



MINUTES

**PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
REGULAR MEETING
GOVERNMENT CENTER CHAMBERS, 4TH FLOOR, ROOM #400
115 E. WASHINGTON STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2021 5:00 P.M.**

The Historic Preservation Commission convened in regular session in-person in the Government Center Chambers on the 4th floor, Room #400 at 5:06 p.m., Thursday, October 21, 2021. City Planner Glen Wetterow, Assistant Director Kimberly Smith, and Assistant City Attorney George Boyle were present. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Scharnett.

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Mr. Paul Scharnett	Chair	Present
Mr. Bobby Castillo	Commissioner	Resigned
Ms. Georgene Chissell	Commissioner	Present
Ms. Sherry Graehling	Commissioner	Present
Mr. Greg Koos	Vice Chair	Present
Ms. Dawn Peters	Commissioner	Present
Mr. George Boyle	Assistant Corporate Counsel	Present
Ms. Kimberly Smith	Economic & Community Development Assistant Director	Present
Mr. Glen Wetterow	City Planner	Present

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MINUTES

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the September 14, 2021 regular Historic Preservation Meeting. There were some suggested edits, but none of substance. A motion was made to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded. All were in favor. The minutes of the August 19, 2021 regular Historic Preservation Meeting will be included in the next meeting

REGULAR AGENDA

- A. **BHP-27-21** Consideration, review and action on a petition submitted by Stephen W. Agge for a Certificate of Appropriateness for repairs to the gutters, roof, windows, downspouts, and addition of a deck on the rear of the property located at 202 Davis Avenue (PIN:21-03-303-005), Davis-Jefferson Historic District, late Victorian style, Four Square, c. 1913, (Ward 4).

Staff introduced the case.

Stephen Agge, the petitioner, was sworn in. The petitioner reiterated the need for these repairs and explanations for the specific types of repairs chosen. The petitioner also stated that the backyard does not have a fence, but significant foliage currently covers the backyard from view.

Chairperson Scharnett inquired what work has been done on the house to date. Mr. Agge stated that no work has been done on the house to date.

Mr. Scharnett inquired if the petitioner has had any contractors look at the windows in the home. Mr. Agge stated that they had not. Mr. Scharnett inquired whether the wood of the fascia or the wood underneath the fascia is what needs to be replaced. Mr. Agge stated that the wood underneath the fascia is what is deteriorating. Mr. Scharnett inquired about the additional downspouts. Mr. Agge stated that there was a request for additional downspouts that match the current downspouts, potentially in aluminum. Mr. Scharnett inquired about the soffit with the fascia. Mr. Agge stated that it would have to be completely replaced, preferably with wood.

Mr. Koos stated that he did not feel as though he had enough information to make a decision on any of the cases except for the roof. Mr. Koos asked if the petitioner would be amenable to amending the case by separating the roof project from the other projects so that repairs on the roof can move forward while the petitioner collects the additional information for the other projects. Mr. Scharnett agreed with the statements made by Mr. Koos. Mr. Agge asked for some clarification on the window requirements.

Ms. Peters asked if it was possible to replace the roof separately from the gutters. Mr. Scharnett stated that it was possible but depends on how the petitioner wants the repairs done. The petitioner stated that he has two separate companies for the gutters and the roof. Options for the windows were discussed.

Mr. Scharnett disagreed with the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Scharnett stated that he did not believe the standard of "The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed" was met. He stated that removing the slate roof will do that. He also did not believe the standard of "Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible" was met. He stated that it appears to be a prohibitive cost involved, making the repair of the roof infeasible, not

impossible. He also did not believe the standard of “Contemporary design for alteration 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, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment” was met. He stated that he believed the asphalt shingles would not be appropriate to meet this criterion. Mr. Koos and Ms. Graehling assented.

Mr. Scharnett asked if the Commission would prefer to separate the roof project from the other projects and postpone a decision on the other projects until a later meeting. There was discussion on whether to include the gutters project. The Commission determined that since the petitioner has a separate contractor for the gutters project, it can be postponed with the other projects.

Mr. Koos motioned to accept the findings of fact as modified and confined to the roof and to accept the reroofing with asphalt shingles that mimic the slate style as presented by the petitioner and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Scharnett clarified that they are motioning to accept fiberglass shingles, not asphalt shingles. Ms. Chissell seconded. Roll call vote: Mr. Castillo - Yes, Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Chairperson Scharnett - Yes. The motion carried (5-0-0).

- B. **BHP-28-21** Consideration, review and action on a petition submitted by Stephen W. Agge for a Funk Grant in the amount of \$5,000.00 repairs to the gutters, roof, windows, downspouts, and addition of a deck on the rear of the property located at 202 Davis Avenue (PIN:21-03-303-005), Davis-Jefferson Historic District, late Victorian style, Four Square, c. 1913, (Ward 4).

Mr. Scharnett asked whether this case should be amended or postponed considering the decision on the previous, related case. Mr. Koos stated that since the roof is the majority of the cost of this grant request, it would be appropriate to proceed as is.

Mr. Scharnett stated that he is unsure whether funding can be provided for a project that is replacing with an inferior building material. Mr. Koos stated that it was his understanding that the Commission has in the past funded replacement projects of a similar nature. Mr. Scharnett clarified that he believes those past cases were for roofs that had already removed the slate roofing. There was discussion about whether the requirement “The project is a repair or replacement using modern materials which mimic historic materials in appearance and increase durability and useful life” is being met. Mr. Scharnett stated that the new material would not increase durability more than the original slate. Ms. Peters stated that it would increase the durability of the house as a whole, however. There was discussion about how to apply the criterion.

Mr. Scharnett reiterated the request for postponing the decision on granting funding for the project. Mr. Scharnett stated that since the Certificate of Appropriateness was approved, work can begin before the funding is approved. However, staff noted that the requirements of the grant state that funding will not be provided for work that has already been started. Ms. Peters

requested to table the decision to allow time for staff to review past decisions on asphalt roofing. Mr. Koos asked the petitioner if he had a start date for the project yet. The petitioner stated that it would not start for a few months.

Ms. Peters motioned to table the discussion until the next meeting, in which time staff will provide additional information on past decisions on asphalt roofing. Ms. Graehling seconded. Roll call vote: Mr. Castillo - Yes, Mr. Koos - Yes, Ms. Graehling - Yes, Ms. Peters - Yes, Chairperson Scharnett - Yes. The motion carried (5-0-0).

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Scharnett stated that the Historic Preservation Plan was approved by council.

Ms. Graehling reiterated that the minutes for the August 19, 2021 regular Historic Preservation Meeting still need to be completed and approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Scharnett has stated that he has had numerous conversations with multiple people to discuss how to begin working on the Historic Preservation Plan. He stated that the first goal is to create subcommittees to focus on each theme of the Plan. He noted that decisions will need to be made on how best to work with the City Staff throughout this work. Mr. Scharnett reminded the Commission that because of the Open Meetings Act, no more than two Commissioners can be on a subcommittee, but Commissioners can work on multiple subcommittees. Mr. Scharnett noted the importance of working with a variety of partners, including and excluding City Staff. Mr. Scharnett suggested that each subcommittee would be chaired by a Commissioner and said Commissioner would report back to the Commission on progress each regular meeting. Mr. Koos expressed concern considering the Commission's recent trouble with filling Commission seats. Mr. Scharnett stated that efforts are being made to fill these seats. Clarification for the requirements for these seats were discussed. Mr. Scharnett discussed the need for resources, especially funding. Ms. Chissell asked to what degree does City Council have to approve Commission funding. Ms. Smith stated that it depends on the funding source. She stated that, for example, grants that were approved in the past don't need to be re-approved again. Future funding sources will likely need approval though. She also clarified that the Council is more likely to approve requests for funding/approval to apply for funding when the requests are specific and clear. She reiterated that the point of discussing this now is to emphasize the importance of making a detailed work plan before beginning work. Mr. Scharnett discussed the need for human resources as well. Mr. Koos suggested using an online public forum where Commissioners can discuss between meetings without violating the Open Meetings Act. Mr. Scharnett asked staff to research the option with legal. Mr. Scharnett stated the importance of not moving forward on major projects without approval by the rest of the Commission.

Mr. Scharnett made some suggestions for how to best prioritize the opportunities from the Plan moving forward. Mr. Koos suggested the creation of an internship program at one of the local universities to move forward with surveying work. Mr. Wetterow stated that Illinois State University already has such an internship program for GIS. Ms. Smith stated that the University of Illinois has existing coursework in surveying homes. Ms. Chissell asked for

MEETING MINUTES

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2021

Page | 4

clarification on what work can be done on the local cemeteries. Mr. Koos stated that there is one cemetery that the City manages that the Commission could work with. Some of the other cemeteries are managed by religious institutions, but they may be amenable to work to survey the cemeteries by the Commission. Mr. Scharnett stated that the Council approached him about adding ADA options for the Funk Grant. There was discussion on how to address Opportunity 2.6 with energy standards for historic homes. There was discussion on how to address Opportunity 2.9 with the City of Bloomington's Five-Year Consolidated Plan. Mr. Scharnett reviewed the Opportunities in Theme 3, Theme 4, and Theme 5.

Mr. Scharnett asked for volunteers to head each subcommittee. The Theme 5 subcommittee chair will be Ms. Peters. Theme 4 does not have any Opportunities for Year One so that one was passed. The Theme 3 subcommittee chair will be Ms. Graehling. The Theme 2 subcommittee chair will be Ms. Chissell. The Theme 1 subcommittee chair will be Mr. Koos. Mr. Scharnett will act as a secondary for Theme 1 and Theme 2. Ms. Peters will act as secondary for Theme 3. Ms. Chissell will act as a secondary for Theme 5.

Mr. Scharnett discussed the need for clarity of the timeframe. Due to the City's budgeting timeframe, funding requests will need to be made before April. Ms. Smith suggested that the timeline for the Historic Preservation Plan work aligns with the City's budgeting year. This would mean the Plan doesn't go into effect until May of 2022 and as such the end of year "one" for the plan would not be until April of 2023. Mr. Koos assented. Ms. Graehling noted that she will be required to leave her seat at the Commission in the spring and at that point a new subcommittee chair would have to be appointed. Ms. Smith emphasized that the Historic Preservation Plan is just a suggested plan, and changes can be made to the timeline and the goals as seen fit by the Commission members. Mr. Wetterow suggested some resources for the Commission to use.

Mr. Scharnett opened up discussion to determine what work should be done by the next meeting. Mr. Koos suggested identifying potential partners and committee members for the next meeting. Ms. Peters suggested also identifying other resources and beginning working on a work plan. Ms. Smith offered to provide help and clarification during this process.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Peters motioned to adjourn, Seconded by Mr. Koos. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:10.