

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
July 24, 2017

The July 24, 2017 special meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:00PM by Chairman Demsky in the board room of the Village Hall. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Upon roll call, the following were:

Present: Commissioners Ciolek, Jung, McWilliams, Reynolds, and Chairman Demsky
Absent: Commissioners Kramer and Tracy
Also present: Michelle House, Planner II
Dudley Onderdonk, AICP Planning Consultant
John Hedrick, Local Preservation Advocate

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Demsky asked for comments/corrections to the minutes from the March 13th HPC meetings. The following correction was made:

- Second line from bottom of Page 2 - Change AP to **AC** for sentence to read, “Unable to determine if the HPC and **AC** merger was working as initially thought.”

There were no other corrections. Commissioner Ciolek, seconded by Commissioner Reynolds, moved to adopt the minutes of the March 13, 2017, Historic Preservation Commission meeting as edited. Upon voice vote, motion carried.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS -None

CONSENT - None

OLD BUSINESS -None

NEW BUSINESS

- Consideration of a recommendation for approval of a Historic Preservation Action Plan
Ms. House reviewed what took place leading up to the proposed action plan that would be discussed at tonight’s meeting. Because this was the initial discussion of the plan, Ms. House stated that it did not have to be adopted tonight. She felt that it could be reviewed and adopted tonight, or it could be reviewed, revised, and adopted at a later date.

Proposed action plan was broken into four (4) categories: Ongoing Action, Short-Term Actions, Mid-Term Actions, and Long-Term Actions. Ms. House would review each category which would be followed by discussion of pertinent points in each. For details of specific categories, refer to the Historic Preservation Action Plan dated May 31, 2017 and distributed in the commissioners’ packet.

Ongoing Actions

At this time, Chairman Demsky invited Mr. Onderdonk to the podium for comments. He stated that from a staff perspective, they attempted to break items into what could be done now, what could be done on an intermediate basis, and what can be done long term. He mentioned the ongoing requirement of the federal and state government for reporting and noted that this was listed in the Ongoing Action category.

Continuing, Mr. Onderdonk stated that the list of possible historic preservation items was longer but had been reviewed and broken down to short term and long term possibilities. He was satisfied with how the list was broken down.

Comments made were:

- Regarding O-4, Mr. Hedrick mentioned that he was active with the Chicago Suburban Preservation Alliance and Landmarks Illinois organizations. He stated that they met on Saturday mornings, and showcased members of other commissioners.
- Mr. Onderdonk also mentioned that it was a nice way to be involved and learn what other municipalities were doing.

Short-Term Action

Ms. House presented the short-term action items as listed in the draft Historic Preservation Action Plan distributed in the commissioners' packet. She referenced S-1 and mentioned that the budget for updated surveys of historic structures was currently being worked on and would be available FY2018. Ms. House stated that staff was using the 2015 data for ownership which was the most recent ownership data available to them. She also mentioned that Item S-4, birthday mailer, would be discussed later in this meeting. They were also considering reducing the building permit fees for designated historic landmarks.

Comments made were:

- Mr. Onderdonk mentioned that a big issue/concern in historic preservation was that owners start work on their homes before realizing what was involved. He felt that the intent behind Short-Term Action was to help owners realize what they have in terms of historic value and to educate them to better understand the historic value of their property before work has been started.
- Mr. Hedrick commented on the data base mapping and technology used for surveys that are helpful in engaging citizens in historic preservation. He mentioned that he had set-up a version for the Circles neighborhood. It uses a software product that has been used successfully in Illinois, and he mentioned Libertyville and Berwyn as successful examples.
- Mr. Hedrick would be willing to talk with staff in terms of what value the program would have for Glenview.
- Mr. Onderdonk added that other communities have developed similar programs for their communities and mentioned Glencoe and Elgin as examples.
- Mr. Onderdonk mentioned that portions of Glenview have been surveyed for landmark eligibility by previous consultants but Glenview in its entirety has not been surveyed to date. He also commented that it would be hard to preserve property unless you were aware of what historic value you may have.
- Regarding the fees and permits, Mr. Onderdonk stated that their intent was to make it as easy as possible for owners to preserve what value they have in their homes.
- Commissioner Ciolek referenced S-10 and questioned if the title of developer as shown in S-10 was broad enough for a homeowner to understand. He thought perhaps the use of **applicant** rather than developer would be appropriate. Ms. House stated that the term could be changed if the AC felt another term would be appropriate.

-Commissioner McWilliams questioned the fee structure for permits and suggested eliminating the fee structure for historic preservation to encourage people to move forward with historic

preservation plans. He added that eliminating fees for the three (3) identified historic preservation properties would indicate village interest in the historic value of the property

-Ms. House stated that because staff would have to do inspections, fees could not be eliminated but could possibly be reduced. She suggested historic homes could possibly be reduced to 50% across the board for the full year.

-Commissioner Ciolek clarified with staff that the fee reduction would be a discussion item with the AC, staff, and village manager.

At this time, Mr. Onderdonk commented on the Village of Kenilworth and their current program to document the important community history. Chairman Demsky suggested having an individual, such as an historic preservation architect, who would be available to dialog with someone who was knowledgeable with historic preservation and could guide owners in what they hoped to do. Mr. Onderdonk suggested a “pre-application meeting” with an individual that could help educate and guide owner in documenting the value in the property before it would be torn down, renovated, etc. He mentioned that Kenilworth had an architect on retainer to work with applicants. Also the Art Institute had an individual who was knowledgeable and could be available.

Mr. Hedrick commented on staff plans for surveying the history of Glenview. He mentioned that downtown Glenview had the most historic properties and that people often asked how they could get information on Glenview’s downtown history. He mentioned a survey of the downtown area that was completed approximately 10 years ago and was available to “jump start” the movement towards historic preservation. Mr. Onderdonk noted that all neighborhoods do not have to be done all at once. Ms. House mentioned that there was a survey previously done that identified the Kit Homes throughout Glenview.

Mid-Term Action

Ms. House read the action items shown in this category as listed in the Historic Preservation Action Plan document distributed to commissioners’ in their packets. She hoped to have Item M-1 (financial incentives) available by summer 2018.

Comments made were:

- Mr. Onderdonk clarified that the mid-term actions were primarily to educate, “get the word out on both resources and what to do and why we do it” and would be an ongoing item.
- Mr. Onderdonk stated that the intent was also to remove barriers for potential historic property owners.
- Mr. Hedrick suggested using phrases that refer to specific resources, digital web base resources and digital tools, social media, Facebook page, etc. which could generate interest.

Long-Term Action

Ms. House stated that no time frame has been assigned to the long-term items to date. She read the long-term items as listed in the Historic Preservation Action Plan.

Comments made on Items L 1-4 were:

- Mr. Onderdonk explained that the intent was to amend the culture of the community to promote greater appreciation for historic preservation and to make improvements that respect the home and property. At this time, he read a portion of a letter that he had received from a Glencoe resident that was emotional and exciting and also explained the purpose of

designating a home to preserve as well as contribute to the history of the Village of Glencoe. The letter writer also mentioned their excitement of sharing stories with others regarding the history of their properties.

- Regarding the 2 tiers, Mr. Onderdonk stated that the two-tier was good for owners who might have concerns of landmark status.
 - One tier was non-binding, honorary status, and allowed for inclusion without owner consent. Advisory review of visible alterations would not qualify for financial benefits.
 - Certified Landmark tier would require owner consent, mandatory review of viewable alterations and would qualify for financial benefits. No demolition of viewable areas would be permitted.

Regarding L-3, Mr. Hedrick commented on the initial formation of the HPC and that the focus was on landmark properties at that time. He felt that there was some reluctance to “take on” individual homes. However, Mr. Hedrick stated that if the HPC does not reach out to the community, people would not be engaged.

Commissioner Reynolds felt that it “blended in with architectural appreciation”. He felt that Glenview should celebrate what Glenview has in addition to the historic value. Glenview should applaud new construction done well as well as recognize historic value and its renovation. He commented that Glenview should not just preserve a home but appreciate good architecture.

Mr. Hedrick commented that the combined commissions, HPC and AC, can recognize quality architecture. It was suggested that a Project of the Month or Project of the Year, can be awarded to new homes in recognition of quality architecture. Ms. House stated that different qualification could be considered for new home, new addition, for residential and for commercial, for example. Nominating process could be done by staff, individuals, or architects for example.

Comments made on Items L 5-10 were:

- It was suggested offering a historical lecture series on Historic Preservation in other areas so resident would see how it was done in other communities. Mr. Onderdonk added that it was good to have local communities together to discuss preservation in their specific communities.
- Regarding L-10, Commissioner McWilliams asked if there was feedback available on demolition delay in other communities. Mr. Onderdonk responded that all ordinances have some type of delay. Policy delay was a “tough call” but was the individual community determination. He added that it did take a while to sell a home with historic landmark status.
- Mr. Onderdonk mentioned that interiors of landmark status homes can be modernized while maintaining and not disturbing the exterior of the home.

At this time, Commissioner Reynolds stated that he had dealt with demolition delay in Winnetka and to date, he had not seen where demolition delay “stopped anyone or changed the mind” of any owner to follow through with what they intended to do for the property if the owner wanted to move forward with his project. Commissioner Reynolds felt that what was extremely important for Glenview to do was to require documentation of the historic value of the home so its history would not be lost.

Chairman Demsky noted that demolition delay allows for more time to research and document the home's history and historic value.

- Chairman Demsky commented that the wording in L-10 did not make sense and would have to be reviewed and reworded for clarity.
- Commissioner Reynolds stated that education was important. He felt that the problem was people were not aware of what they had, what they were looking at. If there was no known historical value, it could be easily replaced.
- Mr. Onderdonk stated that it takes time to put things in place and gave examples of historical homes that had been saved with the demolition delay.
- Mr. Hedrick commented on some of his involvement with other communities. He felt that there was a need to educate and culture the community to make owners aware of what they have and Glenview has as a community.

Comments made on Items L 11-18 were:

- Commissioner Reynolds was in favor of L-11, which would eliminate designated landmark properties going through the zoning variance process. Ms. House commented that this elimination would save time. Mr. Onderdonk commented that a greater lot coverage could be allowed for a historic project or grant a higher ratio, for example.
- Chairman Demsky stated that the assumption would be that the structure would be an appropriate building or project
- Commissioner Jung stated that he was in favor of L-14 and felt that it would encourage property owners

Commissioner McWilliams questioned the wording of L-11. Consensus was that it needed further discussion and reworded for clarity. As it was worded, did it refer to properties already designated or the few that have been reviewed and were currently on the list of potential properties?

Commissioner Reynolds felt that it would be a bonus zoning-wise for the homes already on the list to encourage them to be “repurposed and continue” to exist which was what the HPC wanted to do.

Commissioner McWilliams was in agreement with Commissioner Reynolds and suggested rewording it to state: structures with historic landmark eligibility or historic landmarks. Chairman Demsky confirmed with staff that homes or properties eligible would be a discussion with HPC and staff.

Comments made on Items L 19-21 were:

- L 21 incorporates ideas of social media to advance historic preservation
- L 20 involves potential facade improvement for either commercial and/or resident. Further discussion would be needed
- Chairman Demsky clarified that the village has the opportunity to step in to save a property if an owner was intent on tearing it down. Mr. Onderdonk stated that this type of transaction would be considered a “conditional sale” with the intent of reselling to a developer who would build in historic style to maintain value
- Commissioner Reynolds stated that it was important to maintain list and receive notification if/when potential properties would be placed on the market

- Regarding L-19, the demolition impact fee, Commissioner Reynolds felt that it should be “equally spread through all demolition”. He felt that every home that would be demolished should be contributing to the expense of history documentation.
- Chairman Demsky stated that it could be temporary until all homes in Glenview were reviewed.
- Commissioner McWilliams pointed out that the fee was a long-term action item and would be discussed further. He was in agreement with Commissioner Reynolds that it was an economic hardship for an owner who should have the right to act on the demolition if that were their choice.

Final comments made were:

- Commissioner Jung suggested a marker such as a plaque could be presented to a home if it were landmarked as historic
- Mr. Onderdonk stated that Highland Park had a \$10,000 demolition fee which was earmarked for their non-profit, low-income housing.
- Mr. Onderdonk stated that there could be opportunity for special provisions should a planned unit development come through the process
- There were approximately 50 teardowns per year in Glenview

Chairman Demsky confirmed with staff that if the HPC was in agreement with the time-line outlined in the Historic Preservation Action Plan, staff would begin working on short term action plan items. She confirmed with commissioners that all items were on the correct list.

Commissioner Ciolek stated that as presented it made sense and if approved, the ground work could begin. There could be an opportunity to change/move items if needed at a later date. Ms. House pointed out that Item O-6 was to update the action plan once annually. She also noted that policy discussions take time.

Chairman Demsky commented that Long-Term Item L-2 should be considered soon. Consensus was to move L-2 to the Short-Term Action list. Brief discussion on splitting the tiers, non-binding on the Short-Term list and Certified Landmark moved to the Mid or Long-Term list.

Commissioner Reynolds commented that the Certified Landmark status was already in existence. He suggested that the honorary status could simply be recognition to valuable homes or buildings of the top 20 homes recognized by the HPC.

Commissioner McWilliams suggested that the HPC should do something soon because of the number of teardowns. It was suggested that a documentation packet be provided to the real estate community or to homeowners considering teardown, to document history of homes prior to teardown. He added that there may not be historic landmark status but it could have a unique history for a specific property. It was also noted that the HPC cannot enforce anything, but people would have the knowledge and could follow thru with the village. Commissioner Ciolek confirmed that this was Item S-11 which was a phased approach to community development. Photos of the home and/or documentation could be included on the demolition check list.

Ms. House discussed with commissioners that the draft document could be revised as discussed and returned for review and adoption at a future meeting. If additional information was needed, staff could research/investigate. Commissioner Ciolek stated that everything in the documents seemed to

fall in place. Chairman Demsky commented on the fee structure that would be evaluated and discussed at a later date.

Mr. Onderdonk confirmed with staff that any policy items would need discussion with the other commissions and the village board. For example, a change of fee structure would call for research of other communities for fee structure and use. Glenview was lenient when adding fees. However, there would be a need to present research in terms of why and what. Commissioner Reynolds stated that nothing was set in motion that could not be reversed if needed. Commissioner McWilliams noted that terms were evaluate, explore for example, and he was comfortable with the plan as worded. Consensus was to approve the plan as presented.

Commissioner McWilliams moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the Village of Glenview Historic Preservation Action Plan dated May 31, 2017, subject to the revisions discussed tonight. Commissioner Ciolek seconded the motion. Upon voice vote, motion carried.

- **Birthday Mailer**

Ms. House stated that the Birthday Mailer was Item S-3 in the Short-Term Action list. She stated that the letter was previously sent to potential designated property owners. The letter was created to be mailed to all homes that were 50 years of age. It was intended to be upbeat and informative for residents who might be leaning towards historical preservation.

Comments made were:

- Consensus was that the draft letter was too lengthy, not very interesting, and should be graphically interesting.
- Commissioner McWilliams suggested more graphics, a birthday card that included the list of items needed to meet landmark status with 50 years old already \checkmark d. A photo of the home could also be included.
- Commissioner Reynolds confirmed that the mailing would go to every home that was 50 years old.
- Commissioner Ciolek suggested to tier the list such as:
 - 50 years old with link leading to more information.
 - If honorary status, a special card including more information would be forwarded. Largest card would be mailed to those already on the register.
- Commissioner Reynolds suggested a simple birthday card, wishing homeowner a Happy Birthday to the 50 year old home.
- Chairman Demsky and Commissioner McWilliams were in favor of omitting the sentence asking if owner would like to be removed from the list.

Consensus was to simplify card, let owner know they are eligible, and inform them of where they could go for further information.

In response to Chairman Demsky, Ms. House stated that the card was mailed at age 50. After 50, a mailing would go to properties that could be landmarked. Discussion on how often to mail would be needed (once a year, every five years?)

Commissioner Reynolds clarified that the intent of the mailing was to educate property owners as well as to get some word out to those homes that were older whose owner may not be aware of historic preservation.

Final comments were:

- Commissioner Ciolek stated that it would be good to know how many homes would be 50 years old.
- Commissioner Reynolds requested that staff redistribute list of potential homes to HPC commissioners.
- Ms. House stated that the list of the original 89 homes had been on the website but it was necessary to remove it from the website at owners' request.
- GIS maps are color coded with blurb about home.
- Commissioner Reynolds clarified that Mr. Hedrick had a Facebook page for downtown Glenview. He felt that might be interesting to do to reach out to historic places. Photos of Glenview from 100 years ago could be posted which would be a nice way to promote Glenview history.

Chairman Demsky summarized that the mailing should be a card with a simple message

Commissioner McWilliams moved to continue review and approval of the Birthday Mailing to a future meeting. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Upon voice vote, motion carried.

Mr. Onderdonk commented that progress had been made towards the Historic Preservation Action Plan in Glenview.

There was no other business and Chairman Demsky adjourned the meeting at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Pomillo
Recording Secretary