

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**APPROVED**

**DATE:** October 1, 2003

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

**PLACE:** Council Chambers, 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rich Cahill, Alice Novak, Bill Rose, Trent Shepard, Art Zangerl

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Liz Cardman

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Elizabeth Tyler, Director of Community Development Services;  
Michaela Bell, Planner; Teri Anel, Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Gerald Brighton, Lisa Fitzgerald, Lauren Kerestes, Karen  
Kummer, Linda Lorenz, Steve Ross, Christopher Stohr, Joan  
Zagorski

---

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

Urbana Historic Preservation Commission Chair, Alice Novak, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared.

**2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Chair Novak proposed moving the two National Register Nominations ahead of the M.O.R. Zoning District Guidelines discussion. The Urbana Historic Preservation Commission agreed.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Mr. Zangerl moved to approve the minutes from May 7, 2003 as amended. Mr. Cahill seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote as amended.

**4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were none.

**5. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was none.

**6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

**7. OLD BUSINESS**

There was none.

**8. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

**9. NEW BUSINESS**

**National Register Nomination for the “Lincoln” Statue, located in the 1000 Block of South Race Street**

Chair Novak mentioned that she had a conflict of interest with this nomination, because it was done by one of her students. She removed herself and turned the Chair over to Art Zangerl.

Mr. Zangerl noted that nominations come before the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission after the review at the state level with the state’s recommendation. The Urbana Historic Preservation Commission has to determine whether they believe it was appropriate for the nominated property or object to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Zangerl to describe the significance of placing property on the Historic Register and the implications of it. Mr. Zangerl stated that there were financial incentives at the federal level. There were no absolute protections afforded by that designation; however, if there were alterations to the significant features of the proposed building or object, then it could be removed from the register.

Lauren Kerestes, 2<sup>nd</sup> year Master Student in the Department of Urban & Regional Planning, nominated the Lincoln Statue for the National Register.

Mr. Zangerl pointed out that in Section 7, Page 1, Ms. Kerestes made reference to the Mediterranean Revival Pavilion having been built in the 1950s. He asked if there was a firmer date on that? How did she come across this information? In her research of the Lincoln Statue, Ms. Kerestes found it listed in several articles.

Mr. Zangerl noted that in Section 8, Page 10, there was a reference made to the idea of moving the statue several times over the years. He commented that it would be nice to have a timeframe. He was not sure if Ms. Kerestes was referring to the most recent controversy surrounding the statue.

There was interest in moving the statue to the new courthouse. He felt that it needed to be made clear that the suggestion was not to bring the statue back to where it was originally was. Ms. Kerestes remarked that it was originally at the southeast corner of the Urbana Lincoln Hotel before it had its pedestal and platform. It was moved to Carle Park with its pedestal. Then, it was moved a third time about 20 feet and placed so that it faced southeast.

Mr. Zangerl pointed out that there was a mistake in the letter from Tracy Sculle regarding Lorado Zadok Taft, sculptor of the Lincoln Statue, always wanting the statue to face “southwest”. It should say that Mr. Taft always wanted the statue to face “southeast”.

Mr. Cahill understood Section 10, Page 15 to mean that both the statue and the land it sits on were being nominated, so that it would provide some protection that the statue would stay put. Ms. Kerestes stated that Section 10, Page 15 was just a boundary description. It identified where the statue was in relation to the rest of Carle Park. The nomination was just for the statue.

Mr. Shepard inquired if it would be more difficult to move with it being on the National Register? Mr. Zangerl believed that the location of the statue was part of its historical context, and to move the statue would probably compromise the nomination. Ms. Kerestes corrected her previous statement by saying that the property around the statue was part of the nomination.

Ms. Tyler felt that there was a perceptual value in a National Register designation. Even if it was not a prohibition against demolition or removal, it certainly signifies symbolism.

Mr. Zangerl questioned if Ms. Kerestes anticipated making a nomination for local listing? Ms. Kerestes replied that would be something for them to talk about. It would certainly provide a lot more protection.

Mr. Cahill asked if the Urbana Park District technically owned the statue? Ms. Kerestes replied yes. Mr. Cahill inquired if the Urbana Park District would have to support this process? Ms. Kerestes answered by saying that public bodies cannot object. However, the Urbana Park District was contacted, and they do support the nomination.

Mr. Rose felt that the boundaries of the property needed to be spelled out more distinctly in Section 7, Page 1. Ms. Kerestes responded by saying that the rectangular tract referred to just the rectangular section that also includes the sign and walkway into the park. The triangular tract would just be where the sidewalk breaks it up. She commented that it could be clarified more. Mr. Rose believed that the nomination should include the site and some definition of the site.

Ms. Novak stated that for National Register purposes, the legal description was in the geographical data in Section 10. If there were ever any dispute, then the information in Section 10 would be the information that would be relied upon.

Mr. Rose moved that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend to the Department of Interior that they list the Lincoln Statue and the pertinent property, on which it is sited, on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Shepard seconded the motion.

Ms. Novak pointed out that this recommendation would go to the Illinois Historic Sites Advisory Council (IHSAC). Mr. Rose amended his motion to that affect. Mr. Shepard accepted that amendment. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Rose	-	Yes	Mr. Shepard	-	Yes
Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes	Mr. Cahill	-	Yes
Ms. Novak	-	Abstain			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Merritt resumed the Chair position. She thanked Ms. Kerestes for her hard work in documenting this nomination. Also, she wanted to clarify what it would mean to be on the National Register if there were an attempt to move the statue again. If there were a desire to keep the statue on the National Register, then the owner would have to apply to the IHSAC for their approval of the moved site. That potential moved site would then have to be approved by IHSAC and by the Department of the Interior. If the statue were moved without that permission, then it would be automatically deleted from the National Register, and there would have to be another submission of an application for a National Register nomination.

### **National Register Nomination for the Kappa Kappa Gamma Sorority House, located at 1102 South Lincoln Avenue**

Karen Kummer, petitioner for this nomination, came before the Historic Preservation Commission to answer any questions that the commissioners may have.

Mr. Zangerl wondered why the Kappa Kappa Gamma Sorority House was referred to as a fraternity in some places of the application? Ms. Kummer replied that technically and legally it was a fraternity. It was started as a fraternity, but in some areas it became a sorority, so they are interchangeable now.

Mr. Rose inquired if there were other fraternity buildings in the same neighborhood listed or under consideration for being listed? Ms. Kummer answered by saying that there were some fraternities down on Ohio Street that was listed. In addition, the next-door sorority, Alpha Gamma, was also considering being listed. Altogether there were about 13 sororities and fraternities listed on the National Register as part of a multiple resource documentation of all the fraternities and sororities at the University of Illinois. She mentioned that this had been an on-going project since about 1995.

Mr. Rose asked if this nomination had the support of the local and national level of this sorority? Ms. Kummer stated that the local sorority was in favor of it and had been very supportive. The national level knows of the process, because she contacted their Archives for information, but they have not given their opinion one way or the other. She added that this nomination was part of a project for the preservation of Greek Housing, which was a national organization headquartered in Champaign-Urbana. The idea was to preserve Greek chapter houses on college campuses throughout the nation. One of their missions was to list nominations on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Novak asked if there was any interest in becoming a local landmark? Ms. Kummer thought that the sorority might be amendable to it, if they were approached. They do not have that much information about it at this time. The sorority was very proud of their house.

Ms. Novak clarified that this nomination could not go through, since it was privately owned, unless it did have the approval of the owner(s). Non-federal public entities have no right to formal objection. Official listing does hinge on the type of ownership. Only federal agencies may nominate federal properties.

Mr. Shepard commented that it was interesting to look at the sorority and the statue on the corner. Ms. Kummer added that it was very well designed and very well cared for.

Mr. Zangerl moved that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend to the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency that the Kappa Kappa Gamma Sorority House be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cahill seconded the motion. The roll call was as follows:

Mr. Shepard	-	Yes	Mr. Zangerl	-	Yes
Mr. Cahill	-	Yes	Ms. Novak	-	Yes
Mr. Rose	-	Yes			

The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

**M.O.R. Zoning District Design Guidelines Discussion**

Michaela Bell, Planner, gave the staff report for this discussion. She presented background information about the history of the Mixed-Office Residential (MOR) Zoning District. She talked about the moratorium and noted that the Plan Commission would be meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2003 to discuss the MOR Zoning District and the Development Review Board and to form a recommendation for the City Council.

Ms. Novak inquired what the status was for the text amendment changes? Ms. Tyler replied that Mr. Kowalski and she were still in the process of drafting the changes. However, she could give the Historic Preservation Commission some more background and tell them what those text amendments were likely to include. She did this by reviewing the "Overview of the M.O.R. Zoning District" handout that was in the packet material that the commissioners received prior to the meeting.

Basically the changes that staff was looking at included the following:

1. Revisions to the Process of the Development Review Board –
  - A. Composition of the Development Review Board
  - B. Improved representation on the Development Review Board

Ms. Tyler mentioned that there was about 90 some properties zoned MOR. Only about 11 of those 90 properties are owner-occupied. Therefore, most of them are investment properties. The petition was signed by about 200 people who live nearby, and most of the people live just south of the MOR Zoning District. This told staff that we are really talking about impacts of the MOR Zone upon an adjacent neighborhood. On the other hand, the City needs to balance this with the property rights of the people who own property in the MOR Zoning District. This was why there was a historical context, which relates back to the Downtown to Campus Plan that was adopted in 1991. There was a number of rezonings resulting from the Downtown to Campus Plan, and the MOR Zoning District was one of them.

2. Unanimity
3. Intent of the MOR Zoning District

Ms. Tyler commented that through the years the preservation of the older homes has been not active as the original vision might have been. The original vision was of Green Street retaining its older structures and having boutiques and offices. Although there have been a few, the reality was that there have been more proposals for demolition of the older homes for redevelopment with multi-family apartments.

4. Development Regulations
5. Review Criteria

Ms. Tyler went on to discuss the recent proposals in the MOR Zoning District. She mentioned that Mr. Rose had given some input at one of the Development Review Board meetings, and it was the kind of thing that was really helpful to staff.

Mr. Rose commented that he would have liked to be more involved in the process; however, he was unable to. He remembered having presented three of the elements that can be seen on Green Street, which were: 1) asymmetry, 2) porches and 3) half stories.

He wanted to discuss how they might get design review for compatibility up and running. One extreme would be to ensure that there were designers on the Development Review Board. Another extreme would be to capture these three elements in a zoning requirement. However, he favored something more in the middle, which would be a design guide to the community that would identify the prominent characteristics of the neighborhood and would identify them by priority. This could be useful when a developer fills out an application and wants to comply with the requirements, but is not sure of how to comply.

Ms. Tyler noted that staff has an architecture student, who was working with a group called CIVITAS, which is a design center that was being funded by the University of Illinois. One of their first projects will be to do a pattern book for the MOR Zoning District. Clearly, it will follow the moratorium, because it will take some work.

Mr. Zangerl stated that when looking at the pictures of the buildings in the MOR Zoning District, he began to come up with some things that are easy to tact as “out of character”. Following are a few of the things he noticed:

1. No windows facing the street – He suggested that there be a minimum and a maximum percentage of the face along the street being in windows. From looking at the pictures, it appeared that those percentages should be somewhere between 25% and 60%.
2. Most windows in older buildings are taller than wide – He noticed that usually the windows in older homes are twice as tall as they are wide. There could be a category that windows in a new structure should be 1.8 to 2.5 times tall as wide.
3. Asymmetry was very common, but not universal. It seems that it occurs when the gable comes towards the street and are highly pitched.
4. No porches on second floor or higher – He believed that putting balconies on buildings created big problems. He noticed that one apartment building in the MOR Zoning District that had totally enclosed balconies that seemed to blend rather nicely. He thought it was because those balconies were continuous from top to bottom and because they were enclosed.
5. Multiple gables look really nice.
6. Foundation line seemed to blend better.
7. Bay windows could be used to make a new building fit into the character of the neighborhood.
8. Entryways to each apartment should be on the inside of the building and not from the outside of the building. Single entryways are a feature of all the older housing.
9. If no gable faces the street, then often times, the older buildings will have dormers. Although these may not be functional in the design, they certainly would help make a new building look better.

Ms. Novak mentioned that Ms. Cardman had a conflict and was unable to attend this meeting. However, she provided comments that she would like Ms. Novak to read. Those comments were as follows:

1. Reducing permissible density
2. Essential design criteria should include:
  - A.* Height of Structure should be a reasonable height of existing adjacent structures.
  - B.* Maximum 2-1/2 stories.
  - C.* Designs should include a 1/2-story attic.
  - D.* Proposed setback should be at most an average of the setbacks of the adjacent properties.
  - E.* The relationship of the height to width of the front façade should be consistent with the pattern established by the character of the MOR Zoning District.
  - F.* There should be a front door on the street facade.
  - G.* The lesser façade orientation should be towards the street.
  - H.* The relationship of the height to width of windows, door and other openings should be consistent to the pattern established by the character of the MOR District.
  - I.* Asymmetry should be incorporated into any design.
  - J.* Porches should be included for a multi-dimensional façade.
  - K.* Parking should be underground.
  - L.* Encourage proper maintenance of historic structures.

3. The Historic Preservation Commission review designs of proposed structures adjacent to historic landmarks and/or districts.
4. Eliminate the profit motive in allowing historic properties to deteriorate beyond the ability to rehabilitate them.

Mr. Cahill noted that he lives adjacent to the MOR Zoning District, and he has attended every Development Review Board meeting. He agreed that the current situation was very frustrating for both the developers and the people making comments on the process. He found that when the Development Review Board went through the exercise of reviewing the 13 Design Review Criteria, it all seemed very redundant and very frustratingly long.

He felt that changing the makeup of the Development Review Board was a great idea. He believed that the affected property owner should be someone who lives on High Street or Illinois Street. Also, he thought that a developer, like Kevin Hunsinger, should be on the board as well. Thus, it would be a broader based board.

Mr. Cahill walks up and down Green Street every day. Part of the change of Green Street should include stopping the removal of the trees. Pretty soon Green Street will not be green anymore. He thought it would be nice to encourage some treatment of including trees into new development plans.

He was surprised that Buena Vista Court, which is a National Landmark, was not part of the MOR Zoning District. He did not like the idea of not having contiguous zoning. He noted that the Brighton-Ross House and the little house at 501 West Green Street could become local historical landmarks. Elm Street was a little tougher to pick out homes that could become landmarks, because the street was narrower and many of the properties have become group rentals. Some of them are in very sad condition, which would lead to demolition by neglect unless the issue of demolition gets turned around.

He did not know how the City could change the text so that a parking lot could be permitted without any comments. He was upset when two houses were torn down in the 500 Block of Green Street by the Presbyterian Church to build a parking lot that only gets used one day a week. Also, he was upset when the funeral home on Cedar and Green Streets was torn down to build a parking lot. There was no review process for either of these demolitions and constructed parking lots.

Mr. Cahill noted that the architects for 605 and 611 West Green Street were trying to do their best. He mentioned that he was looking forward to seeing staff's recommendation regarding the text amendment changes to the MOR Zoning District.

Mr. Rose believed that development plans should be in a format for presentation to the Development Review Board, that includes adjacent properties both in plan in section and in elevation. He thought that maybe City staff could assist with this. Could there be something that could be made available for the district that includes the footprints of buildings on lots so that adjacent properties could be seen and every view of the property was not seen surrounded by white paper, but instead seen as an insertion into an existing neighborhood? Ms. Tyler noted that in the last three development cases that came before the Development Review Board, two of the architects



did perspectives on the adjacent properties and the other architect did elevations of the adjacent properties. It really did help in the review process. Mr. Rose added that good judgment could only be made if the adjacent properties are shown.

Mr. Shepard noted that 712 West Green Street was a perfect model for new development. It has porches, gables, and the building is not too tall or massive. Some of the most recent cases for new development in the MOR Zoning District appeared to him to be too massive and do not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Two or three stories should be a maximum in height on any building. It should have gables facing the street and having green space, not just in the front, but on the sides as well.

Ms. Novak thought there would be less trouble in the MOR Zoning District if the City developed a way to key demolition permits to approve building permit before demolition was granted. Premature demolition could be part of the problem, if the City does not link the two together.

She appreciated Ms. Tyler's comments about the problems of getting unanimous approval of the Development Review Board; however, she was haunted by how the Ricker House was saved by one person having the courage to vote "no" on one of the votes. Thus, she suggested requiring a super majority rather than a simple majority vote.

Regarding design review, Ms. Novak felt it would be important to say no balconies if possible. The balconies that have been added to Green Street have been dreadful. The City should also pay close to the types of doors that are used. There should be no front patio doors or street facing patio doors whether facing Green Street or a side street. If there are conflicts between code requirements and a residential-looking door, then the City needs to at least look at doors that are residential in character.

Windows are a huge issue, and there needs to be some way of reflecting the existing fenestration pattern. It was not just single windows that are seen on historic buildings, but window type becomes important as well. Large fixed sash encasement windows do not really reflect the character that can be seen in older historic homes. The longer and narrower windows in proportion are better, even when they are banded together in groups.

Ms. Novak agreed that gables are pretty common to see, but moreover, the roof pitch makes a difference, especially on the house at 305 West Green Street. The gables and the roof pitch need to be tightly linked.

She agreed that asymmetry was the key. There are very few symmetrically balanced buildings. There was usually some variation of the façade plane. Staff needs to get this across in the design guidelines, whether it was a projecting entry, a porch or a bay window of some kind. She also agreed that dormers could also work if there was a side-facing gable.

Regarding setbacks, the City should be super careful in granting serious variations. She agreed with Ms. Cardman that maybe it should be an average of the immediate adjacent properties instead of district wide.

Ms. Novak felt that the City could possibly get into some materials issues and not allow too much usage of synthetic materials. She expressed her happiness about the MOR Zoning District being dealt with, because it has been very frustrating looking at development plans and not know what the volume of the space would look like.

Ms. Tyler noted that currently the parking requirements require completely submerged parking if there was not any surface parking available. The practicality, because of the density limits of the FAR, does not pay to submerge the parking. However, partially submerged parking with screening could work financially. She inquired how the Historic Preservation Commission felt about this idea? Mr. Cahill saw below grade parking as a safety hazard. Also, he felt it would be ugly, unless screened properly, to see vehicles disappear or appear from under a building.

Mr. Shepard asked why the foundation could not go all the way down, so that people could not see the cars in the underground parking lot from the street? Ms. Tyler stated that when a parking lot is completely submerged, it adds tremendously to the construction cost and the utilities. She felt that a partially submerged parking facility might work underneath part of a building from the rear. This way, people would not necessarily see it from the street.

Mr. Zangerl inquired if the all of the blocks in the MOR Zoning District had alleys? Mr. Shepard replied no.

Mr. Rose was skeptical of good designs, but he was open to this idea. He agreed with Ms. Novak about demolition of the existing buildings being the big problem in this district. He felt the City needed a firmer grip on which properties were permitted to be demolished.

Mr. Zangerl did not think that the City could deal with demolition as a separate issue. He felt that it should be wrapped up with the Design Review. Staff would need to tell a developer that if he or she wants to develop a property and begin by tearing down an existing building, then the City would need to see what the developer plans to build in its place. It might very well be that if a developer comes in and sees that he has to incorporate a significant number of these design features, the cost of building might go up, then the developer might decide to adaptively reuse the existing building. Ms. Novak remarked that was what she meant. A person should not be able to come in and ask for a demolition permit without linking the building permit process to it by having plans for replacing the development available. If there was some way to address the issue of deferred maintenance or complete lack of maintenance, because there were people coming in saying that it was an old building and falling apart. It was a conscientious act of neglect, and not because it was an old building. Unless the City figures out some way to address this issue, then we are going to still have problems.

Ms. Novak expressed some concern about encouraging more commercial development in the MOR Zoning District. Ms. Tyler agreed that the City does not want to limit that opportunity. Even though few have picked up on the commercial opportunities, it was still something that the City wanted to retain. It was a link between campus and Downtown Urbana. The reality was that the MOR Zoning District remains primarily a residential area.

Ms. Tyler commented that the demolition need in the MOR Zoning District was so radically different than in any other part of town. It would definitely need legal review. Demolitions are sometimes court mandated because of safety. Sometimes a building looks just fine on the outside, but it is not on the inside. To fix it would cost more than what it was worth. Sometimes people purchase properties without really knowing what they are getting into. Therefore, they are not necessarily the ones who have done the neglect. Mr. Zangerl mentioned that staff could write in exceptions for court-mandated demolitions. Ms. Novak added that this was unique for the MOR Zoning District; therefore, it would be appropriate to support the idea that the City needed to take additional measures to strengthen the corridor that was so special to the community. According to the Downtown to Campus Plan, Ms. Tyler stated that any kind of restrictions on demolitions that do not exist anywhere else might be seen as a further taking of a property owner's right. She did feel that demolitions were a big part of the problem in the MOR Zoning District. The only places where demolitions do not take place are in the City's historic districts. So then, if older homes are valuable enough to protect from being demolished, then they belong in historic districts. Ms. Novak felt this issue was very worthy of discussion and consideration. Vacant lots give an impression and appearance as well.

Mr. Zangerl said that it seemed to him that from a legal standpoint, the design review could be the taking of property, because the decision of whether or not a building gets built depends upon the approval of the Development Review Board. Ms. Novak remarked that by design review, the City was not saying that a developer could not build anything. The City would only be saying that a developer could not build a proposed structure that did not meet the requirements. Mr. Zangerl commented that he was trying to argue in favor of linking the demolition with the design, because the City would not really be deciding on the demolition. They would be deciding on whether or not the proposal gets through design review. Mr. Cahill mentioned three examples of buildings that have been or are to be demolished and apartment buildings to be raised in their place. One out of the three was still standing, because the property owner wanted to make sure that the proposed apartment building was going to be approved first. Thus, he was still paying taxes on the existing structure. Whereas, the other two property owners did not want to pay those taxes, they demolished the existing structures first, and then they applied to the Development Review Board for approval of their proposed developments.

Mr. Cahill noted that people living on the south side of Green Street could get a parking permit to park on the street. However, people living on the north side of Green Street could not. Ms. Tyler mentioned that the way to handle this was to take the south side of Green Street out of the permit area, because the City does not want to prejudice one street versus another.

Mr. Cahill stated that he was concerned about people hunting for parking spaces. Ms. Novak inquired if people were parking in the church parking lot? Mr. Cahill replied yes. The church was not supposed to allow that, but they do not patrol it either. He mentioned that this was an out for some of the apartment buildings being built, because they have to provide or find parking within so many feet from the proposed property. Next thing you see will be one of the little homes being torn down and become a parking lot for something much bigger next door to it. There was nothing worse affecting the character of Green Street than the parking lots.

Ms. Tyler gave a hypothetical Development Review Board case regarding the possible review of a demolition of a house that had several code violations. The Historic Preservation Commission then gave possible solutions to handle the case.

Mr. Zangerl asked if many property owners demolished existing structures so that they could sell empty lots? Ms. Tyler replied no. She believed that Weaver was the only one. Ms. Novak mentioned that there was a historic house across the street and a historic gas station on the corner.

Mr. Cahill thought that by going before the Development Review Board, maybe some of the smaller developers might think that the process was more trouble than it was worth and decide to rehabilitate their existing structure or sell it as single-family housing. He suggested also making the demolition permit process time longer allowing more time for a developer to think about it before demolishing an existing structure.

He mentioned that vacated properties become places for homeless people to live in. Ms. Tyler agreed and added that in a lot of ways a vacant property could be more of a nuisance.

Ms. Novak reminded everyone that the public hearing regarding this case would be held before the Plan Commission on October 9, 2003 at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Tyler added that staff would be notifying every property owner in the MOR Zoning District.

Mr. Shepard questioned whether the Mayor would appoint the citizen and architect that would serve on the Development Review Board? Ms. Tyler answered that staff recommendation would be that all members serving on the Development Review Board would be mayoral appointments, just like all the other boards and commissions and would be approved by the City Council.

## **10. MONITORING OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES**

There were none.

## **11. STAFF REPORT**

### **FY 2004 Historic Preservation Fund Grant Program**

Michaela Bell, Planner, announced that she received in the mail the 2004 Historic Preservation Fund Grant Program. If the Historic Preservation Commission decided that they wanted to hold another educational project, then they would need to have the application form submitted by the end of October 2003.

Ms. Novak questioned what other types of projects were they funding? Ms. Bell answered by saying that the projects were as follows: 1) public education, 2) survey, 3) National Register, 4) planning and 5) development.

Mr. Cahill asked how many brochures were left and whether they needed to be updated? Ms. Bell replied that the brochure needed to be updated.

Ms. Novak wanted to move beyond the public education and think about possible National Register Historic Districts. Although this was not considered a top priority, the Historic Preservation Fund Grant Program would still fund the project.

Ms. Tyler remarked that there were only two planners, so the Planning Division was at 2/3 staffing, which delays things a bit in terms of getting their work plan accomplishments done. Ms. Novak stated that they could rely on student projects substantially in both communities to get National Register and Local Listings. She felt that the Historic Preservation Commission needed to get serious about the National Register as a step of recognition and definition of what we appreciate in our community. The only way to get some larger scale historic districts done was to do it through a grant.

Ms. Tyler inquired if the same information went into the National Register as that in a local landmark? Ms. Novak responded that the National Register was much more detailed than what the City of Urbana requires for local landmarking. Therefore, it would be an easy step to take going from the National Register to local landmarking. However, it would require more research and documentation to go from local landmarking to the National Register.

Ms. Tyler asked which was the higher priority: to get our National Register listings as local landmarks or vice versa? Ms. Novak felt it made sense those things that were good enough to be on the National Register to become local landmarks. She did not know if there was something the Historic Preservation Commission could do, such as send out letters suggesting this to the property owners.

Ms. Novak believed that surveys and the National Register were other steps that the Historic Preservation Commission should consider to progress with what they had been doing. They have already done a lot with public education so far. Ms. Tyler agreed. The first year there was a flurry of activity, and it was very productive. Then, they fine-tuned the ordinances, held some public education workshops that were really positive, had a district designation that was difficult, and in recent months, there had been the advisory participation regarding the MOR Zoning District. It seemed that the Historic Preservation Commission needed to get back to the primary function of the commission, which should be designation of landmarks and districts.

Ms. Tyler continued by saying that the Historic Preservation Commission should set some annual goals with designation as one of them. Steady progression is the way to go. There should be some goals of so many designations per year. One of the obstacles was that there were some restrictions on who could submit a designation. However, she noted that the University of Illinois was a great resource.

## **12. STUDY SESSION**

There was none.

**13. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ms. Tyler announced that the Mayor at the next Committee of the Whole would propose Scott Dossett as a new member on the Historic Preservation Commission.

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Zangerl moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m. Mr. Rose seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

Submitted,

---

Rob Kowalski, Secretary