

MINUTES

BOARD/COMMISSION: Historic Preservation

DATE: April 22, 2010

MEETING: Regular

CALLED TO ORDER: 7:40 p.m.

QUORUM: Yes

ADJOURNED: 9:35 p.m.

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Chairman Marks;
Commissioners Ford, Isaac, Janninck,
Wright, Loftus, Manak, Cooper, and
Salamunovich, Staff Liaison Schrader

LOCATION: Glen Ellyn Civic Center

ABSENT: Trustee Liaison Ladesic

1. Call to Order

Chairman Marks called the Historic Preservation Commission meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. on April 22, 2010.

2. Public Comments

No public comments were given.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the March 25, 2010 Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission

Chairman Marks stated the minutes from March 25, 2010 were presented to the Commission for approval. Commissioner Manak motioned for the approval of the minutes from March 25, 2010. Commissioner Wright seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Old Business

Not discussed.

5. New Business

a. Review and Vote on Historic Preservation Award Nominations

Discussion first ensued on properties up for the Renovation of the Year Award, including 415 N. Park Boulevard, 376 N. Park Boulevard and 625 Hillside Avenue. Chairman Marks provided background information regarding the details of the property and the renovations made to 415 N. Park Boulevard. General discussion took place regarding the renovations made at this

property. Discussion then took place on the property at 625 Hillside Avenue and it was noted that the renovations at this property were mostly landscaping renovations, with very few exterior renovations made. Chairman Marks then provided background information regarding the renovations made to 376 N. Park Boulevard. Discussion arose over the visibility of the changes from the street. The Commissioners then discussed their opinion on which property should receive the Renovation of the Year Award.

Commissioner Loftus felt 415 N. Park Boulevard was the best choice in this category as he felt 376 N. Park Boulevard used inappropriate windows for the era of time the home was built. Commissioner Manak noted that the renovations made on 376 N. Park Boulevard were spectacular from the view of the street, that they met the criteria for renovations and although the window choice could have been better, it is a great candidate for this award. Commissioner Salamunovich felt both 415 and 376 N. Park Boulevard were great candidates, but that 415 N. Park Boulevard's renovations were more complete and looked like the home could have been built that way. General discussion took place regarding the windows installed on 376 N. Park Boulevard. Commissioner Cooper praised 376 N. Park Boulevard for the amount of research done toward the renovations completed. Commissioner Janninck leaned towards 376 N. Park Boulevard due to the renovation changes completed. Commissioner Wright felt 376 N. Park Boulevard was more like an addition and 415 N. Park Boulevard was more of a total renovation. Chairman Marks stated he felt both of these owners did a great job preserving the home. Commissioner Manak was in favor of 415 N. Park Boulevard due to the time spent researching, the renovations made, and materials used to complete the home. Commissioner Ford preferred the Dutch colonial home from a renovation standpoint and work done on the core structure. General discussion took place over the judging criteria and the voting process. The vote taken was a draw and ultimately the Commission decided to award each home with the award.

Discussion then took place on the Restoration of the Year Award, for which 490 Pennsylvania Avenue, 602 Prairie Avenue and 542 Hillside Avenue were nominated. Chairman Marks felt 490 Pennsylvania Avenue did not match up to the other two homes nominated for restoration of the year. Chairman Marks then provided information regarding the background of 602 Prairie Avenue, leading up to the restoration of the home, as well as 542 Hillside Avenue. He stated he would like to award both 602 Prairie Avenue and 542 Hillside Avenue the Restoration of the Year Award because of the tremendous amount of work completed on both homes. Commissioner Manak felt he could not make an educated decision because of lack of viewing of the homes in this category. Commissioner Ford felt both owners of each property did an outstanding job on the restoration of each. Commissioner Loftus felt the Hillside restoration was the best choice for the restoration awards. Commissioner Salamunovich stated both homes did an outstanding job on all of the restorations completed.

General discussion took place over the Pennsylvanian property receiving the Streetscape Compatibility Award and the guidelines necessary for a structure to receive this award and the criteria for a restoration award. Commissioner Isaac presented pictures from each of the structures nominated for the Restoration of the Year Award category. Commissioner Cooper

felt both homes did outstanding jobs. Commissioner Janninck felt both homes did a great job in this restoration category. She stated she was slightly in favor of the Hillside only because it was a pure restoration and the other home was more of an addition. Commissioner Wright felt both home should receive the award because of the outstanding work completed on both homes. Commissioner Isaac felt both homes did an outstanding job and could receive an award for restoration. Commissioner Manak stated he felt both properties could receive an award. The Commission agreed unanimously to award best restoration to both properties.

Chairman Marks questioned if the commercial building should be given a Certificate of Appreciation. The Commission agreed unanimously to send the owners of 490 Pennsylvania a Certificate of Appreciation for their efforts to restore the property.

Discussion then took place on the Architectural Details Award, for which 481 Hawthorne Boulevard was nominated. Following discussion on the nominee, it was determined that 481 Hawthorne Boulevard would be awarded the 2009 Architectural Details Award for its efforts to restore the exterior detail elements of the home in a manner fitting its historic character.

Discussion finally took place on the Streetscape Compatibility Award, for which 711 Riford Road was nominated. Commissioner Isaac stated 711 Riford Road fits the historical design of Glen Ellyn and is better than many homes built in the area. Commissioner Ford felt this home did not meet the criteria for an award. Commissioner Loftus stated the architecture was unique and the size fits the character of the neighborhood, but may be a stretch for this award. Commissioners Salamunovich and Cooper felt it was not suitable for an award. Commissioner Isaac felt the design of the house was fairly simple and felt it did not meet the criteria for an award. Commissioner Janninck felt the sizing of the home met the character of the neighborhood, but felt it did not meet the criteria for an award. Commissioner Wright and Chairman Marks felt it did not meet the criteria. The Commission unanimously agreed to not award a winner in this category.

b. 2010 Commission Goals

No discussion.

c. Discussion on thoughts to be provided to Village Board on Downtown Strategic Plan Report

No discussion.

d. Memorial Field Discussion

Chairman Marks provided background information regarding this draft letter and stated the funding for these changes would be covered by District 87. General discussion took place between the Commission members regarding the proposed changes and alternatives that could implemented. Commissioner Cooper stated the rerouting of the road was due to safety concerns to the students and teachers. Chairman Marks expressed his concerns with the

proposed lighting that is planned to be installed around the football field. Commissioner Isaac stated he was not for or against the lights but felt the choice of lights used could please all parties as long as issues such as the brightness and the extra noise that could be a burden to neighbors are considered. Chairman Marks stated he felt the lights would ruin the ambiance of the historic nature of the neighborhood and felt the Village Trustees have not considered the effect it will have on the residents.

General discussion took place regarding the location of the lights and the lights that are currently installed on tennis courts near this area. Commissioner Ford stated the installation of lights could provide more usage of the field. Discussion also took place over how to handle this situation and a solution that could please all parties involved. The Commission agreed it would like more information regarding the type of lights that will be installed and the foot candle measurement that will infiltrate into the surrounding neighborhood. Staff Liaison Schrader stated she would work to get more information on the lights for the next meeting.

6. Historical Society Business

None.

7. Chairman's Report

None.

8. Trustee Liaison's Report

None.

9. Staff Liaison's Report

None.

10. Adjournment

With no further business, Chairman Marks asked for a motion to conclude the meeting. Commissioner Manak motioned for adjournment. Commissioner Ford seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Submitted by: Chris Ragona, Historic Preservation Commission Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Kristen Schrader, Historic Preservation Commission Staff Liaison