Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/7 as amended by Public Act 101-0640 and in the interest of public health and safety, this Commission meeting will be held remotely.

To participate in the live meeting use the webinar link below to register for the event: Registration Link - https://cityofbatavia.net.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_MbQRSlegRza0Wt2_IbwnSQ. You will need to provide your name and email address.

Residents can listen by phone to the Historic Preservation Commission meeting by dialing (312) 626-6799 and using the webinar ID 991 0153 1100 and Webinar Passcode 823859 when prompted. Callers can ask questions by pressing *9 to raise their hand.

Questions and comments regarding agenda items can be submitted prior to meeting by emailing jalberts@cityofbatavia.net.

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval Of Minutes: February 8, 2021
   Documents: HPC 2-8-21 FINAL MINUTES.PDF
4. Items Removed/Added/Changed
5. Matters From The Public (For Items Not On The Agenda)
6. COA Review: 29 South River Street - Wall Sign
   (Tiffani Johannsen, applicant)
   Documents: 29 S RIVER ST--WALL SIGN COA PACKET.PDF
7. COA Review: 14 North Washington Avenue
   Demolition (Barco Products, applicant)
   Documents: 14 N WASHINGTON AVE--DEMO COA.PDF
8. Updates
   1. 7 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
   2. Anderson Block Building—Masonry Maintenance
3. Significant Historic Building Inspection Program
4. 227 West Wilson Street—Historic Inspection
5. 16 East Wilson Street—Historic Inspection

9. Other Business

10. Adjournment

Historic Preservation Commission
Kurt Hagemann, Vice-Chair
Kyle Hohmann, Chair
Phil Bus
Jennifer Faivre
Jamie Saam
MINUTES
February 8, 2021
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 Commission/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 Hohmann called the virtual meeting to order at 5:30pm.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair Hohmann; Vice-Chair Bus; Commissioners Faivre, Sherer and Saam

Members Absent: Commissioner Hagemann

Also Present: Mayor Schielke; Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Scott Buening, Director of Community Development; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

3. Approval of Minutes: December 14, 2020

Motion: To approve the minutes from December 14, 2020
Maker: Sherer
Second: Faivre
Roll Call Vote: Aye: Sherer, Bus, Saam, Faivre, Hohmann
Nay: 5-0 Vote, 1 Absent. Motion carried.

4. Items to be Removed, Added or Changed
There were no items to be removed, added or changed.

5. Matters From the Public (for items not on the agenda)
There were no matters from the public.

6. Recognition of Commissioner Robert Krawczyk
Albertson reported that Commissioner Robert Krawczyk recently passed away. Mayor Schielke stated that we would truly miss him. He was a great representative of Batavia. Mayor Schielke continued that he had amazing talents with the computer, taking a home with several renovations and deconstructing it to show how the home originally looked. He was a valuable resource, and we are sorry to lose him.

Motion: To send a letter to Robert Krawczyk’s wife with deepest sympathies and have it signed by the chairman
7. COA Review: 90 N Island Avenue – Wall Signs (DK Signs, applicant)
Danny Konovalchik, DK Signs, addressed the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Konovalchik discussed the wall signs for Windmill Creek Pizzeria. There will be two flush mounted illuminated channel letter signs and an awning fabric change. Albertson stated that the signs meet code and there is a sign graphic on the awning on the north wall and all comply with the Zoning Code.

This building is non-contributing. Chair Hohmann asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. The HPC viewed illustrations of the graphics on the awning and the proposed signage.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented
Maker: Bus
Second: Sherer
Roll Call Vote: Aye: Bus, Saam, Faivre, Sherer, Hohmann
Nay: 5-0 Vote, 1 Absent. Motion carried.

8. COA Review: 19 N River Street – Wall Signs (Amanda Leutenberg, applicant)
Amanda Leutenberg, applicant, addressed the HPC. She stated that they would like to put a wall sign over the door as well as one on River Street. She explained that they have a private walkway near the Instrument Exchange building so they would like to place a sign next to it. Originally, they wanted to have a projecting sign but it is not a 50ft building so they could just do a flat sign and that would be fine. The HPC viewed illustrations of the proposed signs.

Albertson announced this building is classified as contributing. All of the signage that was in the original posting complied, except the projecting sign. The Zoning Code only allows one projecting sign on a building elevation unless the building elevation is wider than 50ft. This building elevation is narrower and only allows for one projecting sign. There already is one for the Instrument Exchange. A flat mounted sign would comply with the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Sherer asked if the applicant feels the flat sign would be adequate in showing people where to find their store. Leutenberg answered not particularly but there is not much a of a choice due to the size of the building. She would much rather have a projecting sign because of where they are located. Sherer asked if it would be legal to put the projecting sign on the slope on the side of the building. Albertson answered it would not. Projecting signs are only allowed on the street-facing frontage of the building. Saam asked if the sign could be added to the Instrument Exchange sign with chain links. Albertson stated that was the first suggestion but the applicant did not feel it was feasible. Leutenberg stated it has to be ten feet so the Instrument Exchange would have to mount theirs a lot higher and she is not sure if it would be fair to ask them to do that.
Chair Hohmann stated that he really likes the idea of the projecting signs. It really adds to the character of River Street and the feel that the City is going for down there. Historically, it looks correct to have the sign protrude from the building even if there are multiple ones on the same building. Albertson stated that the applicant could apply for a variance or else it would have to be an amendment to the Zoning Code. Unfortunately, both of those options would take about two to three months to work through the process. Bus stated that he agrees with Chair Hohmann and one of our directives is to make recommendations to the City Council on things in the Historic District. On River Street, because of the unique character, the City Code could be amended to allow for projecting signs to be added to a building less than fifty feet. He thinks we could recommend that to the City Council so that by late spring early summer, if approved, the business could add a projecting sign if they wanted. Sherer, Saam and Chair Hohmann agreed with Bus’ comments. Chair Hohmann asked for a formal motion.

**Motion:** To recommend to City Council that in the Historic District on River Street that the zoning provisions regarding signage be amended to allow for up to two projecting signs on buildings less than 50ft in the Zoning Code

**Maker:** Bus

**Second:** Sherer

Discussion was held on the motion. Sherer asked if this gets approved would the projecting sign be allowed on the down slope side of the building. Albertson stated that they would have to make that specific allowance in the ordinance. Right now, the way the Zoning Code is written, signs are only allowed on the street facing elevation. The code would have to be amended both ways, one to allow a second projecting sign and also to allow it on another elevation. Buening noted that since it is an alley the sign might have to be hung a lot higher. Bus stated that if they get the projecting sign on the street and the temporary sidewalk board sign that would get people to the door. Sherer agreed.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Aye:** Bus, Saam, Faivre, Sherer, Hohmann

**Nay:**

5-0 Vote, 1 Absent. Motion carried.

**Motion:** To approve COA with the sign being flush mounted and the one over the door being accepted as presented

**Maker:** Sherer

**Second:** Saam

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Aye:** Sherer, Bus, Saam, Faivre, Hohmann

**Nay:**

5-0 Vote, 1 Absent. Motion carried.

9. **Discussion: Historic Landmarking Process**

Albertson overviewed the memo. Albertson noted that one of the difficulties in this particular situation had was the property was sold right as the process was getting started. That did not help. The property was sold and changed hands within days of when the application was sent. The original notification went to the bank that was in charge of the property in Texas and we found out...
from the bank that the property had changed hands to a new owner. We attempted to notify that owner as well. A lot of the problem was the property had changed hands in the middle of the process. Faivre stated that the homeowner went to the Historic Society and reached out that way and the Historic Society could have given her HPC’s contact information. She does not understand how the certified mail process failed to notify the applicant. She just finds it all very odd. Albertson noted that the Historic Society reached out to him just after the Public Hearing. It was between the Public Hearing and when it was forwarded to the City Council’s Committee of the Whole. Vice-Chair Bus stated that he is of the opinion that this is a one in ten thousand situation and it is hard to conceive that it would happen again. To put any more time or effort on amending the code is not necessary. Chair Hohmann agreed with Vice-Chair Bus in this instance. This is a rather rare circumstance that this would occur. At the end of the day, it’s up to the City Council’s purview to accept or to not accept based on comments from a citizen or citizens. In this case, the process worked itself through. He does not know if we need a lot more time revising this process.

Alderman Joe Knopp addressed the Commission. Knopp stated that this property is in the fourth ward and he was contacted by the Historic Society and he got some input there as well as opinions about the property and the fit for being designated a historic landmark. Knopp reached out to the property owner and had conversations with staff. Knopp shared that he is a process engineer by trade and when things aren’t coming out the way we expect them to the first thing we do is go back and make sure we followed our process. That is when we noticed some discrepancies on dates. There was some explanation that staff oftentimes get applications where not all the pieces are in place at the time it is submitted but they do not take any action on it until everything is all in place. That will make for dates that are not quite in line with the process. Knopp stated that is not spelled out in the process. The property owner did get due process, she was involved before the final decision was made. Being that this is the first such property that is going through this process we wanted to make sure we had it right. When we saw the hiccups and the bumps along the way we felt that, in general, we could refine the process a little more.

Knopp continued one of the things we looked at was a more standardized form rather than having different people submit in different ways, make it clearer in the language of the code that before it could be processed you have to have all of these things. That would take some ambiguity out and allow things to happen in the order that they happen. Another thing we would like to see, if you have a property owner who does not want it, make it a little more than a simple majority that approves it at City Council. Make it a 2/3 vote by City Council because we are trying to balance out the need for historic preservation in the City of Batavia against the property owner’s rights.

Vice-Chair Bus stated that if the aldermen think that the City Code should be revised to require a 2/3 vote that is their prerogative. It does not have any bearing on the responsibility of the HPC. A lot of the things we do or recommend are ultimately decided on by the City Council so it is really a Council policy issue. Chair Hohmann stated that he believes that the Commission would support those changes and we appreciate being involved in the conversation. Albertson stated that any revisions to this process would effect how the HPC operates. This would come to the HPC first for a recommendation and then to City Council for a formal vote. Buening stated that a more standardized form is more of an administrative task that staff could do. The revised form is not something that has to come back to the Commission. Buening stated that he would have to think about the process to ensure it is business and people friendly. Buening added that a 2/3 majority
vote should be made in general for any land marking or districts. There were no objections from the HPC.

10. Updates:
   1. 7 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection
   2. Anderson Block Building – Masonry Maintenance
   3. Significant Historic Building Inspection Program
   4. 227 West Wilson Street – Historic Inspection
   5. 16 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection
   6. Certified Local Government

Albertson reported that staff did hear back on the Certified Local Government application. It has been approved. The City of Batavia HPC is now a Certified Local Government as of January 26th of this year.

Albertson reported that the 16 East Wilson Street item has a redevelopment agreement for this property with a perspective tenant, a comedy club. This property will be undergoing significant renovations soon. With the recent new tenant and redevelopment Albertson believes that the items needed to be done on this building will be accomplished and it will then be taken off the list. Chair Hohmann stated that he would like to challenge the HPC and staff to do what we can to finalize the remaining buildings this year.

11. Other Business
Mayor Schielke reported one of the things he will be bringing to the HPC and City Council are nationally designated and landmark signs. There are several buildings that should have some designation or explanation. One would be the City Council Chambers, which during the 1960’s was a research laboratory by DK Aerospace, which was one of the subcontractors to the US Space Industry. The flexible fuel lines that were used in the rocket that landed on the moon and returned to earth were made in the City Council Chambers. He thinks Batavia should point that out to visitors. He continued that some sort of plaque should be listed on the Shumway Foundry because the molds for the Academy Awards were manufactured at the Shumway Foundry. The J&E Greenhouse on Walnut Street many of the roses for the Rose Bowl Parade were grown at that location and transferred to railroad cars that sat on a track that is now the walking trail that goes down to Gustafson School. They had a huge rose growing operation in November of every year to be used in the big parade. These things have a national recognition to them. The technology used to create the MRI machine and the internet came out of Fermi Lab. Bellevue already has a plaque about Mary Todd Lincoln but there are a number of other places that could use a plaque and we could create a map for a self-guided tour people could take in Batavia.

Chair Hohmann stated that this discussion of further plaquing of historic places and events in Batavia should be continued and we should discuss this with the Historical Society to get some opinions as well as administration opinions from staff. Chair Hohmann noted that this would have to be phased-in as resources were allowed and available.

12. Adjournment
There being no other business to discuss, Chair Hohmann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:41pm; Made by Saam; Seconded by Sherer. Roll call was made and all were in favor. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary, on February 15, 2021.
Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

City of Batavia
Community Development Department
100 North Island Avenue
Batavia, IL 60510
Phone (866) 854-2700
Fax (866) 654-2775

Property Address: 29 S. River Street

Property Identification Number: 12-12-22-22-01-11

Owner's Name: Tiffani Johansen
Phone Number: 630-862-1678
Mobile Number: Same
E-Mail: Tiffi.0609@hotmail.com

Applicant's Name: Tiffani Johansen
Applicant Address: 29 S. River Street
Phone Number: 630-862-1678
Mobile Number: 630-862-1678
E-Mail: Tiffi.0609@hotmail.com

Project Description:

Attach sign with name of business in the outside of the business.

Submit Date: 3/9/21

Signature:

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

- Exterior Alteration/Repair
- New Construction
- Demolition

- Primary Structure
- Addition
- Whole Primary Structure
- Garage/Outbuilding
- Part Primary Structure
- Other
- Relocation of Building
- Other

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

- Architectural Feature (Decorative Ornamentation)
- Awning or Canopy
- Deck
- Door
- Fence
- Gutter
- Light Fixture
- Mechanical System Units
- Masonry Cleaning, Repointing, Painting
- Material Change (wood, brick, etc)
- Painting (paint removal etc)
- Parking (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)
- Security Doors or Windows
- Sidewalks
- Shutters
- Siding
- Signs
- Solar Collection
- Storm Doors or Windows
- Windows, Skylights
- Other
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, in scale drawings with dimensions will be required for major changes in design (e.g., roofs, facades, porches, and other permanent 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. Elevations drawings of each façade with dimensions and specifications
□ 3. Drawings, photographs, samples and manufacturer’s illustrations

☐ Drawings of 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 onto 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 ______

Condition: 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.
THE SALON
BY THE RIVER
This message originated outside of the City of Batavia -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe. If you have any doubt, contact the sender by phone to confirm.

The sign will be 32" x 96"
3/8" MDO wood
Vinyl lettering applied to painted woodboard
Attached with 6 screws

Tiffani Johannsen
630-862-1678

Get Outlook for Android
Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Property
Address 14 N. Washington

Property Identification Number 12.22.27.02
Existing/Proposed Zoning Ordinances Yes No
Zoning DMU

Submittal Date 3/5/2021

Project Description:

Removal of existing dilapidated house and foundation.
Landscape restoration of all areas.

Owner's Name Barco Products
Phone Number
Mobile Number 630-514-9389
E-Mail morgan.w.morgan@msn.com

Applicant's Name Barco Products
Applicant Address 14 N. Washington
Phone Number
Mobile Number 630-514-9389
E-Mail morgan.w.morgan@msn.com

Applicant Signature Morgan Morgan
Owner Signature Morgan Morgan

TYPE OF WORK
(Check All That Apply)

☐ Exterior Alteration/Repair ☐ New Construction
☐ Demolition
☐ Primary Structure ☐ Whole Primary Structure
☐ Addition ☐ Part Primary Structure
☐ Garage/Outbuilding ☐ Garage/outbuilding
☐ Other ☐ 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)
☐ 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
☐ 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property is:</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th><strong>Contributing</strong></th>
<th>Non-Contributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.
Hi Chrissa,

The house has set for many years due to basement leaking and structural damage. Also the complete exterior and part of the framing structure has water damage, chimney is completely failing. The interior also needs to be rundown. The cost of a complete remodel does not make sense at all. Cyril Matter is willing to fence off the driveway on Washington which is very dangerous and also landscape the area beautifully if the city allows it. The will look very welcoming especially if the Shodeen project goes thru. I have some landscape design drawings you can look at to see how it would look.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 9, 2021, at 12:52 PM, Simkins, Chrissa <csimkins@cityofbatavia.net> wrote:

Good afternoon,

We’ve received the applications for the demo of the home at 14 N Washington St. Jeff Albertson took a quick look & asked me to contact you regarding the reasoning/justification of the demolition. Jeff said because this is in the historic district, he will need more information as to why the home cannot be renovated.

Thank you,
Chrissa

PLEASE SEND ALL QUESTIONS/CONCERNS TO: permits@cityofbatavia.net
The Community & Economic Development Department is working split shifts; Emails sent to personal email addresses may be delayed.

<image002.png>

Chrissa Simkins
Community & Economic Development | City of Batavia
P: 630.454.2700 F: 630.454.2775
W: cityofbatavia.net E: permits@cityofbatavia.net
100 N Island Ave, Batavia, Illinois 60510
Here’s some pictures. Cyril had a drawing made of a proposed site after demo. The other pictures as you can see tell the story of the home. Pretty much rotten completely on exterior. Chimney is shot and limestone foundation is crumbling. Let me know if you need anything else. Thanks for your help. M