



MINUTES
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
REGULAR MEETING
BLOOMINGTON POLICE STATION, OSBORN ROOM
305 S EAST STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701
THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2022 5:00 P.M.

The Historic Preservation Commission convened in regular session in-person in the Osborn Room of the Bloomington Police Station at 5:02 p.m., Thursday, May 19, 2022.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Scharnett.

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Mr. Paul Scharnett	Chair	Present
Mr. Greg Koos	Vice Chair	Not Present
Ms. Georgene Chissell	Commissioner	Not Present
Ms. Sherry Graehling	Commissioner	Present
Ms. Dawn Peters	Commissioner	Present
Mr. John Elterich	Commissioner	Present
Ms. Kim Miller	Commissioner	Present
Mr. George Boyle	Assistant Corporate Counsel	Present
Ms. Kimberly Smith	Assistant Economic & Community Development Director	Present
Ms. Alissa Pemberton	Assistant City Planner	Present
Mr. Jon Branham	City Planner	Present

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received.

MINUTES

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the March 17, 2022, Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Minor corrections were noted. Ms. Graehling made a motion to accept the minutes, as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elterich. All were in favor.

REGULAR AGENDA

- A. BHP-09-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Stan Thompson and Fred Wollrab for a Rust Grant in the amount of \$16,478.70 for awning replacement on the property at 102 W Washington Street (PIN:21-04-338-006) (Ward 6).

Mr. Branham presented the case, with recommendation for approval of a Rust Grant in the amount of \$16,478.70.

Chair Scharnett asked for clarification on page 18 of the staff report, as to whether it is the proposed awning, or an image of the older awning. Staff clarified that the image is of the proposed awning.

Stan Thompson (2512 Yorktown) spoke on behalf of the project. He stated the new proposal is for a striped awning and the logo had been removed. The corner of the building entryway is no longer covered; there are now two awnings and an opening above the door that will allow the placement of identification signage.

Chair Scharnett stated that he believes this proposal meets the intent of the previous review comments.

Mr. Elterich inquired about the color palette. Mr. Thompson showed a higher-resolution image indicating the colors.

Ms. Graehling stated they have done a good job of meeting the guidelines the Commission had provided, working with staff, and that she feels this will fit well and be a positive visual impact on the community.

Ms. Peters motioned to accept the findings of fact as presented by staff and award a Rust Grant in the amount of \$16,478.70. Mr. Elterich seconded. All were in favor. (5-0)

- B. BHP-10-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Bradley & Erin Carmean for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a fence on the property located at 1009 E Jefferson Street (PIN: 21-03-304-009), Davis-Jefferson Historic District, Italianate Style, c. 1873, (Ward 4).

Mr. Branham presented the case, with recommendation for approval.

Erin Carmine (1009 E Jefferson St) spoke on behalf of the project. She stated she recently purchased the property and would like to fence-in the rear of the property to allow safer play space for children.

Chair Scharnett inquired about the type of wood proposed for the fence. Ms. Carmine stated the project is being completed by Peerless Fence Company. She was unsure what kind of wood was planned, but they have discussed a natural wood color and do not intend to paint or stain.

Chair Scharnett asked whether the clips visible in the image provided would be easily visible on the actual fence. Ms. Carmine clarified that the clips in the image are part of the gate and that the gate would be different than that in the marketing image. There are gates planned for between the garage and house and another on the front side facing the street, but they will

be designed to match the fence and be consistent with the rest of the fence. The planned height is 6' for the entire project.

Chair Scharnett noted that wooden fences tend to rot if not treated; some woods are worse than others. He stated one can apply UV finishes to keep it from graying-out and rotting, without changing look and color. He stated cedar tends to hold up better than some other options. He noted that the Commission does not have purview over the maintenance of historic properties but cautioned that this kind of fence does have long-term associated maintenance to be aware of, and that a coating of some sort may be warranted.

Ms. Graehling stated she is glad that they are working with a fencing company that has experience with the installation and care of historic-appropriate fences.

Chair Scharnett recommended Ms. Carmine make sure to keep the top rail a consistent elevation, despite grade changes on site, as older sites tend to have slightly more settling than newer development.

Ms. Graehling motioned to accept the findings of fact as presented by staff and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. Ms. Peters seconded. All were in favor. (5-0)

- C. **BHP-11-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Tom & Jan Harrell for a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement on the property located at 304 E Walnut Street (PIN: 21-04-202-013), Franklin Square Historic District, Georgian Revival Style, c. 1933, (Ward 4).

Mr. Branham presented the case with a recommendation for approval.

Jan Harrell (1709 Sweetbriar Drive) spoke on behalf of the project and provided images of current condition of property and windows.

Chair Scharnett asked whether they are looking to replace all of the windows around the property. Ms. Harrell stated that all of the windows do need to be replaced. They plan to install historically correct windows on the front and sides of the home that are visible from the street and use a more modern type of window on the remaining areas that are less visible, due to cost differences.

Chair Scharnett inquired about estimates. Ms. Harrell stated that multiple companies have reviewed the project and that Pella is the one that could provide the historically correct windows.

Chair Scharnett asked if any of the companies had looked at repair instead of replacement. Ms. Harrell stated that the condition and type made replacement the best options; they have already had one window repaired at great expense and the rest are in worse condition and not repairable.

Chair Scharnett stated that guidelines require the Commission to look at maintenance first, then repair, restoration, finally replacement, in that order. The reason for that is due to the materials that are present and a desire to retain and care for them, if possible.

Additional party to the Petitioner, Tom Harrell, provided further images of the windows demonstrating that all windows have joints separating and many have rot and mold issues that prevent them from being repaired. He stated he has glazed all windows at least three times, sanded all of them, and cannot manage to repair them further at this time. He stated the hope was to improve condition of the home and improve efficiency.

Chair Scharnett clarified that the proposal is for an aluminum clad window. He noted that one of the concerns is about the texture of replacements. Ms. Harrel stated that everything will be exactly as it is now in terms of size and type. The glass panes will protrude out and will be individual panes rather than one big pane.

Mr. Elterich noted that many people put storm windows up as a way of managing the condition of older windows, but that changes the aesthetic of the residence. Ms. Harrell said they do not want to add storm windows.

Ms. Graehling noted that they make plexiglass, custom-fit interior storm windows for draft issues, but they do have to be removed to open the windows.

Chair Scharnett stated that they try not to replace windows. He inquired whether the metal wrap around the brick will be removed during replacement. The brickmould will need to match the correct profile when replaced. Mr. Harrel stated the windows will be replaced from the outside so the interior trim can remain in place. He is unsure of the condition of the brickmould but suspects it will be acceptable since it has been covered and protected by the metal for so long.

Ms. Graehling commented about the dividing parts of the glass having disappeared in some places due to the extreme rot. After seeing the additional photos, she can see why panes of glass are falling out. She would consider these windows beyond repair at this point.

Chair Scharnett stated he believes they are beyond cost-effective repair, but they should exhaust every opportunity for preservation.

Ms. Graehling noted that these windows were not even 100-years-old and may be replacements themselves, based on the grade of wood. Ms. Harrell explained that the house was built during the Great Depression so the lowest quality possible was likely used when the McClure family built it.

Ms. Graehling commented if this was an 1875 home with original windows, she might be more hesitant, but the current windows on the property have outlived their useful life.

Ms. Peters motioned to accept the findings of fact as presented by staff and approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. Mr. Elterich seconded. All were in favor. (5-0)

- D. BHP-12-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Kim Jackson for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof replacement on the property located at 408 E Walnut Street (PIN: 21-04-203-015), Franklin Square Historic District, c. 1885, (Ward 4).

Mr. Branham presented the case with recommendation for approval, noting this is an after-the-fact application. He stated the same type of shingles that were previously existing were utilized, according to the Applicant. The Applicant was not present.

Chair Scharnett stated he is familiar with this property and shingles, and he has concerns regarding the drip edges and ridge caps because it was done in a more modern style. He also noted there is not enough information in what the applicant provided to make an accurate assessment of whether the project is compatible or not.

Ms. Peters stated that they need to ask for more details on what was completed. Chair Scharnett agreed. They need more details on edge conditions, samples of the shingles used, close-up photos, and before/after images. Like-for-like does not necessarily mean it is appropriate.

Mr. Peters asked the City Attorney for guidance on what happens if the Commission does not approve a Certificate of Appropriateness. City Attorney Boyle explained that there are two possible ways to proceed; the applicant could work further with the Commission, or Code Enforcement can be the primary agent of action.

Mr. Elterich inquired about challenges regarding code enforcement since the permit was issued. Mr. Boyle stated more information from the applicant. It sounds like the applicant may have known it was issued in error since they may have previously gone through the Commission for projects.

Mr. Elterich motioned to table the case to next meeting and request additional information from the applicant. Ms. Peters seconded. All were in favor. (5-0)

- E. BHP-13-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Howard & Debra Rodgers for a Certificate of Appropriateness for porch repairs on the property located at 510 S Mason Avenue (PIN: 21-04-362-010), c. 1853, (Ward 6).

Mr. Branham presented the case with recommendation for approval.

Chair Scharnett noted there is not enough visual content provided in the application to know what is happening in this project. Ms. Peters stated that Brad Williams is the contractor completing the project so they can assume will be done well. Chair Scharnett stated his belief that, from a compliance perspective, the application is not complete enough for review.

Mr. Elterich stated that the Commission cannot approve the project simply based upon the contractor. Ms. Graehling reminded the Commission that Mr. Williams was present during the last meeting but there was not a quorum, so they were unable hear the case.

Mr. Branham asked that if the Commission notes deficiencies in a case, as provided in the packet, they let staff know in advance so the applicant may be contacted for additional information prior to the meeting.

Mr. Graehling motioned to table the case until the next meeting and request more context and photos from the applicant. Ms. Peters seconded. All were in favor. (5-0)

- F. BHP-14-22** Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Howard & Debra Rodgers for a Funk Grant in the amount of \$1,140.00 for porch repairs on the property located at 510 S Mason Avenue (PIN:21-04-362-010), c. 1853 (Ward 6).

Ms. Peters made a motion to table the case until the June meeting. Seconded by Ms. Graehling. All were in favor. (5-0)

G. BHP-15-22 Consideration, review and action on a request submitted by Melissa Moody & Steve Beasley (Bloomingtonian Condo Association) for a Rust Grant in the amount of \$6,000.00 for tuckpointing and gutter repairs on the property located at 102-116 W Locust Street (PIN 21-04-196-001) (Ward 6)

Mr. Branham presented the case, noting that the applicant has requested to contract with A1 Masonry which has higher bid. Mr. Branham recommended approval of the request.

Chair Scharnett asked for additional information, including bids and images that did not make it into the packet. Mr. Branham handed out a copy of the information provided by the applicant.

Steve Beasley (112 W Locust) spoke on behalf of the petition. This property is the “entryway to downtown,” but the building is old and needs constant repair. Midstate Gutter has been out multiple times in the last few years to “fix” the gutters and has yet to get it right, so they would like to contract with A1 despite the higher cost.

Chair Scharnett asked the applicant to explain the differences and condition of the brick in different locations on the building. Mr. Beasley explained that the brick across the front is newer than brick on rest of the building; they had that tuckpointed a few years ago due to some drainage/gutter issues.

Chair Scharnett asked what kind of mortar or sealer is proposed for the project. Mr. Beasley is unsure about what kind of mortar they plan to use, knows the quote did list a sealer. Chair Scharnett explained that certain kinds of sealer can trap water in the brick and cause damage long-term. Silanes/Siloxanes and combinations thereof are breathable and can be better for the brick. The mortar needs to be softer than the brick; O or K is usually appropriate. He recommended some type of column cap to protect the brick from drainage and rain on the upper side, and noted that where it is starting to tilt there may be some structural issues. Mr. Beasley explained that the columns have a steel/metal post in the middle that the brick is around, so they should be structurally sound. He noted that a car hit one of the brick columns on the lower level and column remained sound.

Ms. Graehling stated that some stipulations need to be added to any approval, regarding appropriate mortar, sealing, etc. This is a very visible and familiar building and she wants it to stand and be proud and be enhanced going forward. Mr. Beasley stated he will gladly take suggestions from the HPC on the best way to move forward on the project.

Chair Scharnett inquired about what gutter profile they will be using for the replacement gutters. Mr. Elterich asked how old the current gutters are. Mr. Beasley guesses that they were replaced during the building rehab in 2005. He is unsure if A1 can do one of the HPC’s preferred types of gutters, but if they can’t he will be happy to come back to get approval for what they *can* do. Chair Scharnett noted that the proposal does show a 4”x3” standard residential downspout. An appropriate downspout would be round; this requires revision to the quote/plan.

Ms. Graehling recommended that they approve the masonry work, with stipulation, and come back with additional information on gutters to amend the grant for the additional value. There was no objection from staff or the Petitioner.

Ms. Graehling motioned to approve the Certification of Appropriateness and grant funding—in the amount of \$3,000—for tuckpointing and masonry work, with the condition that the appropriate cleaning is done, breathable sealer applied, and that O, K, or something equivalent and softer than the brick is used, AND that the portion of the project related to gutters be tabled until the following meeting. Seconded by Elterich. All were in favor (5-0).

OLD BUSINESS

The Commission discussed various updates on historic preservation plan work groups. Ms. Peters inquired if additional collaboration could be done including the Town of Normal. It was stated that WestFest was coming up July 23rd and there could be an opportunity for further input.

Howard Rodgers, applicant for case #BHP-13-22 and #BHP-14-22, 510 S Mason Avenue, arrived at the meeting at 6:12pm and stated the porch was redone a couple years ago and was not completed in a professional manner; he is trying to do everything he can to preserve the home, but some of the paint was done at the wrong time of the year and started peeling, wood rotting, even some of the footings on the main columns have degraded.

Chair Scharnett stated the Commission had continued the case. He stated they need more information for the file and to have the documentation to support the Commission's decision.

Ms. Graehling stated since they are using public money, they are held accountable for the quality and extent of the information provided in the applications.

Mr. Elterich clarified they will need information on the materials to be used, as well as additional images. Mr. Rodgers left the meeting at 6:21pm.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Branham presented background on proposed changes and updates to Rust Grant Guidelines. He clarified that the same amount of funding is to be provided this fiscal year as last year. He stated there was a Resolution adopted in October 2021 directing the Commission to amend the guidelines to address accessibility issues. Staff has provided a red-lined version of the guidelines that also clear up other issues identified by staff and the Commission.

Chair Scharnett discussed requiring additional details regarding various accessibility aspects. He stated accessibility improvement projects can only be those affecting the outside of the building and would only be relating to those that affects entry to and from the building. He inquired if there might be model language regarding accessibility funding opportunities from other communities.

Ms. Smith stated this was directed to provide a path for moving forward and there was an expectation from Council for the update. She inquired about next steps.

Chair Scharnett was hopeful that someone could locate model language, but he was also concerned about liability. He suggested setting up meeting with an architect/engineer, or state representative/accessibility specialist, to try to gain additional information that might be helpful.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Peters motioned to adjourn. Mr. Elterich seconded. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 6:40pm