

## MINUTES

**TOWN OF NORMAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
UPTOWN STATION, 3<sup>rd</sup> FLOOR (Illinois Terminal Conference Room)  
11 UPTOWN CIRCLE  
NORMAL, ILLINOIS**

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

**12:30 p.m.**

#### **Members Present**

Nancy Armstrong, Kathy Burgess, Anne Matter, Bruce Warloe

#### **Members Absent**

Kristen Allen, Laurie Christensen, Chris Niebur

#### **Others Present**

Taylor Long, Associate Planner; Bill Foley, 15 Clinton Pl.; Karen McConnell, 700 N. School St.; Gary Hammond, 307 W. Virginia Ave.; Jeff Augspurger, 607 N. Main St.; Tim Powell, 705 S. Broadway Ave.

#### **Call to Order**

Ms. Matter called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. noting that there was a quorum.

#### **Minutes**

Ms. Burgess moved to approve the minutes of the April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017 rescheduled meeting. Ms. Armstrong seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

#### **CA-17-05-18: Storm Door Replacement, 15 Clinton Pl.**

Ms. Matter summarized the application and explained that the applicants had proposed an aluminum storm door to replace the home's current, non-historic wooden door. In the recent past, the current interior-rated and veneered door was installed at the entrance of the home's enclosed front porch. Referencing pictures attached to the application, the commissioners agreed that the current door was certainly in rough shape and in need of replacement.

Commissioners Burgess and Matter stated that they believed the replacement door should be made of wood, thus ruling out the proposed aluminum storm door. Ms. Burgess elaborated that even if the current wood door was not appropriate, any exterior door to the home, historically, would have been wooden. Also, if one looked at it from the perspective that the home's current door was not a true storm door, Ms. Burgess explained, the commission would still require any new storm door to be wooden. The commissioners expressed their support for the proposed door's one, full glass panel, but agreed that it should be framed in wood and feature an appropriate handle and lock set.

Commissioners Warloe and Armstrong introduced the idea of a Bone Grant possibly going towards the purchase and contracted installation of a wooden storm door and its hardware. Ms. Matter stated that she had thought about that and personally concluded that since the home's porch would not have been originally enclosed, the installation of a new storm door to a non-historic porch area could not be considered restorative. Ms. Burgess added that as good stewards of limited grant funds, the commission should not award funding for

a door that historically was never present and could be removed in the future if a new owner choose to restore and re-open the porch area. The commissioners agreed that grant funding would likely not be awarded for the new door's purchase and/or installation. However, the applicants were informed that they were certainly welcome to apply and make their case for approval.

Mr. Long agreed to follow-up with the applicants after the meeting and work on finding an appropriate wooden door and hardware. Mr. Long confirmed with the commissioners that an appropriate door and its hardware could be approved by the chair directly, rather than having the applicants return in June.

Ms. Burgess moved to approve the storm door replacement at 15 Clinton on the condition that the door be made of wood and feature historically appropriate hardware approved by chair. Ms. Armstrong seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-19: Garage Construction, 22 Broadway Pl.**

This Certificate of Appropriateness, as well as the following two related to 22 Broadway Pl., were moved to the end of the meeting's agenda.

Mr. Long summarized the application for a new garage's construction at 22 Broadway Pl. and summarized that a garage original to the home's construction and a recently-demolished shed once stood on the site of the new proposed garage. Mr. Long displayed an illustration of the garage's western, main façade that would be visible from the street and walked the commissioners through the structure's proposed design (see application).

The proposed garage's main facade would feature a wooden garage door, steel entry door, brick cladding from grade to gable, and cement board siding everywhere else. The commissioners agreed that brick cladding on only one face of the structure would not be historically appropriate to design and building methods used at the time of the home and larger neighborhood's construction. The commissioners resolved that the garage should instead feature only cement board siding. Cladding small structures like garages on three sides with one material and a different one on the main face is a modern design technique.

Noting a difference between the proposed garage's siding and shingle colors and those of the main house, Ms. Armstrong asked for an explanation for such plans. Mr. Long explained that the applicant and owner of the property had applied for shingle replacement to match the structures through the expedited process, and that he plans to paint the home's aluminum siding to match the color of the garage's cement board.

The commissioners approved the wooden garage car door, but did not approve the metal entry door that would most likely be visible from the street if placed on the western facade. The entry door should instead be made of wood, feature appropriate hardware, and match either the house or main garage door's divided lite pattern. Ms. Burgess stated that historically, garages of the period would not have had entry doors on the same face of the structure as the main car door, but more often had windows on one or both sides of the main door. The commissioners agreed that the door should be moved to the south side of the new garage if possible. Mr. Warloe added that this relocation would also make the door invisible from the street and, thus, allow for a steel door's installation.

Lastly, the commissioners agreed that any exterior lights installed on the garage would have to be approved by the commission. They suggested that any light(s) match the ones on the home's front porch.

Town staff agreed to follow-up with the applicant regarding the commission's conditions for approval and seek direct approval for re-submitted materials with the chair.

Ms. Burgess moved to approve the application for garage construction at 22 Broadway Pl. on the conditions that:

1. The garage be sided completely with cement board, rather than feature any partial brick cladding.
2. The garage's entry door be made of wood, feature appropriate hardware, and match the divided lite pattern of the home or garage's main door. If possible, the entry door should also be moved to the south side of the garage.
3. Any exterior lights on the garage also be approved by the commission.

Ms. Armstrong seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-20: Storm Door Installation, 22 Broadway Pl.**

Mr. Long summarized the application and explained that the applicant had submitted an aluminum storm door for the commission's consideration. The home appears to have never featured a storm door, but the homeowner would like to take the step to protect the main wooden door and gain added weather protection.

The commissioners reviewed the proposed door and agreed that only a wooden door with appropriate hardware could be approved.

Mr. Warloe moved to approve the application for the installation of the proposed storm door at 22 Broadway Pl. Ms. Burgess seconded the motion. The motion failed 0-4. Town staff agreed to follow-up with the applicant and get direct approval from the chair for any appropriate door and hardware submitted by the applicant.

**CA-17-05-21: Egress Window Installation, 22 Broadway Pl.**

Mr. Long summarized the application and showed the commissioners where the proposed egress would be installed. Mr. Long also informed the commissioners that the applicant did not intend to install an egress window with two exterior muntins to mimic the pattern of the home's other original basement windows. The applicant was under the impression that the Fire Department bars the use of egress windows with muntins, but Town staff informed him that no such rule or concern exists and that the Normal Fire Department told them as much.

Ms. Burgess moved to approve the application for the installation of an egress window on the south side of 22 Broadway Pl. on the condition that it feature exterior muntins to match the home's existing basement windows. Mr. Warloe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-22: Fence Installation, 700 N. School St.**

Ms. Matter introduced the application and Mr. Long displayed images of the proposed powder-coated aluminum fence and the area of the back and side yards that it would enclose. The home's owner, Karen McConnell, explained that the fence would stand at four feet tall and run the perimeter of the home's side and back yards and up to the home's rear deck (see application).

Ms. Armstrong moved to approve the application to install a fence at 700 N. School St. Mr. Warloe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-23: Window Replacement, 307 W. Virginia Ave.**

Ms. Matter invited the applicant and home's owner, Gary Hammond, to explain the need for the 12 identified windows (see application) to be replaced at 307 W. Virginia Ave. Referencing the numbers given to each window in his application, Mr. Hammond explained that each of the home's remaining original windows (windows 3 - 6 and 8 - 12) allowed for very little protection from winter breezes, were nearly inoperable, and that windows 3 - 6, specifically, could only be opened using a prybar. Mr. Long instructed the commissioners to ignore the note that only windows 3 through 6 were original, upon Mr. Hammond's assertion that windows 8 through 12 appeared to be of the same vintage. Mr. Hammond added that windows 1, 2, and 7 were small, single pane picture windows that were certainly not original to the home. Lastly, Mr. Hammond stated that the current storm windows on the home served little to no purpose and would be removed as part of his replacement of the 12 windows.

The commissioners reviewed the proposed replacement windows made of a wood composite material called Wood-Ultrex by Marvin Windows. Mr. Hammond brought a sample window to the meeting and the commissioners could see what the window and composite material looked like up-close. Mr. Hammond explained that his proposed model of window is considered one of the most efficient and well-constructed composite windows on the market. Mr. Hammond explained that the windows would feature divided lights, wood-Ultrex interiors and framing, and raised exterior, fiberglass-clad mullions. Commissioners Matter and Burgess expressed skepticism that such a composite window could truly be considered a wood window. Mr. Hammond stated that the manufacture assured him that the windows' wood components were made of pine and explained that the fiberglass exterior cladding was the most effective material when it comes to reducing weathering and shrinkage. Mr. Warloe offered that fiberglass cladding was just another material on the spectrum of modern window exteriors, and added that there is most likely not a window on the market that is constructed entirely of wood. Mr. Long added that the commission had recently approved this exact same make and model of window for a home in the Old North Normal Historic District, except that that window was externally clad in aluminum.

Finally, Mr. Hammond explained that replacement windows 3 - 6 and 8 - 12 would all feature double hung inserts and mimic the current windows' mullion patterns. Of the three non-historic picture windows, windows 1 and 2 would be replaced with small double hung inserts with appropriate mullions; while window 7, due to its smaller size, would just feature a small, sealed, non-double hung insert.

Ms. Armstrong moved to approve the application for window replacement at 307 W. Virginia Ave. Ms. Burgess seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**BG-17-05-05: Window Replacement, 307 W. Virginia Ave.**

Ms. Matter introduced the application for the Bone Grant. Mr. Hammond and the commissioners discussed the application's attached estimates for the purchase of the windows and whether the replacements might be done by a contractor – a cost also covered by the grant program. Mr. Hammond stated that he did intend to have a contractor do the installation, but that such estimates were not included with the application at that time. After reviewing the purchase estimates alone, the commissioners concluded that any additional costs for installation would make the project exceed \$10,000, thus maxing out any possible grant at \$5,000.

Ms. Armstrong moved to approved a grant in an amount not to exceed \$5,000.00 for the purchase and contracted installation of 307 W. Virginia Ave's 12 replacement windows. Mr. Warloe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-24: Siding Replacement, 607 N. Main St.**

This application and its associated Bone Grant application were moved and considered after 705 S. Broadway Ave's three applications.

Ms. Matter introduced the application for 607 N. Main St. and invited Jeff Augspurger, the home's owner, to walk the group through the proposed replacement of his Italianate home's damaged cedar siding and various detailing with modern, fiber cement board (see application). Mr. Augspurger explained that he purchased the home within the last five years and had observed large sections of the structure's recently installed cedar siding grow weathered and begin rotting in earnest. The homeowner clarified that he only proposed using cement board to replace the home's siding, but that the building's window frames and various, ornamental detailing would be rebuild and/or replaced with historically appropriate cedar. The commissioners expressed immediate approval for the restoration of the window frames and detailing using cedar.

Mr. Augspurger went on to explain that he had not fully committed to the idea of using cement board in the replacement of his home's exterior siding— either in full or in sections – but stated that he really wanted to get the commission's opinion of the material and its efficacy as a substitute for largely substandard, modern wood siding. The commissioners agreed with Mr. Augspurger that modern, young woods just do not hold up to anywhere near the same amount of wear and tear as the old-growth woods used in the original construction of historic homes. The homeowner expressed that he was more than open to the idea of repairing and/or replacing the home's cedar siding the new wood boards.

After a lengthy discussion, the commissioners and Mr. Augspurger concluded that residing and restoring the home's exterior should only be done using materials original to the home's 1850s construction. The use of modern cedar siding, though far less durable than cement board, was decided to be more historically and aesthetically appropriate because its surface/grain appears much more realistic than any designed for cement board, whether smooth or impressed with a weathered, faux-wood pattern. Additionally, the commissioners stated that replacing the home's wood siding with cement board and its ornamentation and window frames with cedar would make for an historically inappropriate mixture that would be readily evident to any observer. For the sake of continuity and preservation, the commission also stated that no side of the home or attached garage should be sided in cement board even if it is not visible from the public right of way.

Lastly, the commission stated that Bone Grant funding could most certainly be awarded for the costly restoration of the home's exterior and use of cedar replacement boards. Mr. Augspurger expressed appreciate for the commission's guidance and agreed to use wood, rather than cement board to re-side his home.

Ms. Armstrong moved to approve the application for the repair and replacement of 607 N. Main St's wood siding, window frames, and various detailing with new cedar, and not cement board. Ms. Burgess seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**BG-17-05-06: Siding Replacement, 607 N. Main St.**

The commission restated its commitment to awarding grant funds for the restoration of the home's siding, window frames, and Italianate ornamentation using cedar, rather than the rejected cement board.

Mr. Augspurger and the commissioners reviewed the grant application's attached estimates and concluded that new estimates incorporating the use of cedar and detailing new scopes of work for the project would need

to be resubmitted before a Bone Grant could be considered. Town staff agreed to follow-up with the applicant after the meeting and in the coming weeks to put together one or two separate grant applications.

The applicant withdrew his grant application and stated his intent to return soon with revised estimates for external cedar repair and replacement.

**CA-17-05-25: Window Restoration, 705 S. Broadway Ave.**

Ms. Matter introduced the application for window restoration and invited 705 S. Broadway Ave's owner, Tim Powell, to summarize his proposed project. Mr. Powell stated that the window frame and glass in question was on the southern face of the home and in the third-story gable. Mr. Powell stated that he had no illustrations of the proposed window's design, but that the window would be designed to complement the home's lower, east facing stained-glass window. Mr. Powell added that his plan is to have the current window's remaining broken and discolored glass removed and to rebuild its wood frame with appropriate cedar. Lastly, Mr. Powell stated that he would like to have the new stained-glass window feature an apple as an homage to the home's builder, Orson Manchester – a lifelong educator, former dean of ISNU, and an early 20<sup>th</sup>-century mayor of Normal – and the first word spoken by the Powell's son.

Ms. Burgess moved to approve the application for window restoration at 705 S. Broadway Ave. on the condition that the stained-glass window's apple motif be tastefully designed and comparable in size to the home's eastern stained-glass "P" window. Ms. Armstrong seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**CA-17-05-26: Shake Shingle Restoration, 705 S. Broadway Ave.**

Mr. Powell stated that after some preliminary evaluation of the shake shingle around the third story window and throughout the gable, the areas identified in the application would need to be repaired or replaced with cedar. It was very likely, according to Mr. Powell, that other sections of shingle would also need attention upon closer inspection. Ms. Matter asked if the replacement shingles would match the existing siding material. Mr. Powell assured the commissioners that cedar shakes of the required size are readily available and would be installed by qualified professionals.

Ms. Armstrong moved to approve the application for the repair and/or replacement of shake shingle siding at 705 S. Broadway Ave. Mr. Warloe seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**BG-17-05-07: Window and Shake Shingle Restoration, 705 S. Broadway Ave.**

Mr. Powell walked the commissioners through his two estimates, stating that the estimates covered the repair and/or replacement of shake shingles and window framing in the home's third-story gable and the removal and replacement of the window itself. The estimates did not include the cost of manufacturing the stained-glass window or the ineligible costs associated with painting the siding.

Due to the likelihood of additional repair costs arising, the commissioners made clear to Mr. Powell that he should request an increase to his Bone Grant when submitting his receipts for reimbursement. Town staff agreed to bring such an increase before the commission if/when necessary.

Ms. Armstrong moved to approve a Bone Grant in the amount \$1,310.00 for wood shake shingle and window frame restoration. Ms. Burgess seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

**Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Taylor Long".

Taylor Long  
Associate Planner