

**MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING,
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2015, 5:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 E. OLIVE ST., BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Graehling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Elterich,
Ms. Bailen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Sturgeon

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Kennedy called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Dabareiner called the roll.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

MINUTES: The Commission reviewed the minutes from the September 17, 2015 meeting. There being no corrections, Ms. Graehling moved for approval of the minutes, seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0 with the following votes being cast on roll call: Ms. Graehling-yes; Mr. Williams-yes; Ms. Bailen-yes; Mr. Kennedy-yes.

REGULAR AGENDA:

Consideration, review and approval of the application for Case BHP-37-15 application submitted by Keith Thompson requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for restoration of the carriage house and decorative limestone band, the Ashael Gridley house, Italianate, c. 1859, located at 301 East Grove Street in the East Grove Street National Register Historic District.

Chairman Kennedy referred to the updated agenda which removed Item 5.B., explaining that 5.B. was the grant award for the work discussed in August but the required Certificate of Appropriateness had not been considered at that time. He noted that Mr. Thompson was not present. Chairman Kennedy introduced the case and asked if there was any additional dialogue needed. Mr. Williams stated that the staff report lists several items for discussion and asked if they needed additional consideration. Mr. Dabareiner reiterated he prepared the report not realizing that a previous report had been prepared on the same property. Mr. Elterich arrived.

Chairman Kennedy reviewed a copy of the prior report and suggested walking through this month's report to see if they had been previously covered. He noted staff's positive recommendation with the statement that no power washing be allowed; he noted that the contractor understands this is not allowed. Chairman Kennedy added that the contractor prepares custom mixes for the tuck pointing work; Mr. Williams stated that he spoke with the contractor who will use a softer mortar. Chairman Kennedy noted that a sample of the roofing material was not supplied, but believed the intention is to match that used on the mansion; Mr. Dabareiner confirmed that statement was included in the application. Chairman Kennedy stated he would be comfortable moving ahead knowing that the Commission had approved the mansion's roofing. Ms. Graehling read from the application, emphasizing the consistency promised between the

existing and proposed roofing materials. Mr. Williams added that the same company was being used.

Mr. Williams motioned to **approve** case BHP 37-15 for a Certificate of Appropriateness; seconded by Mr. Elterich, which passed by a vote of 6-0 with the following votes cast on roll call: Mr. Williams-yes; Mr. Elterich-yes; Ms. Graehling-yes; Ms. Bailen-yes; Chairman Kennedy-yes.

Consideration, review and approval of the application for Case BHP-39-15 application submitted by Bob Vericella requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of the roof, the John T. Lillard house, Victorian-era Queen Anne, c. 1882, located at 302 East Walnut Street in the Franklin Square National Register Historic District.

Chairman Kennedy introduced the case and requested a report from staff. Mr. Dabareiner stated staff reviewed the materials submitted and passed along the sample shingle; he recommended in favor of the COA designation, referring to photographs showing the deterioration of the existing roof. He asked for a more detailed description of the work proposed and added there is a broken window that needed to be repaired, based on a site visit. Mr. Dabareiner stated staff requests a comparison of the historical or existing shingles with the proposed new shingle. Mr. Williams asked to see photographs to learn what is going on with the roof.

Chairman Kennedy introduced Mr. Vericella, the property owner and contractor. Mr. Vericella stated that a number of the existing shingles had blown off; he intends to remove all the existing shingles down to the deck, add new felt and shingles. Chairman Kennedy asked if the deck was good; Mr. Vericella replied there are no leaks so he believes it is fine but agreed to change out any rotten plywood. Mr. Elterich asked what style of shingle would be used; Mr. Vericella stated it would be architectural. Mr. Williams asked if any other changes were proposed; Mr. Vericella stated he would repair the broken basement window. Mr. Elterich asked if the gutters would be replaced; Mr. Vericella stated they would remain and were less than ten years old. Chairman Kennedy stated that the Commission has been less particular about shingles because of the high cost associated with using something similar to that used years ago; Ms. Bailen agreed that cost is high to replace with tile or slate but added the look of asphalt shingles does not carry the same value from a real estate perspective. Mr. Williams stated that it is a significant cost burden but the Commission no longer provides grants for asphalt shingles given the difference from historical roofing materials.

Chairman Kennedy mentioned the broken window concern raised by staff; he added he is hesitant to link the concern with the shingle review. Mr. Dabareiner stated staff saw it as a gentler way that ticketing to correct a code enforcement matter, because properties with outstanding property maintenance issues are typically not moved forward to a Commission-level unless the concerns are resolved first. Mr. Williams considers the window repair a minor maintenance item.

Mr. Elterich returned to the discussion of the shingle type, noting that an architectural style shingle is made that looks like a slate shingle. Mr. Williams stated that is also expensive. Mr. Elterich stated there is also a rubberized shingle for flexibility that looks like slate; Chairman Kennedy noted that these are also expensive, but it looks like slate. Mr. Vericella noted that the propose shingle is an upgrade over the existing shingle.

Mr. Williams motioned to **approve** case BHP 39-15 for a Certificate of Appropriateness; seconded by Mr. Elterich, which passed by a vote of 6-0 with the following votes cast on roll call: Mr. Williams-yes; Mr. Elterich-yes; Ms. Graehling-yes; Ms. Bailen-yes; Chairman Kennedy-yes.

OLD BUSINESS:

Ms. Bailen asked if 1314 Fell received the zoning change requested to allow multi-family residential; Mr. Dabareiner stated a rezoning was not granted, but that under a different owner a duplex is now proposed but requires a special use permit. Ms. Bailen is concerned that the house is allowed to be a duplex. Mr. Dabareiner reiterated that a duplex is allowed after the owners obtain a special use permit.

A general discussion occurred about code enforcement and their roles in assuring changes are not being made to properties which should go before the Commission for approval. Mr. Dabareiner stated that code enforcement is performed on a complaint basis due to lack of staffing. A general discussion also occurred about the negative impacts of an increase in density by making multi-family out of single family properties. Mr. Williams expressed concern for a large sign in front of a property located at the southwest corner of Prairie and Chestnut.

Mr. Elterich asked for an update on 1215 E. Washington. Mr. Williams reviewed the process for following up with the required changes by the new owner. Mr. Dabareiner agreed to double check on the status. Mr. Williams stated that the new owner intends to replace the unapproved columns with the original.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Dabareiner provided an update on 1706 E. Washington, where the trees have come down, and the property owner's intent to showcase the house architecture and install a fence similar to that found at Ewing Manor. He stated they are seeking zoning board of approval review for the fence height.

Mr. Williams asked if grants can be approved or not, based on the known quality and past work of the contractor, given the need to protect grant money and tax payer dollars. Mr. Dabareiner noted that the City cannot maintain a pre-approved list of contractors. Mr. Elterich noted the lack of resources for the City to follow up on all the work being done; Mr. Dabareiner stated he would accept the work of volunteer inspectors. Ms. Graehling stated that if the Commission has concluded that lack of standard of care has been demonstrated by a contractor, to the extent that a grant is not paid for the work, this is public record and can be stated. Chairman Kennedy noted that the grant requirements indicate that photographs must be taken before, during, and after repair as evidence that a standard of care was taken, before reimbursement is issued.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Williams made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Bailen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Dabareiner AICP, Community Development Director