

CITY OF BATAVIA

100 N. Island Ave., Batavia, IL 60510
(630) 454-2000 www.cityofbatavia.net

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

July 25, 2016

5:30 PM

City Hall – City Council Chambers – 1st Floor

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Items Removed/Added/Changed
4. Matters From The Public (For Items Not On The Agenda)
5. COA Review Continuation: 111, 133 East Wilson Street And 20 North River Street Demolition (City of Batavia, Applicant)

Documents:

[COA PACKET FOR 7-25-16 MEETING--133 E WILSON.PDF](#)

6. Updates
 1. 7 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
 2. Anderson Block Building—Masonry Maintenance
 3. Significant Historic Building Inspection Program
 4. 10/12 North River Street—Historic Inspection
 5. 227 West Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
 6. 109 South Batavia Avenue—Historic Inspection
 7. 8 North River Street—Historic Inspection
 8. 16 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment

Historic Preservation Commission

Phil Bus, Chair

Kurt Hagemann, Vice Chair

Doris Sherer

Doug Sullivan

Belinda Roller



City of Batavia
 Community Development Department
 100 North Island Avenue
 Batavia IL 60510
 Phone (630) 454-2700
 Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property Address 111 & 133 E. Wilson St., 20 N. River St.

Property Identification Number 12-22-276-009, -022 and -023

Existing/Proposed Zoning Ordinances DMU Yes ___ No ___

Submittal Date 7 / 6 / 2016

Resubmitted 7/12/2016

Project Description :

Demolition for safety and structural reasons. Demolition to make way for mixed-use development, including a 300-space public parking deck, ground floor commercial space and apartment dwellings. Demolition will include the former Baptist Church and attached school building (133 E. Wilson), the old Servicemaster building (111 E. Wilson Street) and the City parking garage (20 N. River Street).

Owner's Name City of Batavia

Phone Number 630-454-2060

Mobile Number _____

E-Mail bmcgrath@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant's Name City of Batavia

Applicant Address 100 N Island Ave.

Phone Number 630-454-2060

Mobile Number _____

E-Mail bmcgrath@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature *[Signature]*

Owner Signature *[Signature]*
 CITY OF BATAVIA

TYPE OF WORK
 (Check All That Apply)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Alteration/Repair | <input type="checkbox"/> New Construction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demolition |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Primary Structure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Whole Primary Structure |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Addition | <input type="checkbox"/> Part Primary Structure |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Garage/Outbuilding | <input type="checkbox"/> Garage/outbuilding |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Relocation of Building |

Additional Information to be Submitted with Application – Digital Format If Available

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Alteration/Repair | <input type="checkbox"/> Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation) | <input type="checkbox"/> Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Awning or Canopy | <input type="checkbox"/> Retaining Walls |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deck | <input type="checkbox"/> Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Door | <input type="checkbox"/> Satellite Dish |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fence | <input type="checkbox"/> Security Doors or Windows |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gutters | <input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Light Fixture | <input type="checkbox"/> Shutters |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical System Units | <input type="checkbox"/> Siding |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting | <input type="checkbox"/> Signs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Material Change (wood, brick, etc) | <input type="checkbox"/> Solar Collectors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Painting (paint removal etc) | <input type="checkbox"/> Storm Doors or Windows |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping) | <input type="checkbox"/> Windows, Skylights |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs of building(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Others _____ |

Attach a detailed description of all work to be done for each item. Include the following materials where appropriate and check appropriate box if included

- A. Drawings, photographs, specifications, manufacturer's illustrations or other description of proposed changes to the building's exterior, to-scale drawings with dimensions will be required for major changes in design (e.g., roofs, facades, porches, and other prominent architectural features)
- B. If application is for any feature not on the primary structure, include a site plan. A site plan will not be required if there is no change to the existing structure or any proposed new structure.
- C. If changes to building materials are proposed, include samples.

New Construction/Additions

Include the following materials where appropriate and check appropriate box if included.

- For primary structure, outbuilding or addition:
 - 1. Fully dimensioned site plan
 - 2. Elevation drawings of each façade with dimensions and specifications
 - 3. Drawings, photographs, samples and manufacturer's illustrations
- Drawings or other descriptions of site improvements, e.g., fences sidewalks, lighting, pavements, decks.

Structure Demolition

1. Photographic evidence supporting the reason for demolition
2. Describe the proposed reuse of the site, including drawings of any proposed new structure
3. If economic hardship is claimed, include evidence that hardship exists (Criteria set forth in Section 7-2 of Title 12)

Structure Relocation

1. Explain what will be moved, where and why.
2. If a structure will be moved into the district from outside, include photographs.
3. Include a site plan showing proposed location of the structure on the new parcel. Describe any site features that may be altered or disturbed (e.g., foundations, walls)

THIS FORM IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY BELOW

Property is:

Significant

Contributing

Non-Contributing

Signature of Historic Preservation Commission Chair

Date of Commission Review

City Council Action: Date _____ Vote Record _____ Not Applicable _____

Conditions: YES*/ NO

*See Attachment

The Batavia Historic Preservation Commission, or its authorized agent, has reviewed the proposed work and has determined that it is in accordance with the applicable criteria set forth in Section 6-2 of Title 12 of the Code of the City of Batavia. Accordingly, this Certificate of Appropriateness is issued.

Any change in the proposed work after issuance of this Certificate of Appropriateness shall require inspection by Commission staff to determine whether the work is still in substantial compliance with the Certificate of Appropriateness.

This certificate is not a permit, does not authorize work to begin, does not ensure building code compliance, and does not imply that any zoning review has taken place.



CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 12, 2016

TO: Historic Preservation Commission

FROM: Scott Buening, Community Development Director
Jeffrey Albertson, Building Commissioner
Chris Aiston, Economic Development Consultant

SUBJECT: Certificate of Appropriateness, 111 & 133 E. Wilson Street, 20 N. River Street

As requested by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), we are providing the following justifications for the demolition of the above noted buildings. These justifications follow the criteria listed in Title 12, Chapter 6 of the Batavia Municipal Code (Historic Preservation). The demolition of these buildings is appropriate because the request meets the following standards:

Section 12-6-3-D-1 (Significant Structure Properties):

- a. *Retention of the structure constitutes a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including the sale of the structure on its present site to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.*

The church structure condition has deteriorated such that it is no longer usable for groups to use for assembly purposes nor is it safe to use for general storage. To make the entire building just usable (not renovated for productive use), the City (as owner) would need to spend over \$3,100,000, over \$1,700,000 for just the 1889 church (not including demolition costs for the newer church structure). This also does not include renovation costs to make the building usable for other productive uses. The City has advertised the property for sale, but other than the current entity, we have received no interest in redeveloping the property. The City feels that the renovation costs are prohibitive for this structure, and removal of the church structure will mitigate a hazardous situation.

- b. *Preservation of the structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program, which will be of substantial benefit to the community.*

The removal of the structures is necessary to facilitate redevelopment of this block. The proposed improvements include a 304 space public parking lot, which will also be used by

the apartment building tenants. Prohibiting the removal of the buildings will prevent the additional parking spaces from being developed.

- c. *Preservation of the structure would cause an undue and unreasonable financial hardship to the owner, taking into account the financial resources available to the owner including the sale of the structure to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.*

The church building was acquired with deficient issues knowing that the intent was to probably demolish the structure to make way for a roadway improvement. When this did not occur, the City was left with the building and to examine ways to reuse the building or property. As stated in the structural report which was provided to the HPC, a substantial amount of money will need to be expended just to make the building safe for occupancy, more so to make it usable for specific users. This is a large sum of public money for a building that also needs adaptive features (ramps, elevators) to meet current day code requirements. Also as stated previously, the City has attempted to sell the property by a public request for proposals, and we had no interest in the property other than the current entity.

- d. *Preservation of the structure would not be in the interest of the majority of the community.*

If the church building is to be preserved, substantial sums of money will need to be spent to make the building usable. These funds will be public funds that will otherwise not be able to be used for redevelopment or infrastructure projects. This is especially the case since the property in question generates zero (\$0.00) tax dollars since it is tax exempt municipal property. This diversion of funds would not be in the best interests of the City as a whole.

Section 12-6-3-D-2 (Secondary Factors):

- a. *The effect of the demolition on the surrounding buildings.*

The demolition would have no effect on nearby buildings.

- b. *The effect of the demolition on the historic district as a whole.*

While the demolition of the church would reduce the inventory of significant historic buildings in the downtown area, there are many buildings that remain that are in much better condition than the case at hand. In addition, when the road realignment was proposed, it was a likely scenario that the entire building would need to be removed to accommodate the realignment. Thus the removal of this one building will have a negligible effect on the historic district as a whole.

- c. *The value or usefulness of any replacement structure to the community, and the appropriateness of its design to the historic district.*

The replacement structure would add public parking spaces, over 170 apartment units and over 14,000 square feet of commercial space to the downtown area. While the design of the façade has not yet been finalized, the influx of residents, new and modern commercial

space and additional parking would have a significant value to the downtown and the historic district.

- d. *If the lot is to be left open, how the space will be treated and the impact on the district as a whole.*

The lot will be left open only temporarily until construction can begin on the new development. This area may be used for temporary parking until that time. The effect on the district during this short period of time would be negligible.

- e. *The effect of the demolition on the local economy.*

The demolition will have no effect on the local economy. The building is not safe for use, and is in the process of being fully vacated. The actual uses of the building were for storage, and this created minimal activity on the site. The new building to be constructed, however, will have a positive effect on the local economy by generating shoppers and shopping space in the downtown area.

- f. *Whether the demolition will foster civic beauty.*

The demolition will partially foster civic beauty by removing the old Servicemaster building (111 E. Wilson) which is an old block building without any redeeming architectural features or qualities. The church building itself has suffered from a lack of maintenance over the years and is beginning to show its age. Without the structure removal, this situation would continue and demolition would be inevitable.

- g. *The effect of the demolition on safeguarding the heritage of the city, state or nation.*

This factor is not applicable to this petition.

- h. *The effect of the demolition on promotion of the district for the education, pleasure and welfare of the citizens of the city.*

While the demolition itself would not promote these factors, the replacement building would certainly do so. The new commercial spaces would provide places to shop, and the parking would facilitate residents not living downtown to patronizing downtown businesses.

We intend to work with the potential property developer to properly memorialize the structure in some manner which has yet to be determined. There has been discussion of saving the bell tower portion of the building in part or in whole. It is possible that some sort of preservation or salvaging of a portion of this section of the building may be feasible based on preliminary discussions. This will need to be studied further to determine that actual extent to which that can happen.

City staff feels that the criteria for approving a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the subject buildings has been met, and therefore respectfully requests the HPC to approve of the

request, subject to working with the developer of the property to save or salvage all or a portion of the bell tower part of the building.

Cc: Mayor & City Council
Bill McGrath
Laura Newman
Gary Holm
Kevin Drendel
File