

MINUTES
August 14, 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; Commissioners Sherer, Sullivan, Bus, and Hohmann

Members Absent: Vice-Chair Roller

Also Present: Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

3. Minutes: June 26, 2017

Motion: To approve the minutes from June 26, 2017

Maker: Bus

Second: Sullivan

Voice Vote: 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 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)

Chair Hagemann asked if there were matters from the public for items not on the agenda. There were none.

**6. COA Review: 901 North Batavia Avenue
Façade Revisions (Evergreen Real Estate Group, applicant)**

Chair Hageman stated that the scope that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) oversees is the exterior and how any modifications or changes to the building would impact the historic significance of the building itself. This Commission does not have any authority over the parking, traffic or any of the other items that have been brought to the Plan Commission (PC). Albertson stated that the PC meeting regarding those other items would be held this Wednesday, August 16th.

David Block, Director of Development for Evergreen Real Estate Group, addressed the Commission. He introduced Dennis Langley to the Commission.

Dennis Langley, Weiss Langley Weiss Architects, presented to the HPC on the application process and site plan. He stated that this particular property has a historic drive. The purpose is to provide new parking for the project while trying to maintain the idea of the racetrack drive in the front of the building. They are also placing plantings in the front of the building on the first floor to shield the lower part of the building where they are introducing windows. All the parking plans would be integrated into the historic plan. There will be limited landscaping to keep with the historic nature of the big, open sweeping lawn down to the road. There are few original trees and they will be adding some trees to coincide with the historic nature along Fabyan Avenue. The rest of the landscaping would be as required by the parking we are doing on the side. Langley discussed the interior plan with the Commission. Langley discussed the elevations. He stated that on the east elevation there would be windows below the stone sill on the main building and the wings to the left and to the right. The National Park Service had expressed that it was their preference to not put any windows in the glass block so they are using the same strategy used in the main building, which is putting the windows below the sill and not in the glass block. The stone sill is four feet above the floor so there is room for that window. The window has to be up off the floor so that people could reach and operate it. The west elevation has the ability to introduce more windows. All the original masonry openings including the openings for the original loading docks are to remain in this elevation. The windows would be infilled with simulated steel sash windows, which is more correct to the period of that building. The upper levels would introduce windows into the glass block units. The north elevation they would be introducing windows in that elevation because it is a secondary elevation and not very visible from the street. On the lower part of the image there is the primary south elevation where there are no windows. He discussed the strategy of the block and the stone and the operable skylights and windows below the sill. All units would have the proper natural light as required by code, there would not be any enclosed units without the proper light.

Langley discussed how they plan to insert the windows below the glass block. The windows would be flush with the brick with a special glazing unit that is the color of the brick around it. The lower level would have lines visible. On top of that strategy, there is a whole series of plantings planned to block the view of that lower set of windows from the primary street views on Fabyan.

Langley shared historic photos of the building with the Commission. He stated that the original façade, for whatever reason, only lasted twenty years. The brick that is there now has been re-facaded in 1956. They will be using the historic photos to inform them on how they would light the building at night. The ground floor would not be even because there would be tenants but the second floor would be open so they could light it to match what is there. The third floor would have lights added to match what is there and the tower would be lit. The Campana sign would be stabilized and will stay. The cell tower antennae would be taken off the side of the building and placed on top of the tower. They would use a Stealth Enclosure to hide the cell towers on top of the building. It would match the color of the tower and become an extension of the tower. The original glass block of the building was 12x12 and was replaced in the 1950's with 8x8 block. They found a whole wall of 12x12 block on the north elevation. They would take those blocks

off the north elevation and redo the non-original block on the tower to bring it back to the original state. There is enough yellow brick on site to salvage and replace. They might be able to find the original brick on some non-primary elevations and bring it to the primary elevation so there would not be any matching problems. He explained to get the materials on-site for replacements are the best way to go.

Langley stated that the wings, though not historic, were built in 1968-1973 per the drawings they have are considered an important adjacency to the historic building so we have to treat them with the respect that respects the historic building. They play an important part of the original historic building and were built as an extension to the historic building at some place or time so they have to consider them as well. He showed pictures of the original brick, glass block, curved block, and the proposed interior of the building.

Chair Hagemann opened the floor for Commission questions. Bus asked structurally what is behind the brick and the glass block. Langley stated that it is a steel structure cast in concrete to fireproof it. It is very strong and durable. The floor is concrete joist, the concrete around the steel ties the concrete joist to the steel. Bus asked if the glass block, 12x12 specifically, failure is due to the weight of the glass blocks and if they are not capable of supporting the weight above them. Langley stated that it is not the structural issue of the block. Similar to brick, if you get moisture in there it could deteriorate. There is no structural issue, it is more of a maintenance durability issue. The block spans from one floor to another. The block has a reinforcing wire on it to hold it in place and sits on 12-inch masonry.

Sherer stated she is concerned about the proposed windows. She stated that this is a historic building so as soon as you install the new windows you change the architecture of the building. Langley stated you could make the argument that the architecture of the windows that we would be placing in this building can be found in this type of building in this way. Sherer stated not in that particular building. Langley agreed. He stated that the primary elevations are the east and the south and you don't see any windows in the glass block and that is why we did this strategy. Sherer stated it makes no difference if the public can or cannot see these windows, whether you have hidden them behind berms and evergreens, you have still changed the architecture of a historic building. Langley stated that it does make a difference what elevation it is on. Sherer asked if you are changing the architecture of a historic building by adding these windows. Langley agreed.

Hohmann asked what is the projected lifespan of the proposed materials. Langley stated that the requirements are a thirty to forty year lifespan and he feels that this would be a long-term durable building. Sullivan asked for a rendering of the building after completion. Langley stated that he does not have a slide of the building after completion. Sullivan asked what are the biggest changes intended to make on the building. Langley answered that it would look cleaner and better with no visible windows. The flag may become operable and the building would be restored. Block added that on top of the tower there would be an eight foot additional panel that would be the same color and texture of the tower masonry material and that would be hiding all of the cell equipment. The tower would grow to be eight feet taller than what it already is. It is 100ft tall and it would become 108ft tall. The building would look the same way it looks today with a taller tower and landscaping concealing the subsill windows. It will be cleaner but other

than that the building would look the same as it looks today. Block noted that the windows provided in the packet would be changed to all subsill windows. Hagemann asked about the berms and Langley answered that the berms are very subtle and are there to camouflage the windows. It is on the civil engineering drawings. There will be berming on the connecting road that will be made between the back and front parking. Hagemann asked if eventually the HPC would receive renderings on how the building would look like with the berms. Langley stated hopefully there would be a beautiful finished photo. Hagemann asked where the cell towers would be hidden, adding eight feet to that, what visible change would happen to the sign and the flag pole on the top of the tower. Langley stated that it is a fifty-foot flag pole and it would look eight feet shorter. The geometry of what we are discussing and the change proportion is on the site plan. Langley noted that the National Park Service suggested these changes as a way to handle the cell tower antennae.

Bus asked about the east elevation. He asked about the color of the glass windows. Langley stated that there is a special glass that they are getting to blend in with the existing brick. There is a company that prints on a film that puts into glazing any image you want and you can see out but you can't see in. They have sent photos and started the process of getting them. Everything that they are saying that they are going to do has to be mocked up, photographed and be approved to ensure that the materials actually do what we say they can do. The Stealth enclosure has to be reviewed and approved, the brick, terracotta, and masonry has to be reviewed and approved by the State and National Park service and your organization as well. Bus asked about the color choice and Langley stated that it approximates the color of the brick that is there. Bus asked about the berm planting. Langley stated that it is a low hedge like planting that will be linear and clean and would hide the windows. Bus stated that he would like to see more information on the plantings. Langley stated that there is a section that they drew to explain that which they could get to the Commission and would explain it better than the civil engineering, which they could give to the HPC. Bus asked for a site visit before the HPC renders their final decision in order to better understand the things being presented tonight. There was no opposition from the Commission.

Sullivan stated that he is surprised that there would be a berm and a colored film used to hide the proposed windows. He asked if it were a belt and suspenders type technique. Langley agreed that it is belt and suspenders. He explained that you could minimize the impact of the windows with the glaze but you still could see that there has been something introduced so we have proposed the plantings as well so you could not see the minimal intrusion into the wall. One or the other wouldn't work but together we feel it would work.

Anthony Rubano, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, stated that this is a complicated building for its reuse and the developer is seeking the Federal Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits, which the National Park Service administers and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency administers at the State level. Rubano discussed the standards and the review process with the Commission.

Rubano discussed the proposed project in terms of historic preservation. He stated that if there is a solution that meets the standards of introducing subsill windows it has to include some type of topography that helps to minimize the visual impact. In a review, they try to figure out what are the primary significant elements, features and facades, of a building and work to preserve those

while allowing a new program to be installed. The things that are not significant could be altered if the owner chooses in a manner that is compatible. The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency approved this project with twelve conditions, which is very common with a tax project and submitted it to the National Park Service.

Rubano stated that he spoke with Scott Berger, Kane County, and their concerns were the east façade window insertions. They were also operating under the understanding that the north and south wings were actually older than they are. They thought they were built in the 1940's but they were actually built in the late 1960's so that had an impact on their point of view. Nonetheless, the decision that they rendered had to do with the slit windows on the wings.

Liz Safanda, Geneva resident, shared that she had recently been appointed to the Kane County Community Development Commission (KCCDC). She stated that these are Federal HUD funds used for the Evergreen proposal and the KCCDC felt that it was a good plan and allocated the funds. Bus asked staff if there would be a report from Kane County that they could review as part of the process. Buening stated that he would double check. Bus asked for staff to follow-up with the County as to when the 106 Report would be available. He noted that a draft report would be suitable as well. He is interested in the cooperation between the jurisdictions. Block further discussed the application process and funding with the Commission. He explained that the Section 106 review is part of the overall review that Kane County has to do as a delegated federal agency. They have issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and has triggered a request to Release of Funds (ROF). Kane County has completed its historic process. Bus asked for the FONSI report for review.

Chair Hagemann opened the floor for public comments. A letter from Bonnie McDonald, President of Landmarks Illinois, was submitted for the record.

Jeffery Wilson stated that the access road in front of this building, which has become a requirement of the Plan Commission, certainly impacts the historic nature of this property and the views from Route 31. He commented that the petitioner, at a public meeting, said that they can't even build a dog house on the front lawn without affecting the historic nature of this project. Wilson continued that over forty percent of the property has new structures on it such as an access road (required by the PC) and angled parking. He pointed out that there are no views supplied from Route 31 looking back to the property. He stated that is because the requirements of the PC it has a significant impact of the historic views from 31, which are the very things designated as needed to be preserved: the open lawn. He encouraged the HPC to view the historic impacts of that road, that parking, and access that would be more than a dog house on the front lawn. He pointed out that the HPC was not given finished elevations. The HPC was shown past elevations. You should see final elevations and the impact of the changes proposed to the building elevation and the lawn to make your decision. The images from inside the building shows transparent block in which you could see trees and roads. When you take your site visit, make sure you go inside the building and look through those windows. You can't see trees, you can't see the river. Sometimes elevations do not tell you the true story. The road will change the lawn and is much bigger than a dog house.

Elizabeth Safanda, Executive Director of the Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley (PPFV), addressed the Commission. She also distributed a handout of her comments to the members of the HPC. Safanda stated that the City of Batavia faces unique challenges with the Campana property: The Campana building is a white elephant and has been for years. But, it is also an iconic landmark, a beacon on the Illinois prairie, which is deeply appreciated by many in our region, and far beyond. The challenge facing us today is approving an appropriate use for the building, that will allow its owners to fully utilize the site, and will accomplish a comprehensive restoration of the beloved landmark, preserving its integrity for decades to come. A brief history, as Executive Director of PPFV, I have monitored development proposals for over 2 decades: these three stand out:

- Build Dreyer clinic in front, to the north, with strip of retail on bottom floor of Campana, including large picture windows for each store
- Move the entire structure forward on property, to allow large townhouse development to the rear (west)
- Rent out a large portion of the building to a Chicago charter school

None of these proposals advanced to review by City staff and officials. Most important, none of these proposals would have restored the building, repairing its unique features, such as glass block windows, ceramic tile, and concrete infrastructure. We have in front of us tonight a project that will accomplish the goals I have outlined, a proposal that has met the rigorous approval of the State Historic Preservation Agency, qualifying it for federal historic tax credits. Preservation Partners strongly supports the proposed use of the site for mixed income housing; however, our focus tonight is the future of the building. We are well aware that you appreciate the profound significance of the structure, since you designated it a Local Landmark; we simply want to add our voices to the chorus of supporters who view the Evergreen proposal as a remarkable opportunity. We implore you to take advantage of it.

Victoria Lamb, 515 North VanNortwick, stated that the Bauhaus and Art Deco Campana building was considered state of the art and ahead of its time being one of the first buildings to be completely air conditioned and outfitted with fire protection. The predominate tower housed a large 58,000 gallon cedar wooden water tank installed to allow the air conditioning and fire suppression system to work. As a consequence of the building being fully air conditioned, fully operating windows were considered unnecessary and the glass block was used for natural lighting. In 1968 the water tower began to leak. At the time, the insurance company told Campana that they needed more water capacity and they should have a municipal water supply. Geneva told Campana they had no water line nearby and so the company went to see Batavia's mayor at the time, Mayor Swanson. There was a PC meeting that night and incorporation of Campana and water connection was approved that very night. Campana agreed to pay for the water extension. Section 12-6-2 of the City of Batavia's code related to historic preservation and rehabilitation was read. Lamb stated it was mentioned by the real estate group that the water tank is falling apart and they hope to salvage the wood. She feels that the tank is the central reason why the Campana building is on the National Historic Registry, the tank should be removed, refurbished and rebuilt to its current form and donated to the historical society. It deserves to remain a part of the history for all of Batavia to enjoy.

John Fermanis, President of MSN Corporation, and has been a resident in the Campana building since 2001. They are happy at the Campana building and they utilize 7,000 square feet of space. His rent pays for 80% of the annual property taxes of the Campana Building. He pays the City of Batavia over \$4,000 per month for electricity. He considers himself a pretty good Batavia commercial resident. He asked the Commission to not make a decision of the subsill windows until they see a sample of what the window is going to look like. All the HPC has seen is an artist rendition. It is important to the historic significance. What are the windows going to look like and will they be everything Evergreen has said they would do. He suggested putting the sample of the glass pane against the brick to ensure that it is invisible. He stated that another concern for him is the view from Route 31. There will be eight handicap parking spaces added right in front of the historic entrance. He asked if there would be a handicap ramp to meet ADA specifications and if there will be a handrail added. He asked if there would be a handicap panel to press to automatically open the doors. He noted that there are two historic doors in the front and right behind them are two other non-historic doors. The non-historic doors could be removed but it must be dealt with if we are to have handicap people use the front door. He suggested using the north entrance as a handicap entrance because there is no grade. He continued that the eight handicap parking spaces could be added to the northwest of the building, where all the handicap units would be.

Langley stated that there would be no changes to the façade. There is a gentle sloped walk up to the door. It does not require a rail. They would have to create a properly placed handicapped door operator that meets all of the federal guidelines for placement and clearance at the doors. The automatic doors will have both doors open at the same time. He stated that there is detail on the drawings for that.

Emily Erickson, 1851 Allen Drive, asked if the Historic Tax Credits could be applied by the current owner or is it strictly for a housing redevelopment. Rubano answered that current owners can apply, one could also not be an owner and apply but you would have to get a letter from the owner stating that it is okay to apply if you don't own the building outright. The tax credits go to whatever owns the building and ultimately the owner is very involved in the tax process and the application. Erickson handed out a packet of information to the Commission including aerial photos of the Campana Building from the Geneva Township Land Records Office.

Erickson stated she read through tonight's agenda and it includes Evergreen's historic preservation certification application revised part two to the National Park Service as part of its application for the historic tax credits. She has also read through the original application to nominate the Campana building for placement on National Historic Registry of Places (NHRP). The original nomination to the NHRP discusses the north and south additions to the Campana building being built in the 1940's and were included in the narrative on the nomination form. She read the nomination form where it states that there has been only one major addition to the factory, in the late 1940's two glass block wings were added to extend the first floor of the structure, one on each end. While these wings detract somewhat from the smooth corners of the original structure the materials used are identical to the original and addition is in harmony with the style of the factory. She referred the Commission to the aerial photos of the Campana building. It shows the north and south additions were added at some point by the spring of 1970. There is a photo from the records office from 1963, which does not show the north and south

additions. And then there is a photo from the spring of 1970 that does show the additions being present. We could deduce from the photos that somewhere between 1963 and 1970 the north and south additions were built, based on the photographs. We have the application to nominate the building and place it on the National Historic Registry saying that the additions were done in the 1940's but we have photos showing that the additions were built in the 1970's. Evergreen's part two application to the National Park Service to obtain Federal Tax Credits on July 20, 2017. In more places that she could count it refers to the north and south additions as being built in the 1940's. When looking at aerial photos from the Geneva Township's office, it is clear that the western commercial warehouse was built by 1956. An aerial photo from 1939 does not show the warehouse but an aerial photo from 1956 does show the warehouse. We could deduce that sometime between 1939 and 1956 the warehouse on the western side of the Campana building was built. But, Evergreen's application to the National Tax Service for the historic tax credits states that the warehouse was built in the 1990's. This is all very confusing. She hopes that the people making the decision for the historic tax credits can make sense of this. In the agenda for tonight's meeting there is a document titled "Historic Preservation Certification Application Revised Part Two." This document is an important part of the paperwork for Evergreen to receive the federal tax credits for the Campana project and is dated July 20th. Given that Evergreen is at the point in the approval process to come before the HPC for approval, we still have discrepancies in the documents submitted to the Federal Government this is all very confusing and concerning. This is an official document submitted to the Federal Government to obtain historic tax credits and it has several discrepancies. It would appear her own income tax filings are more scrutinized than this multi-million dollar tax credit application. Accuracy matters and the ages of the structures have an impact on the preservation standards used in reviewing this project. She asked what is the proper means to address these errors and how could this governing body consider a COA in light of these inaccuracies. She asked when the Campana building was designated as a landmark, was the building as a whole designated as a landmark or were the north and south wings excluded from the landmark designation. Hagemann answered the building as a whole and stated that this body has no authority over the historic tax credits.

Albertson clarified that the west wing was entirely reconstructed in the late 1980's early 1990's and there is permit paperwork to prove it. There may have been a structure there before but it was completely reconstructed in the late 80's early 90's. Block stated that they had nothing to do with the 1970's nomination document. That document, which is what is called the Keeper Document, is the official document of record on file with the National Park service which says those wings were built in the 1940's. To some extent we are looking at that information but people make mistakes, including historic preservationists. Block asked John Kramer, Preservation Consultant, to address the Commission.

Kramer stated that they now know that the 1970's document is incorrect, the aerials that Kane County provided us show that the wings were at least beginning to be built between 1963-1970. They also have historic drawings of the wings that show in fact the wings, where only a portion were constructed before 1970 and they were actually extended sometime after 1970. What you see today is a circa 1970 or even later construction.

Dr. John Kefer asked to speak to the Commission about the antenna and the effects of radio frequency on health. Chair Hagemann stated that if it does not have anything to do with the

historic nature of the building that the Commission has no authority over that. Buening stated that as part of the Telecommunications Act we cannot regulate anything in regards to the radio frequency from cell towers.

Joe Kefer, 1740 Pheasant Run Place, strongly suggested that the Commission contact Kane County and ask for the status of the environmental assessments and why. He implored the HPC to get the answers to all of your questions and that you see everything in order and that you don't rush into anything. As you have heard from Mr. Rubano, this is a very complicated process so why would we move forward without having some of these questions answered and why would we move forward without knowing that any of these conditions that Mr. Rubano has placed, just as one example, have not yet been met. This is about the future and he would like to discuss what might happen to this building if Evergreen continues forward with this project under these circumstances. These are proposed to be lofts. The reason why they are lofts is because you cannot get any windows in the bedrooms. The only window space in those apartments are on the ground floor. Why are these windows allowed. First there is an effort to preserve this building and its historic designation. There have been a lot of leeway and concessions given to Evergreen. Every side of this building has been conceded in some respect. On the east side, you see the windows on the north and south wings the add-ons, you see the ground floor windows on the east façade. The north, west and south sides are clearly forgiven and they are doing what they can to put windows in all of their lofts. Those sides, in his view, have been completely given up. The east side is being encroached upon by having those windows there. Why are we putting vegetation in front of that view. The only reason why is because of the windows. He showed photos of the Batavia History Website and one is from the packet tonight. There is no vegetation on the ground. If we are going to preserve this then let's preserve this. The only reason why vegetation is there is because Evergreen wants to put rooms on the east façade. That violates the historic designation and only used to cover those windows. He asked the HPC to put themselves in the place of a resident of the east facing rooms on the ground floor. People looking out those windows will only see mud and vegetation. They will not see the sky. The quality of life for those residents is going to be very low. Within six months to a year they will come asking for windows. It directly relates to the historic designation and you will be faced with a choice, give the people windows because the ones on the ground floor are not windows or you are going to keep that line with the historic designation. It is not humane to have people living in those rooms where the only windows are the ones proposed. He suggested to not allow Evergreen to build the windows on the ground floor because if you do eventually someone is going to ask you to put in more windows and when they do the historic designation is going to come down and there will no longer be a historic designation any longer. He concluded that Evergreen has asked for 1.6 million to add sixteen more apartments to this project. He handed out a document supporting his comment.

John Hunter, 919 Redwing Geneva, shared that he worked out of the Campana building since 2001. He asked why there are only the windows checked on the COA. It seems to be a limited scope of what is to be reviewed here. He asked if there are elevation drawings to show the changes to the original entry. He asked for more details because he does not feel that it is an adequate size for a wheelchair to access the building. He asked how many lighting poles would be installed on the east side of the property to illuminate the newly reconfigured oval and the road that leads to the south side of the building. He is concerned how the proposed cell enclosure

would change the original look to the building. He has concern about the historic elements of the building. The IBM master clock and water storage tank are much a part of the history of that building as anything. They should be kept where they are. He would like details on stairway modifications. Chair Hagemann noted that the HPC does not have any authority over the interior of the building. Hunter asked what is behind the façade of the building. We all know that it is a steel beam construction with concrete. Hunter stated that he would like a rendering of what the final project would look like, including the parking lot, subsill windows, ADA accessibility, cell tower screenings, and handicap parking modifications. He would like a visual representation of that and it is relevant to the discussion at hand. He noted that there are discrepancies with the subsill windows on the drawings provided. One makes the windows look much larger than the other and he wonders which is the most accurate rendering.

Chair Hagemann addressed the question regarding the COA. He explained that there is also a box checked that states exterior alteration and repair and all the attachments and supplements provided with the COA. Albertson added the details are in the packet. Hagemann asked the applicant about the lighting because he did not see that as part of the application. Langley answered that the lighting was submitted as part of the application for the plan. The fixtures and the spacing all comply with the City of Batavia standards and will also be reviewed by the State and National Historic people as well. Bus asked that at a future meeting the lighting plans be shared with the HPC. Hagemann concurred.

Emily Erickson asked if the frame of the windows would be painted to match the brick. Block showed a rendering of the profile of the frames and stated that it would be a complementary tone. The frames would be minimally visible but with the landscape plantings and berms it would minimize the view of the windows from the street.

Jeffery Wilson asked for Rubano's input on the access road. Rubano stated that they do not like the access road and it is something that they would not like to see in this project. But there is a lot of stuff in his career that he approved that he feels is hideous as long as it meets the standards and a lot of stuff that is gorgeous that he has denied because they do not meet the standards. He would not like to see it there but it could be designed to meet the standards so that it is visually minimized and would not have any impact on the historic nature of the site and there could be a way for that to happen. It would involve the topography, which is addressed in one of the civil drawings attached to the packet and the placement of it is so far back and that anyone who parallel parks on it would have to be towed. If it has to be there it should be a single lane so that there would be no parallel parking on it. He has come to learn that the City of Batavia is requiring the two lanes. We need to try to ensure that cars don't sit there and park. This is something that is a requirement from the City of Batavia and his office is trying to understand this as a requirement and how can one design it so that its visual impact is minimized.

Rubano was asked about the racetrack parking. Rubano stated that it is historically appropriate that cars parked on this racetrack. The shape and placement of the racetrack is critical. Right in front of the building there is green lawn and is very critical to the historic nature of the building. The historic solution is maintaining the racetrack and maintaining the lawn in front of the building that is also very critical to have the continuation of the racetrack shape and an original component of the site plan.

Chair Hagemann asked if there were further comments from the public. There were none. Hagemann asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the Commission at this time. There were none. Hagemann then reviewed the items and documents that the Commission has requested from the applicant. Hagemann stated that he would like to see some elevation renderings on what the project would look like and color renderings. He explained that even for non-contributing buildings the Commission has asked for color renderings on what the project would look like. He continued that if we did not ask for this we would be doing a huge disservice to our charge as the HPC. Sherer asked for color samples and materials for the proposed windows. Block stated that he is not certain they could provide an actual sample of the windows because the company has to fabricate those windows. It will be part of the conditions that would happen during construction and there will be review of those windows at the Federal and State level. Without the approval of the HPC they cannot move forward with the project and will not get to the point of having the windows ordered, even at a sample level. Block explained that the window order would happen when they are under construction. The conditions requested would be addressed on an interim basis during the construction process. They build mock ups on the site to show what is provided meets the conditions. If you need to see the mock up now than we can't move forward with this project and the construction. Hagemann stated that if nothing else, to provide whatever type of samples the window company could provide and any photos of examples of buildings that have used similar types of windows.

The HPC asked for the following to be provided:

- Window company samples and any photos of buildings with similar types of windows as the ones proposed
- On site visit at the Campana building for the next HPC meeting
- Color renderings of what the building would look like in completion including the wheelchair accessible ramp, lighting and the burm
- 106 Review from Kane County
- FONSI Report
- Outline of the dimensions of the subsill windows be provided on the approximate location on the block for the on site visit

Albertson stated that the site visit could be a part of the next meeting. The COA review would be continued to the meeting in two weeks assuming that the developer is ready.

Motion: To table the COA Review to the August 28, 2017 HPC meeting

Maker: Bus

Second: Sherer

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Bus, Hohmann, Sullivan, Hagemann, Sherer

Nay: None

5-0 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion carried.

Hohmann asked for an outline of the dimensions of the subsill windows to be provided on the approximate location on the block.

7. Updates:

- 1. 7 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**
- 2. Anderson Block Building – Masonry Maintenance**
- 3. Significant Historic Building Inspection Program**
- 4. 10/12 North River Street – Historic Inspection**
- 5. 227 West Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**
- 6. 129 South Batavia Avenue – Historic Inspection**
- 7. 8 North River Street – Historic Inspection**
- 8. 16 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection**
- 9. Certified Local Government**

Albertson reported that City continues to work with the property owners and several of these buildings are moving forward with projects. 109 South Batavia Avenue building and the 10/12 North River Street building both have ongoing work being done. The Certified Local Government paperwork is being completed.

Sherer asked if what she sent Albertson about the Anderson Block building would be addressed. Albertson stated that it would. Sherer asked about Stosh's former building. Albertson stated that the owner has gutted the interior of the building and will be coming with a window replacement proposal. The roof has been redone, the tuckpointing of the brick is mostly done, and there are discussions being held on timeline.

8. Other Business

There was no other business to discuss at this time.

9. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Hagemann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:57pm; Made by Hohmann; Seconded by Sullivan. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith