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

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
January 23, 2017
5:30 PM
City Hall – City Council Chambers – 1st Floor

1. Call To Order

2. Roll Call

3. Items Removed/Added/Changed

4. Approval Of Minutes
   January 9, 2017

   Documents:

   HPC 1-09-17 FINAL MINUTES.PDF

5. Matters From The Public (For Items Not On The Agenda)

6. COA Review: 336 Houston Street
   Soffit and Fascia Replacement (Window Works, applicant)

   Documents:

   COA PACKET--336 HOUSTON ST--SOFFIT--FASCIA REPLACEMENT.PDF

7. COA Review: 113 East Wilson Street
   Structure Demolition (City of Batavia, applicant)

   Documents:

   DEMO COA APPLICATION--113-121 EAST WILSON ST.PDF

8. COA Review: 121 East Wilson Street
   Structure Demolition (City of Batavia, applicant)

   Documents:

   DEMO COA APPLICATION--113-121 EAST WILSON ST.PDF

9. COA Review: 111-117 North River Street
   Structure Demolition (City of Batavia, applicant)

   Documents:

   DEMO COA APPLICATION--111-117-124 NORTH RIVER ST.PDF

10. COA Review: 124 North River Street
    Structure Demolition (City of Batavia, applicant)

Documents:

DEMO COA APPLICATION--111-117-124 NORTH RIVER ST.PDF

11. Updates

- 7 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
- Anderson Block Building—Masonry Maintenance
- Significant Historic Building Inspection Program
- 10/12 North River Street—Historic Inspection
- 227 West Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
- 109 South Batavia Avenue—Historic Inspection
- 8 North River Street—Historic Inspection
- 16 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
- Certified Local Government

12. Other Business

13. Adjournment

Historic Preservation Commission
Kurt Hagemann, Chair
Belinda Roller, Vice Chair
Phil Bus
Kyle Hohmann
Doris Sherer
Doug Sullivan

MINUTES
January 9, 2017
Historic Preservation Commission
City of Batavia

Please **NOTE:** These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Committee/City Council, and to include some description of discussion points as understood by the minute-taker. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

1. Meeting Called to Order

Chair Hagemann called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: **Chair Hagemann; Vice-Chair Roller; Commissioners Bus, Sherer, Hohmann, and Sullivan (entered at 5:52 pm)**

Members Absent:

Also Present: **Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; and Cheryl Collier, Recording Secretary**

3. Items to be Removed, Added or Changed

There were no items to be removed, added or changed.

4. Approve Minutes for December 12, 2016

Motion: To approve the minutes for December 12, 2016
Maker: Bus
Second: Sherer
Voice Vote: 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent
Motion carried.

5. Matters From the Public (for items not on the agenda)

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Chair Hagemann asked if there were matters from the public for items not on the agenda.

Elizabeth Safanda, who resides at 1013 Dunstan Road, Geneva, spoke on behalf of the Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley. She is the Executive Director of this organization. She currently lives in Geneva, but lived in Batavia from 1979-1993.

Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley was started in 1974 and is a preservation advocate group that provides resources to groups, individuals, and council members. They are trying to help shape how development and growth can work with preservation of historic structures. Their headquarters are in the William Beith House in St. Charles, and they also operate the Durant House in St Charles, the Fabyan Villa in Geneva, and the Japanese Gardens in Geneva.

Ms. Safanda distributed an information card about their organization and an invitation card for an event they are holding on February 25 in Batavia. The event called Our Past and Future Cities will be held on February 25, 2017 from 9:00 am – 11:30 am. It will be a lecture by Massachusetts Architect Ben Willis about where historic preservation and future development can work together; with a panel discussion to follow. She believes the fee will be $10.00 per person and registration is required. They are hoping to have the general public, and staff members and commission members from the Tri-Cities attend.

Commissioner Bus asked if the City would pick up the registration fee for the Commission members. Jeff Albertson will check into this and get back to the Commission.

Jeff Albertson questioned whether this event would be a violation of the Open Meetings Act if the Commissioners attended. Ms. Safanda explained that there was also a concern in Geneva about the Open Meetings Act, but this event is set up so that it will not be in violation. The questions and answer portion will be the attendees asking questions of a panel of individuals and not discussing the issues with each other. The only way this would be a violation of the Act is if two or more commissioners from the same town started discussing City business with each other.

Ms. Safanda will send additional information about the event to Jeff Albertson to be distributed to the Commission.

6. **COA Review: 8 South Lincoln Street – Roof Replacement (Bethany Lutheran Church, applicant)**

Dennis Schuett of 1134 Wintergreen Court addressed the Commission representing Bethany Lutheran Church. He is requesting approval to replace a 60 year old roof on the church. Chair Hagemann asked if he had a sample of the roofing material that was going to be used. Mr. Schuett showed the Commission a sample and explained that they are the identical shingles that are currently on the structure, and that they were using the same contractor to install the roof. He pointed out how the green in the roofing matches the copper gutters, and how the yellow in the roofing compliments the limestone on the building. He assured the Commission that there were no other changes planned to the structure except for replacing a small section of the copper gutter that is damaged.

Chair Hagemann asked if the Commission had any questions. Bus asked if Mr. Schuett knew what the pitch of the roof was. Mr. Schuett did not, but indicated that he would get this information if the Commission needed it. Bus asked if there were any finials involved and Mr. Schuett answered that there were not.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented
Maker: Sullivan

Second: Bus

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Bus, Sherer, Hagemann, Roller, Sullivan, Hohmann
Nay: None
6-0 Vote, 0 Absent, Motion carried.

7. COA Review: 107 North Batavia Ave – Monument Sign (Express Signs & Lighting, applicant)

Eddie Hartsel of 3207 Wild Oak Court, Joliet, addressed the Commission on behalf of Express Signs & Lighting. The project is a monument sign to be put up at Salsa Verde. The sign is 32 sq ft, 6' in height and 10' in width and meets all City requirements. There is a 10 foot setback requirement in Batavia, but not for this area. Jeff Albertson confirmed that the setback is not required in this area. The sign will be using the existing sign post, so will be the exact set back as the previous business. Mr. Hartsel asked if the background of the sign could light up. Jeff Albertson replied that the background has to be opaque. Chair Hagemann asked how close the color represented on the handout was to the actual color of the sign. Mr. Hartsel responded that it is pretty close to the same color.

Bus asked if the building was a non-contributing building and Jeff Albertson responded that it is.

Chair Hagemann asked if there were any questions from the Commission, and there were none.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented
Maker: Bus

Second: Hohmann

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Bus, Sherer, Hagemann, Roller, Sullivan, Hohmann
Nay: None
6-0 Vote, 0 Absent, Motion carried.

8. COA Review: 15 E Wilson St – Awning Installation (Nuyen Awning Company, applicant)

Jeff Albertson is presenting this because the applicant is out of town. This is for an awning over the Wilson Street entrance, south entrance. The building is a significant structure.

Mr. Albertson had some photos of the awning design and some material samples that he showed to the Commissioners. The material is similar to the material used for the enclosure at the entrance. The logo on the awning is slightly larger than the ordinance allows, so it will need to be reduced. Chair Hagemann thought the awning size looked nice as it was. Sherer asked if Mr. Albertson knew what the thought was behind the ordinance ruling. Mr. Albertson did not know, but explained that the ordinance is part of the City signage code and that the owners would have to get a variance from the City Council if they wanted to keep the logo at the current size. Chair Hagemann asked if the awning met all other City codes and Mr. Albertson responded that except for the size of the logo, it meets all other codes.

Chair Hagemann asked if there were any other questions. Sullivan asked Mr. Albertson what made him willing to present this for the applicant when in the past he was not willing to do this. Mr. Albertson said that he is always willing to present for the applicant, but it has been the desire of the Commission in the past to have the applicant present.

Chair Hagemann asked if anyone had an objection to acting on the COA without the applicant present. No one had any objection.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented
Maker: Roller

Second: Sullivan

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Bus, Sherer, Hagemann, Roller, Sullivan, Hohmann
Nay: None
6-0 Vote, 0 Absent, Motion carried.

9. COA Review: 10 N Island Ave – Door and Rooftop Mechanical Equipment (Dino Alex, applicant)

Bill Alex addressed the Commission on behalf of Briana's Pancake House. They are requesting approval to install a roof top unit and a new door entryway.

Mr. Albertson explained that this project is at 10 N. Island Avenue, which is the end unit toward Wilson Street. The two items that require COA approval are a new entry on the Wilson Street side of the building and the installation of a mechanical platform on the roof.

Mr. Alex explained that the platform would be seen from Wilson Street. It would be constructed of a three section wall made of Hardie board paneling. This would screen the rooftop units from the street. Chair Hagemann asked if this would be on the existing structure, and Mr. Alex responded that this is correct. Mr. Alex did not bring samples with him.

Chair Hagemann asked if there was a plan that showed the change in elevation. The elevation is 4' 10". Roller asked if they were planning on using Hardie panels or Hardie sheets. Mr. Alex stated that they were using Hardie sheets.

Mr. Albertson was asked if this was a non-contributing building, and he responded that it was.

Roller asked if there was any equipment currently on the rooftop. Mr. Albertson answered that there was not.

Bus asked what color the paneling was. Mr. Alex responded that they had not determined a color but would try to match the color of the roof as closely as possible.

Bus asked if it was related to the Briana's Pancake House in Elburn. Mr. Alex responded that they have restaurants in Palatine and South Elgin, but he did not know if they were partners with Elburn.

Chair Hagemann stated that it will be a fairly sizable change to the look of the building.
He opened up for questions from the Commission.

Bus would like to include in any motion that the Commission has a preference for the brown color to match the roofing.

Chair Hageman asked that they talk about the second part of the COA, which is the door.
Mr. Alex explained that the doors used would be the same doors as are currently being used on the building, but there would be double doors facing Wilson Street instead of one door. Mr. Albertson explained that the Commission approved this type of door for all of the units in this building a couple of years ago. Chair Hagemann asked if the reason for putting the doors in this location is that there will some type of patio put in. Mr. Alex stated that that was possible in the future, but believes that this location provides better access than the current door location. He said there is no plan for a patio now, but possibly in the future.

Chair Hagemann asked if there were any questions. Roller asked if there would be a sidewalk going to the new doors. Mr. Albertson responded that they would have to add stoop pads. Roller asked if they will still be using the doors that are on the parking lot side. Mr. Alex answered that there are two doors, and the furthest door would not be used. Roller asked if they are planning on putting signage on the Wilson Street side of the building. Mr. Alex responded that they would, and Mr. Albertson stated that the signage would have to come before the Commission at that time.

Roller thought the Hardie panel would be less of a screen and more of a wall, and asked if there was a reason that they picked the solid sheets and not the panels. She is having a hard time picturing how this would look. Bus agreed that slats would create more architectural detail and would look much better. Mr. Alex said that they could do it this way instead of the sheets.

Roller asked if it would be unreasonable to ask for a rendering of what it would look like as more of a fence style instead of a solid panel style. Even though it is considered non-contributing, the location does create an importance that the building is updated in a way that still looks good.

Chair Hagemann asked when they are planning on doing this. Mr. Albertson stated that the permit has been in for a while, so as soon as possible.

Roller asked if they would come back to the next meeting with a color rendering of what it would look like. Chair Hagemann asked for a small sampling of what it is going to look it.

Chair Hagemann stated that they would continue this agenda item to the meeting on January 23.

Chair Hagemann asked the applicant if they had any other questions. The building owner, Dino Alex, addressed the Commission. He said the sooner that they start working there, the better downtown is going to look. He stated they have been trying to get a permit since August.

10. Historic Plaque Program

Roller told the Committee that information from Christen Sundquist reference the Elgin Historic Preservation Building Plaque Program was included in the packet. The program is directed more toward residential. Houses around town that have historic significance could get a plaque. The information includes the application form that the residents fill out and Roller state that

Elgin charges a $50 fee. The City of Elgin website has an interactive map that includes the historically significant houses. Roller thought this would be a good item to add to the City of Batavia website. She added that Elgin tries to do ten applications a year. She thought that this project could be grant funded by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency.

Chair Hagemann mentioned that the owners of historical houses in Batavia take a lot of pride in their homes. Roller mentioned that it could be part of a historic house walk.

Bus inquired about the cost of the plaque. Roller indicated that she thought the cost of the plaque is accounted for in the fee the owner pays. Bus thought the plaque should be bronze and of a good quality, and thought that the Commission should request that the City budget for the plaques in the annual budget. Chair Hagemann thought this would go along well with the City branding process. The plaque could be designed to retain the historic nature and also fit in to the image that City is looking for.

Sherer asked how they would get the word out about this program. Chair Hagemann thought that the Commission could partner with the Historical Society, Batavia Main Street and the Library to help get the word out.

Bus asked about the timeline for the branding program. Chair Hagemann responded that they are waiting on the contract to be finalized, but the outline showed an implementation of summer 2017.

Bus suggested that the City logo is incorporated in the plaque, and the Commission request that the City include this in the 2018 budget.

Sherer asked if there would be any repercussions for the home owner if they have the designation and want to sell their home. This plaque does not give the home landmark status.

Chair Hagemann suggested that the details should be discussed on a smaller committee level. The Committee could work on the program and bring it to the Commission. Once approved by the Commission, the City could be approached for funding.

Bus and Sherer volunteered to work with Roller on this program.

Chair Hagemann asked Mr. Albertson to add this to the agenda 4 meetings from now for an update from the Committee.

11. Updates:

- **7 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**
- **Anderson Block Building – Masonry Maintenance**
- **Significant Historic Building Inspection Program**
- **10/12 North River Street – Historic Inspection**
- **227 West Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**
- **109 South Batavia Avenue – Historic Inspection**

- **8 North River Street – Historic Inspection**
- **16 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**

Albertson reported that there were no specific updates. He received a report last week reference the reinspection of all of the listed building and will send it to the Commissioners. There has been a lot of progress.

Albertson reported that there is nothing new on the Certified Local Government.

12. Other

Chair Hagemann asked if there was anything else to discuss.

Roller asked if the updated guidelines had been sent to the Illinois Historic Preservation Commission yet, and Albertson responded that they have not.

Albertson reported that there will be four COA's for the next meeting reference One North Washington. Two of them will be direct and two of them will be from Larson Becker. Public hearings were held about the project on December 7 and January 4, and were closed at the end of the January 4 meeting. The Planning Commission has a meeting scheduled on January 25 for deliberation on this project, and then it will be forwarded to the COW and City Council after that.

Sherer asked about the Barco project, and Hagemann responded that they were waiting for the updated application from them.

Chair Hagemann welcomed new commissioner Kyle Hohmann and asked him to tell the Commissioners about himself. Hohmann was raised in Batavia and is a 5th generation Batavian. He grew up on the eastside and eventually purchased a home on the westside. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Historical Society and the Board of Directors of Main Street; he assisted Bob Popeck with the Windmill installations and upkeep in town; was an Alderman in Batavia; and is a student of Batavia history.

13. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Hagemann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:49pm; Made by Sullivan; Seconded by Hohmann. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Cheryl Collier

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

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

Property Address: 336 Houston St

Property Identification Number: 12-22-177-007

Existing/Proposed Zoning Ordinances: X Yes ___ No

Zoning: DMU

Submittal Date: 1 / 4 / 17

Owner's Name: Jackie Czeslawski

Phone Number: 630-406-0997

Mobile Number: ___

E-Mail: ___

Project Description:

replacing woodwork

replacing soffit & fascia

Applicant's Name: Vanessa Juarez

Applicant Address: 570 E North Frontage Rd

Phone Number: 708-382-2163

Mobile Number: ___

E-Mail: vjuarez@mywindowworks.com

Applicant Signature: [signature]

Owner Signature: [signature]

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- [x] **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- [ ] **New Construction**
  - [ ] Primary Structure
  - [ ] Addition
  - [ ] Garage/Outbuilding
  - [ ] Other ___
- [ ] **Demolition**
  - [ ] Whole Primary Structure
  - [ ] Part Primary Structure
  - [ ] Garage/outbuilding
- [ ] **Relocation of Building**

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

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

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.

WINDOW WORKS

570 E. North Frontage Rd.
Bolingbrook, Il. 60440
1-888-444-4014

Page 1 of 1 Proj. #_____

Please understand that estimates of timelines can vary with weather, association approvals, permits and availability.

SIDING SPECIFICATION SHEET

Date Nov 19, 2016 Buyers JACKIE CZESLAWSKI

Installation Address 336 Houston St City Batavia

Home Ph. 630.406.0997 Cell Ph_____ Email JCZESLAW@ATT.NET

Preparation/Woodwork	Included	Not Included	Quantity	Spec/Comments
Tear-off Existing Siding		✓	Sq. Ft.:	Type:
Install Plywood Sheathing*		✓	Sq. Ft.:	
Build Out Window or Door Frames		✓	#:	
Replace Wood Fascia*	✓		L. Ft.: ≈ 10	included is Rot ON Back WINDOW
Other:				* being Checked

Insulation	Included	Not Included	Quantity	Spec/Comments
1/2" Dow Board with Home Barrier			Sq. Ft.:	
3/4" Dow Board with Home Barrier			Sq. Ft.:	
1/4" Fanfold Installation	NA		Sq. Ft.:	
No Insulation With Home Wrap			Sq. Ft.:	
Add Home Wrap			Sq. Ft.:	

Siding	Included	Not Included	Quantity	Color/Comments
ArmorWall ☐D4 ☐ Dutchlap			Sq. Ft.:	
Market Square ☐D4 ☐ Dutchlap			Sq. Ft.:	
Vertical Siding, Type:	NA		Sq. Ft.:	
Shake, Type:			Sq. Ft.:	
Other:				

Corner Post Color:_____ Other accessories will match siding color unless noted.

Soffit/Fascia/Capping	Included	Not Included	Quantity	Color/Comments
Soffit and Fascia Home	✓		L. Ft.: 203	(white) Entire House + FRONT + SIDE PORCH
Soffit and Fascia Garage		✓	L. Ft.:	
Fascia and/or Frieze Home (circle)	✓		L. Ft.: 8	SIDE PORCH Roof line
Fascia and/or Frieze Garage (circle)		✓	L. Ft.:	
Wall Base		✓	L. Ft.:	
Window Caps	✓		#: 1	* Back Porch. 1 WINDOW
Door Caps		✓	#:	
Garage Door Caps		✓	#:	
Patio Door Caps		✓	#:	
Beam Caps		✓	#:	
4 x 4 Post Caps		✓	#:	* Roof tech gutters
Porch Ceiling		✓	#:	
Bay/Bow Caps		✓	#:	
Corner Caps		✓	#:	

Gutters/Gutter Protection	Included	Not Included	Quantity	Color/Comments
Gutters Home			L. Ft.:	
Downspouts Home		NA	L. Ft.:	
Gutters Garage			L. Ft.:	
Downspouts Garage			L. Ft.:	
Gutter Protection Leaf Relief			L. Ft.:	

***Rotten Wood:** Customer understands that replacing rotten wood not visible prior to the commencement of work is not included in the contract and will be subject to at the following additional charges:
Plywood Sheathing @$53 per 4 x 8 sheet / **Fascia board @$4.50 per lineal foot**

If an item is not checked as being included, **IT IS NOT INCLUDED.**

The Buyer(s) listed above jointly and severally agree to purchase the goods and/or services listed above, in accordance with the prices and and terms described on this SPECIFICATION SHEET and the front and reverse of the accompanying INSTALLATION CONTRACT of which this SPECIFICATION SHEET is a part.

Representative (Print) ERIC FUTTERER
Representative (Sign) E J Futterer
Date 11.19.16

Buyer (Print) C Jacqueline Czeslawski
Buyer (Sign) Jacqueline Czeslawski
Buyer (Print)_____
Buyer (Sign)_____
Date 11/19/2016

336

CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: **January 17, 2017**

TO: **Historic Preservation Commission**

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

SUBJECT: **Certificate of Appropriateness, 113 & 121 E. Wilson 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 (Contributing 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 city has documented some deterioration to the exterior of the 121 East Wilson Street building. No extensive interior inspections or reports have been conducted, but we suspect given the condition of the exterior that some deterioration issues are likely on the interior as well. No known issues with the 113 East Wilson Street building exist. No repair or cost estimates have been prepared on either structure. The buildings were purchased recently for the purposes of a redevelopment project.

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 350 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 City has not obtained any cost estimates for repair of either building. It has also not offered either building for sale as the buildings were purchased recently for the purposes of a redevelopment project.

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

   If the buildings are to be preserved, 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. As previously stated preservation of the structures would prevent redevelopment of the area. 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 121 East Wilson Street building would reduce the inventory of contributing 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. The 113 East Wilson Street building is non-contributing and will have no 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 180 apartment units and over 14,000 square feet of commercial space to the downtown area. The design of the façade has been reviewed and approved by the Commission, 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 little effect on the local economy. The actual uses of the buildings were for small local service businesses, 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.

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. The proposed new structure would promote redevelopment of a long deteriorated and underutilized block in the downtown.

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.

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

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

City of Batavia
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 113 East Wilson Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 276 - 010
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laura M. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 121 East Wilson Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 276 - 014
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Lauren R. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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.

BATAVIA INSURANCE

GMC

General Dentistry
Michael A. Fisher DDS
879-0079

CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: **January 17, 2017**

TO: **Historic Preservation Commission**

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

SUBJECT: **Certificate of Appropriateness, 113 & 121 E. Wilson 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 (Contributing 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 city has documented some deterioration to the exterior of the 121 East Wilson Street building. No extensive interior inspections or reports have been conducted, but we suspect given the condition of the exterior that some deterioration issues are likely on the interior as well. No known issues with the 113 East Wilson Street building exist. No repair or cost estimates have been prepared on either structure. The buildings were purchased recently for the purposes of a redevelopment project.

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 350 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 City has not obtained any cost estimates for repair of either building. It has also not offered either building for sale as the buildings were purchased recently for the purposes of a redevelopment project.

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

   If the buildings are to be preserved, 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. As previously stated preservation of the structures would prevent redevelopment of the area. 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 121 East Wilson Street building would reduce the inventory of contributing 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. The 113 East Wilson Street building is non-contributing and will have no 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 180 apartment units and over 14,000 square feet of commercial space to the downtown area. The design of the façade has been reviewed and approved by the Commission, 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 little effect on the local economy. The actual uses of the buildings were for small local service businesses, 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.

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. The proposed new structure would promote redevelopment of a long deteriorated and underutilized block in the downtown.

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.

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

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

City of Batavia
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 113 East Wilson Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 276 - 010
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laura M. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 121 East Wilson Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 276 - 014
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Lauren R. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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.

BATAVIA INSURANCE

GMC

General Dentistry
Michael A. Fisher DDS
879-0079

CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: **January 18, 2016**

TO: **Historic Preservation Commission**

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

SUBJECT: **Certificate of Appropriateness, 111-117 & 124 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 (Contributing 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 124 North River Street structure condition has deteriorated such that it is no longer usable, nor is it safe to use for residential purposes. To make the entire building usable the City (as owner) would need to spend a significant amount of public funds to renovate and mitigate a significant mold issue on the second floor. The City has not obtained any estimates for repairs of the building; however, our experience tells us they would be significant. The City feels that the renovation costs are prohibitive for this structure, and removal of the structure will mitigate a hazardous situation. The 111-117 North River Street structure has no known significant issues. The buildings were purchased recently for a future redevelopment project.

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 on the west side of River is necessary to facilitate redevelopment of this block. The proposed short term improvements include a 100+ space temporary parking lot, which will be used for public parking during the redevelopment of

the proposed One Washington Place project. Prohibiting the removal of the buildings will prevent the additional parking spaces from being developed. The long term use is not known at this time, however, it is anticipated the property will be developed with a mixed use development in the future.

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.*

1. The City has not obtained any cost estimates for repair of any of the buildings. It has also not offered the buildings for sale as the buildings were recently purchase for redevelopment purposes. The Larson-Becker complex of buildings and properties along the west side of N. River St. were for sale a few years ago with no takers and when they were offered again last year, the City was the only interested buyer. The buildings' intended and probably most suitable uses are those associated with industrial and storage activities, apparently there is little or no demand for such buildings in their present state of disrepair and non-compliance with today's user preferences.

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

If the buildings are to be preserved, substantial sums of money will need to be spent to make the buildings usable. These funds will be public funds that will otherwise not be able to be used for redevelopment or infrastructure projects. As previously stated preservation of the structures would prevent redevelopment of the area. 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 124 North River Street building would reduce the inventory of contributing historic buildings in the downtown area, there are many buildings that remain that are in much better condition than the case at hand. Thus the removal of this one building will have a negligible effect on the historic district as a whole. The 111-117 North River Street Buildings are non-contributing and will have no effect on the building as a whole. However, staff recommends retention of the "pump house" part of the structure at the far southern end. We feel this building has some potential historical significance, and recommend saving this portion of the building at this time.

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

While the long term replacement is not known. The short term use as a temporary parking lot will provide vital public parking during the development of the proposed One Washington Place development.

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 period of time would be negligible.

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

The demolition will have little effect on the local economy. The 124 North River building is not safe for use, and has been vacant for more than a year. The 111-117 North River buildings have seen a decline in business activity in the recent past. The proposed temporary parking will fill an immediate parking need in the downtown area.

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

While the demolition itself will not promote this factor, the redevelopment of the site in the future will promote a long deteriorated and underutilized block in the downtown.

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.*

This factor is not applicable to this petition.

City staff feels that the criteria for approving a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the subject buildings have been met, and therefore respectfully requests the HPC to approve of the request, with the exception of the “pump house” portion of the building at 111-117 N. River which should be preserved at this time.

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

City of Batavia
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 111-117 North River Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 203 - 026
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances _x_ Yes ____No
Zoning _DMU_____

Submittal Date __01_/__06____/_2017_

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laura M. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other_____
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 124 North River Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 233 - 002
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laurah. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

☐ **New Construction**
- ☐ Primary Structure
- ☐ Addition
- ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
- ☐ Other

☒ **Demolition**
- ☒ Whole Primary Structure
- ☐ Part Primary Structure
- ☐ Garage/outbuilding

☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

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

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.

ARSON-BECKER CO

LARSON-BECKER CO.

LARSON-BECKER CO.

CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: **January 18, 2016**

TO: **Historic Preservation Commission**

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

SUBJECT: **Certificate of Appropriateness, 111-117 & 124 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 (Contributing 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 124 North River Street structure condition has deteriorated such that it is no longer usable, nor is it safe to use for residential purposes. To make the entire building usable the City (as owner) would need to spend a significant amount of public funds to renovate and mitigate a significant mold issue on the second floor. The City has not obtained any estimates for repairs of the building; however, our experience tells us they would be significant. The City feels that the renovation costs are prohibitive for this structure, and removal of the structure will mitigate a hazardous situation. The 111-117 North River Street structure has no known significant issues. The buildings were purchased recently for a future redevelopment project.

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 on the west side of River is necessary to facilitate redevelopment of this block. The proposed short term improvements include a 100+ space temporary parking lot, which will be used for public parking during the redevelopment of

the proposed One Washington Place project. Prohibiting the removal of the buildings will prevent the additional parking spaces from being developed. The long term use is not known at this time, however, it is anticipated the property will be developed with a mixed use development in the future.

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.*

1. The City has not obtained any cost estimates for repair of any of the buildings. It has also not offered the buildings for sale as the buildings were recently purchase for redevelopment purposes. The Larson-Becker complex of buildings and properties along the west side of N. River St. were for sale a few years ago with no takers and when they were offered again last year, the City was the only interested buyer. The buildings' intended and probably most suitable uses are those associated with industrial and storage activities, apparently there is little or no demand for such buildings in their present state of disrepair and non-compliance with today's user preferences.

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

If the buildings are to be preserved, substantial sums of money will need to be spent to make the buildings usable. These funds will be public funds that will otherwise not be able to be used for redevelopment or infrastructure projects. As previously stated preservation of the structures would prevent redevelopment of the area. 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 124 North River Street building would reduce the inventory of contributing historic buildings in the downtown area, there are many buildings that remain that are in much better condition than the case at hand. Thus the removal of this one building will have a negligible effect on the historic district as a whole. The 111-117 North River Street Buildings are non-contributing and will have no effect on the building as a whole. However, staff recommends retention of the "pump house" part of the structure at the far southern end. We feel this building has some potential historical significance, and recommend saving this portion of the building at this time.

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

While the long term replacement is not known. The short term use as a temporary parking lot will provide vital public parking during the development of the proposed One Washington Place development.

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 period of time would be negligible.

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

The demolition will have little effect on the local economy. The 124 North River building is not safe for use, and has been vacant for more than a year. The 111-117 North River buildings have seen a decline in business activity in the recent past. The proposed temporary parking will fill an immediate parking need in the downtown area.

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

While the demolition itself will not promote this factor, the redevelopment of the site in the future will promote a long deteriorated and underutilized block in the downtown.

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.*

This factor is not applicable to this petition.

City staff feels that the criteria for approving a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the subject buildings have been met, and therefore respectfully requests the HPC to approve of the request, with the exception of the “pump house” portion of the building at 111-117 N. River which should be preserved at this time.

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

City of Batavia
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 111-117 North River Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 203 - 026
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances _x_ Yes ____No
Zoning _DMU_____

Submittal Date __01_/__06____/_2017_

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laura M. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- ☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**
- ☐ **New Construction**
  - ☐ Primary Structure
  - ☐ Addition
  - ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
  - ☐ Other_____
- ☒ **Demolition**
  - ☒ Whole Primary Structure
  - ☐ Part Primary Structure
  - ☐ Garage/outbuilding
- ☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

- ☐ Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- ☐ Awning or Canopy
- ☐ Deck
- ☐ Door
- ☐ Fence
- ☐ Gutters
- ☐ Light Fixture
- ☐ Mechanical System Units
- ☐ Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- ☐ Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- ☐ Painting (paint removal etc)
- ☐ Paving (Parking Lot, Driveways, Landscaping)
- ☐ Porch – Maintenance and Minor Repair
- ☐ Porch – Major Repair and Reconstruction
- ☐ Retaining Walls
- ☐ Roof (Change in Shape, Features, Materials)
- ☐ Satellite Dish
- ☐ Security Doors or Windows
- ☐ Sidewalks
- ☐ Shutters
- ☐ Siding
- ☐ Signs
- ☐ Solar Collectors
- ☐ Storm Doors or Windows
- ☐ Windows, Skylights
- ☐ 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** _____

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
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia IL 60510
Phone (630) 454-2000
Fax (630) 454-2775

Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 124 North River Street

Property Identification Number 12 - 22 - 233 - 002
Existing/Proposed Use Ordinances x Yes ____ No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 01 / 06 / 2017

Project Description :
Demolition of principle structure to clear site for redevelopment.

Owner's Name City of Batavia
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant's Name City of Batavia
Applicant Address 100 North Island Avenue, Batavia, IL 60510
Phone Number (630)454-2000
Mobile Number
E-Mail lnewman@cityofbatavia.net

Applicant Signature Laurah. Newman

Owner Signature

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

☐ **Exterior Alteration/Repair**

☐ **New Construction**
- ☐ Primary Structure
- ☐ Addition
- ☐ Garage/Outbuilding
- ☐ Other

☒ **Demolition**
- ☒ Whole Primary Structure
- ☐ Part Primary Structure
- ☐ Garage/outbuilding

☐ **Relocation of Building**

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

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

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.

ARSON-BECKER CO

LARSON-BECKER CO.

LARSON-BECKER CO.