

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
July 30, 2014

The July 30, 2014 special meeting of the Glenview Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:05 PM by Chairman McJilton in the board room of the Village Hall. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Upon roll call, the following were:

Present: Commissioners Dawson, Hebson, Kramer, Pappas, Reynolds, Shaw,
and Chairman McJilton
Absent: Commissioner Demsky
Also present: Jeff Brady Director of Planning
Jeff Rogers, Senior Planner
Michelle House, Planner II

Commissioners introduced themselves and gave a brief personal background.

Mr. Rogers stated that the minutes from the December 13, 2013 HPC meeting would be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

There were no general communications, consent items, or old business on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman McJilton turned the meeting over to Mr. Rogers for his presentation who thanked everyone for their participation on the first of four HPC meetings for 2014. He reviewed the accomplishments and responsibilities of the HPC and how it fit with other state national organizations. Points made were:

- HPC consists of nine members but currently has one (1) vacancy resulting in a 5 member quorum at this time
- Terms of appointees were staggered for cohesiveness of group
- US Dept. of Interior governs and enforces laws regarding Historic Preservation Commissions throughout the US
 - Some powers were delegated to state level
 - Illinois Historic Preservation Agency governs activities of the local HPC
- Process was formal and staff was available for assistance

Continuing, Mr. Rogers stated that the Department of Records Management within the Department of the Interior maintains records of all annual reports of Historic Preservation Commissions nationwide. They also govern national park services which produces annual report of all accomplishments throughout the entire nation. They also established baseline criteria for all historic preservation ordinances which are referred to as the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. He mentioned that many of the standards were applicable to Glenview and that the Glenview HPC ordinance was based on the national requirements for rehabilitation of historic properties.

At the state level -

- State agency certifies the content of the Glenview annual report and confirms compliance
- Offers annual grant program with federal and state funds for historic preservation initiatives
 - Recurring application due annually by November 15th.

- Staff monitors announcement of special grant programs offered occasionally for specific purposes
- Technical assistance offered to staff and commissions to ensure compliance and to be in sync with coordinated efforts for historic preservation
- Maintain information database of all and/or potential historic properties (harjus?)
- Advocate for state-wide preservation and work closely with private groups:
 - Landmarks Illinois (most active private advocacy), and
 - Illinois Association of Historic Preservation Commission (Glenview HPC is a member of this group)
 - Holds annual conferences and offers training for interested parties

At the local level, HPC –

- Provide information/consultation sessions to party who is interested in historic preservation of property
- Disclose incentive programs and direct interested parties to available resources for understanding of financial incentives to historic preservation
- Review property inventory surveys of historical significant properties
 - Example, 2008 survey conducted by Glenview
- Referenced Glenview Ordinance for definition of terms commonly used in historic preservation
- Determination eligibility and formal designation of property as historic landmark via established process
 - Properties on approved survey have eligibility established
 - Property would be eligible if eligibility confirmation was done independently

Regarding landmark designations for districts-

- Not all properties within a district have to be confirmed as historic or significant within specific area and that non-contributing properties can be within the historic district. (Ex: village downtown district designated historic with buildings less than 50 years old within the downtown area)
- Any building older than 50 years old may not be significant but could become significant
- State threshold for district approval was: Two (2) properties in close proximity could become a historic district with non-contributing properties between them

Once property designated historic landmark, any alterations to the property has to be reviewed via certificate of appropriateness review process, similar to the current Appearance Commission Certificate of Appropriateness process. A joint meeting of the HPC and AC may be held.

Regarding Certificate of Economic Hardship –

- Formal process with criteria for evaluating if property owner of designated landmark can't meet the economic requirements to improve the property in accordance with the commission requirements.
- Property owner would have to demonstrate that they meet criteria for economic hardship certificate
- Staff and commission participation, eligible properties throughout the village are monitored and reported to state when additions are proposed,

- Properties eligible but not yet designated landmark and/or not able to appear before commission.
- Properties that have been torn down before landmark designated

At this time, Mr. Rogers briefly reviewed the importance of landmark designations. In 1966, the federal government established laws restricting redevelopment and demolition of potentially historic properties and set baseline upon which the Dept. of Interior, state agency, and local ordinance would outline how law would be applied for landmark designation of properties. Property is preserved to maintain unique character, historical significance, or general history/events that took place in an area and/or to maintain the unique design of a building. Incentives of a financial nature often help property owner to seek landmark status.

Mr. Rogers showed commissioners via overhead, the layout of the HPC website which listed the current members of the HPC, code requirements, previous meeting minutes, ordinances and various applications needed by residents. Also shown were cut sheets of current landmark designated properties and historic districts, and links to outside agencies, Glenview Historic Center, and other resources for helpful information.

At this time, Mr. Rogers stated that the ten (10) criteria for landmark designation were the most important part of the ordinance, and were also found in the Historic Preservation Handbook. He emphasized that this was the most important section of the entire ordinance and it was what the entire ordinance was based on. He explained that any one of the criteria was needed to confirm that your property was locally significant and historically eligible for landmark designation. Due to their importance, Mr. Rogers read through the following:

Criteria for Landmark Designation

1. Its character, interest or value as part of the development heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, County, State or country.
2. Its location as the site of a significant local, County, State, or national event.
3. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the community, County, State or country.
4. Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural and/or landscape style for the study of a period, type, method of construction or use of indigenous materials.
5. Its identification as the work of a master builder, designer, architect or landscape architect whose individual work has influenced the development, County, State or country.
6. Its overall embodiment of design, detailing, materials or craftsmanship which renders it architecturally significant.
7. Its overall embodiment of design elements that make it structurally or architecturally innovative.
8. Its unique location or singular physical characteristics that make it an established or familiar visual feature.
9. It is located in an area that has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.
10. Whether the property owner opposes or supports the designation.

Regarding criteria #10, Mr. Rogers clarified that this point was not enough on its own to meet the guideline but that it was listed among criteria. By way of example, he explained that should a property owner want his recently built property to be on the list and considered for eligibility, it

would still have to be 50 years old to be eligible. He stated that it was important to determine if a property owner opposed or supported the designation but it was also necessary for the property to meet one of the other criteria. He added that when the property owner was submitting the application, they were asked to submit reason(s) for why they felt the property was important for consideration of designated landmark status. The HPC would then evaluate the application to determine if the submitted application met one of the ten criteria.

In response to Commissioner Hebson, Mr. Rogers stated that should a property be submitted for consideration but was not yet 50 years old, the village would wait until it was of age to be considered and the property would then be evaluated.

Mr. Rogers stated that the village ordinance does allow for designation of property against the property owner's will. If property owner were in agreement, the process would be more comfortable and smoother for all involved. He gave the example of a building being considered for demolition by the owner and the village and residents felt strongly that it should be saved, the village could move forward on designating landmark status. He stated that both the original HPC members and the village board members investigated the legalities of the village moving forward against the owner. The ordinance amendment does allow for forcible designation of property against an owner's wishes. To date, it has not occurred and the HPC was asked to be considerate of everyone should the issue ever arise.

Three properties have gone through the historic landmark designation process to date:

1. Village Park District Administration Building on Prairie St
Originally the village hall and village library with construction completed in 1929
2. Hutchings residence, south of Grove on east side of Waukegan Rd.
Original farmhouse in the area for private landholding, dates back to 1864, and current home of the Glenview History Center
3. Private residence in Immanuel Lutheran Church subdivision on Park Drive, located on the NW corner of Shermer and Glenview Rds.
Owner did his own research on property and church subdivision and participated in the financial incentive program which reduces property tax on property to compensate for costs of rehabilitating the property

There are no designated historic districts to date, but can be pursued in the future. Mr. Rogers mentioned several neighborhoods in Glenview that could be considered.

Regarding the Kennicott House, Wagner Farm, Navy Chapel on the Glen, and Redfield House for example, Mr. Rogers explained that they were on the National Register. He clarified that the National Register was important but did not provide any local protection against demolition. He mentioned that many of the locally significant buildings were owned by the Glenview Park District and have been designated by non-certified historic preservation board that is operated by the park district. Because of this, there was no risk of losing the properties. However, Mr. Rogers stated that it would be great if the properties were formally designated as local historic landmarks sometime in the future. He added that local designation would have added protection.

Mr. Brady pointed out that the Grove has national status.

Commissioner Hebson commented on the number of older homes in the area that could be considered for demolition. Mr. Rogers stated that the prior HPC spent many years informing the public and explaining the benefits of historic preservation and district preservation. However, in the current environment, owner support was desired to move forward with any application for landmark designation of property. He mentioned areas east of Harms, south of Winnetka Rd, park area, downtown area that had significant properties that could be considered in the future.

Mr. Rogers mentioned a property that was receiving benefits from the designated property process which was a 12 year commitment for the owner. If the Historic Preservation Commission were to lose its certification, the owner's incentive would be cut. He felt that it was a commitment to the owner to ensure that the owner would receive the tax benefit.

Goals for 2014 –

- Review/create draft information mailers to be forwarded to the remaining 43 potential properties so owners know their property was on the eligible list and to make them aware of various incentive programs. Two categories of incentives:
 - Owner occupied residents eligible for specific incentive programs but were not provided to residences that were for rent
 - Incentives for commercial properties used for commercial use
- November Grant Application for activity in 2015 (70% state money for 30% local money)
 - Grant applied for in 2012 and awarded in 2013 with specific instructions that additional grant applications for survey work in Glenview would not be honored until progress was shown designating properties
 - Kit Home Survey was developed with January 2013 grant money (*see update below*)
- Newsletter content that would attract attention and interest to the HPC
- Continue to monitor changes to current eligible property list; track known properties and report on properties eligible if owner were aware of process
 - 43 remaining properties but more property eligible if neighborhoods were surveyed
 - Prior surveys focused on specific neighborhoods
 - Entire village has not yet been surveyed; five areas surveyed (15% of village)

All previous commissioners and staff involved with prior HPC wished more had been done. Mr. Rogers stated that the amount of work and time of the HPC in prior years was not accurately represented. He felt that there was a great deal of owner fear of losing control over the property and the HPC identified that fear as an obstacle. The HPC was available to inform, explain, and hopefully reduce property owner fear.

Regarding the Kit Home Survey Status, Mr. Rogers stated that the grant was awarded in 2013 and that there was a two year term to complete the project or the total cost would be village responsibility. Under the terms, the state requires finalization of the survey by September 30, 2014, and it was a start/stop process. Mr. Rogers stated that at this time, they were not hopeful that the final document would be completed via the HPC and ready to submit for filing and reimbursement of the 70:30 grant match from the state. The same contractor and consultant were still being used, but the plan was to submit to the state a summary of progress to date and confirm that completion would not be finished before September 30th of this year and applying for the November grant by deadline for the January 2015 award and finishing the project. He stated that they had verbal agreements with the consultant that she was still willing to complete the process. Numerous delays,

contractual clarifications had been experienced but consultant would still like to be part of the process. Mr. Rogers stated that they feel the issues were now under control at this time but realize that the survey would not be done at this time. In the hopes of being reimbursed for the 70% cost, he felt that the best option at this time was to postpone the survey, submit a memo regarding status of survey and plan, and to reapply for the grant funds. Memo would be prepared administratively and reviewed via general communication at a future meeting.

In response to Chairman McJilton, Mr. Rogers stated that any questions/concerns were to be directed to Ms. House. If further guidance/direction was needed, he would then be available.

There were no other comments or concerns and the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Pomillo
Recording Secretary