate was given and was not as costly. A certain number of plaques can be given, however because of the higher cost, there will be a limited number.

Ms. Rivera stated that the cost for plaques ranges with size, lettering and materials. She stated there was a price range for a trophy as well as yard signs to showcase the home.

Ms. Simpson stated there are many ways the awards can be given out. The mayor could give out a certificate with a frame at the city council meeting. The plaques can be made after and be given out at an awards ceremony in May, which is Historic Preservation month.

Ms. Bailen asked if an award for each candidate would be given out. Ms. Simpson stated there were different categories and the number of awards given was up for discussion.

Ms. Simpson stated there were missing nominations that were not included in the packet. A special committee could be formed in order to look at the nominations. The item could be postponed until the next meeting as well.

Ms. Bailen asked if there was a limit to individuals that could receive the Preservationist of the Year award. Ms. Simpson stated the category was new and the commission could decide how to proceed.

Mr. Elterich stated in past discussions the number of awards and which categories would receive awards was left open. He stated he does not think limiting the amount of awards was a good idea.

Ms. Bailen asked where the nominations came from, Chairperson Graehling stated the nominations were open to the public, the forms could be obtained online or by request. All forms needed to be returned to Ms. Simpson.

Ms. Simpson stated the other awards that were not included were nominated from other categories. Mr. Scharnett stated the missing nominations were Masonic Lodge, Funks Grove Chapel, and Evergreen Memorial Cemetery.

Ms. Cline stated something that came up in past discussions was that the number of awards that could be given out was related to the price of the plaques. She asked what the budget was, in order to figure out how many awards could be given out. Ms. Simpson stated keeping the budget for awards under \$500 would be preferred.

Ms. Simpson stated that options are to limit the categories that would receive awards, find a less expensive awards to give out, or have first place winners and runner up winners.

Ms. Cline stated if the plaques are ordered at \$30 each and the yards signs at \$20 each, and leave money for printing and engraving, each award can be calculated at \$75.

Chairperson Graehling stated she would like to revisit the idea of using a city brick as the award for the Preservationist of the Year category. Ms. Cline stated they were not allowed to use bricks. Ms. Simpson stated the cost for something like that was discussed previously and came out to \$25 for a small plaque that would be added to the brick.

Ms. Cline suggested Chairperson Graehling speak to the Director of Public Works Jim Karch.

Ms. Chissell asked if those were the same bricks given out to the Beautification Committee. Mr. Scharnett stated they were not. Ms. Cline clarified the bricks Chairperson Graehling suggested were actual street paving bricks. This “brick” award would only be given to the Preservationist of the Year category.

Chairperson Graehling stated the “brick” award could go inside the home, where other awards, like a plaque, could be placed on the outside of the home.

Ms. Simpson stated that Mr. Elterich looked into larger plaques for the outside of the home and they were about \$100 -\$150 each.

Ms. Simpson summarized the conversation on awards, stating the “Preservationist” would receive a plaque or a “brick” award and the other awards would have an outside recognition.

Chairperson Graehling and Mr. Scharnett brought up concerns about the “outside” awards and making sure they are weather proof and theft proof.

Ms. Cline stated her question is how many awards should be awarded considering there are six nominations, and some are in the same category.

Ms. Chissell asked if everyone nominated received an award. Mr. Elterich stated that in the past that was the case.

Mr. Scharnett stated normally there is a defined set number of awards that are given out, such as awarding to the top 5. He stated it would be more meaningful if there was a consistent amount given each time.

Ms. Simpson asked the commission members if they agreed with the category each nomination was given. She asked if the nominations that fall into two categories should be considered for both or only one. Mr. Elterich stated they should be considered for both categories. Chairperson Graehling suggested dividing out the awards. This year the specific property would get an award for one category and the next year another award for the second category.

Ms. Simpson asked if the commissioners thought the Cemetery would fall under the Multi-Generational category. The consensus was that it could be. Ms. Cline asked Mr. Scharnett if he knew what category the Cemetery was nominated under. He did not have the information immediately. Ms. Cline stated for this year it may be best to only have one award go out for the Preservationist of the Year, and have that one person be honored for the year. She suggested one award per category.

Chairperson Graehling stated that no one on the commission would be able to get this award. Mr. Brad Williams, an individual nominated for Preservationist of the Year, has the possibility of returning to the board in the future. Once he is part of the commission he will no longer be eligible for any awards. She suggested this year would be a good year for Mr. Williams to

receive the award. Other things to consider when there are multiple nominations for one category, is the individuals circumstances for that year, that may be health or otherwise. Ms. Bailen stated that a decision needs to be made on whether there will be multiple awards given in one category or only one.

Ms. Cline asked if the commission could vote on how many awards to give out.

Mr. Elterich said that the other nominations could not be considered since they had not seen the nominations. Ms., Cline said, regardless of what the nominations are, they should vote on a specific number of awards to be given out. Mr. Elterich stated discussions on this before left the decision open, in the event that various good projects were nominated under the same category.

Mr. Scharnett stated there is more meaning when there is one awards given per category per year. Chairperson Graehling stated those who were nominated but not selected as the winners could be held over for the next year Heritage Awards. Ms. Bailen stated there should be one award given, per category, per year.

Ms. Cline stated the reality of getting multiple nominations in one category. Chairperson Graehling stated others may not know they were nominated. She stated the discussion of having an honorable mention may no longer apply as it would not be considered an actual award.

Ms. Bailen motioned to have six individual awards, one recipient in each category. Mr. Scharnett Seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 5-1-0 with the following votes cast: Ms. Bailen- yes; Mr. Scharnett –yes; Ms. Chissell –yes; Ms. Cline –yes; Mr. Elterich –no; Chairperson Graehling –yes.

Ms. Simpson stated all six nominations will be put into a packet and distributed to the commission members. Mr. Elterich stated the next meeting would not be until January. Chairperson Graehling suggested a special meeting for the nominations. Ms. Bailen suggested getting the nominations and holding a special meeting. Ms. Chissell suggested December 14th at 5PM.

Ms. Simpson stated she would check the schedule for the room to make sure the meeting could take place on the 14th. Ms. Chissell stated, she leaves for work at 5pm. However with enough notice she will be able to arrive at 5pm for the meetings.

Ms. Simpson stated the nominations will be sent via email. Ms. Cline stated because of the Open Meeting Acts there cannot be email communication regarding any case.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Elterich suggested the new members present themselves.

Ms. Chissell introduced herself to the board. She stated she works as an Independent Living Advocate. She works with people of various ages and abilities. She helps these individuals stay independent. Ms. Chissell became interested in the commissions because of the program Bloomington 101. The Mayor suggested getting involved with Historic Preservation, and she is

very excited to join the commission. She is interested in Historic Homes, and lived in one as a child.

Mr. Scharnett introduced himself to the board. He is an Architect with a local firm. He has done work in the area and is interested in preservation. His passions are building aesthetics and character.

Ms. Bailen introduced herself to the new members. She works in real estate and lives in an old home. She is interested in the stories and history of the homes.

Chairperson Graehling introduced herself to the new members. She lives in an Arthur Pillsbury home. She has been involved with preservation for many years.

Ms. Simpson introduced herself and Ms. Rivera. She let the new members know that we will be meeting with them for orientation and giving them the resources they need for the commission.

Ms. Cline introduced herself to the new members. She is the vice chair of the commission. She is a professor. Her field is Ancient Rome Architecture. She has always been interested in older buildings. She now lives in an old home on the west side of Bloomington. Her goals are to get homes like her own, on the west side, recognized as Historic. If they are recognized they are able to get Funk Grant money that can assist in restoring their homes.

Mr. Elterich stated Ms. Cline is doing a great job at bringing more awareness to the west side of town and appreciates her work. Ms. Cline stated that she was able to help with 4 new Historic Designations on the west side.

Mr. Elterich introduced himself to the new members. He is retired and worked as an attorney for 36 years. He has been a volunteer at the Davis Mansion for 30 plus years. He is also involved with the Old House Society. He lives in a George Miller house, and owns Historic properties.

Ms. Simpson gave an update for the Funk Grant. She stated there are \$3372.29 left in the budget for the remainder of the fiscal year, which ends April 30, 2018. The Rust Grant, which applies to the downtown, has \$74,331.58. There is a Funk Grant and Certificate of Appropriateness that should have been placed on this agenda. She asked the commissioners if they would be willing to hear the case at the special meeting. Ms. Simpson stated the petitioner would like to go before the board as soon as possible, as he has safety concerns.

Ms. Bailen stated the Adali Stevenson home be addressed, as there appears to be a business running out of the home, many trucks and materials.

The commission reached a consensus that the Certificate of Appropriateness and the Funk Grant application for 317 E Chestnut would be reviewed at the special meeting on December 14, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Elterich motioned to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Scharnett. The meeting adjourned at 6:35 P.M. by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted.

Izzy Rivera
Assistant City Planner