

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** May 17, 2000

**TIME:** 7:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Urbana City Building  
400 Vine Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alice Novak, Art Zangerl,  
Liz Cardman, Lachlan Blair,  
Richard Cahill, Trent Shepard

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Paul Ecklor

**STAFF PRESENT:** Rob Kowalski, Senior Planner  
Elizabeth Tyler, Asst. City Planner  
Tim Ross, Planner  
Mary Jo Montgomery, Recording Secretary

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM**

The meeting was called to order by Urbana Historic Preservation Commission Chairperson Alice Novak at 7:05 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was declared present.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved. The minutes of the special meeting held May 3<sup>rd</sup> were approved.

#### **4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

#### **5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

#### **6. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

#### **7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

#### **8. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **Text Amendments**

Ms. Novak stated that she thought it was best if the commission started going through the ordinance section by section and work off of the strike out copy provided by staff.

##### **Definitions**

In Section XII-2. Definitions, Ms. Novak thought that the definition of application needed to be added to this section to clarify what is considered to be a complete application. Mr. Zangerl stated he thought the Commission could adopt rules for what the Commission deems is a complete application. Mr. Kowalski stated staff uses a checklist and all items on the list have to be checked before the application is considered complete.

##### **Historic Districts**

Mr. Shepard proposed that the word partnership be added to Section XII-4, 2 containing the wording dealing with corporations. The commission agreed that adding the word partnership was acceptable. Much discussion followed concerning the percentage figures that were needed to protest and/or approve designations. Staff suggested that further review by the City's legal counsel was in order. Concerning the section titled, Decisions on Designation, general consensus was that the review process should be no longer than 5 business days to determine if application is complete.

### Historic Landmarks

In Section XII-5, E., 1, Mr. Zangerl was questioning the fifty percent (50%) of interest in the property. Mr. Zangerl and Mr. Shepard agreed that if fifty percent (50%) of the owners were in favor and fifty percent (50%) of the owners were against, the vote would cancel itself out. Ms. Novak asked if the Commission were in agreement. She stated that the percent votes would apply to landmark owners as well as property owners of parcels within a historic district. Mr. Shepard stated that partnership needed to be added to c. in the same section. Also, in F., 1., Mr. Shepard stated that b. and c. could be combined. Under the section concerning City Council Authority, the commission agreed that Legal counsel should review this section and make revisions if necessary.

### City Council Action

Art Zangerl noted that it was not clear as to how City Council will act on proposed historic districts in which there is a filed protest. He noted that there should be a tougher approval vote required for a district or landmark nomination where there is a protest.

### Certificate of Appropriateness Review

There were minor suggestions to improve text by the commission.

### Building Permits Previously Issued

Staff and the commission agreed that this section needs to be revised and possibly even omitted.

Mr. Shepard moved that staff make the revisions that the Commission and staff agreed upon and that legal counsel be involved on the issues that need clarification and that a corrected version of the ordinance be presented to the Commission at their next meeting. Mr. Zangerl seconded. Unanimous voice vote.

## **9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

## **10. STAFF REPORT**

Mr. Kowalski spoke briefly about the brochures. Mr. Kowalski also stated that the next meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission would be the Certificate of Appropriateness hearing on Wednesday, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2000.

## **11. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

April D. Getchius, Secretary  
Urbana Historic Preservation Commission