

**MINUTES**  
**August 28, 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 5:35pm.

**2. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Chair Hagemann; Vice-Chair Roller; Commissioners Sherer, Sullivan, and Bus

**Members Absent:** Commissioner Hohmann

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

**3. Site Tour of Exterior Façade – 901 North Batavia Avenue**

The meeting began in the foyer of 901 North Batavia Avenue, Campana, due to rain and lightning. Dennis Langley, project architect, showed the Commission and attendees a sample of the window (Imagine Glass) and sample of the Stealth Enclosure material. Langley explained that the windows and berm will have a belt and suspenders approach where the windows will have the brick pattern imprinted on the glass and the berm would hide the windows from view. Langley explained that the brick pattern would align horizontally to the surrounding brick and they will do their best to catch the vertical pattern when they can.

The meeting continued outside the building. The applicant placed masking tape to represent the location and size of the proposed sub sill windows. A steel header would be used as support under the sill and the brick would be notched. The steel would be repainted and caulked. The brick being removed for the installation of the sub sill windows were from 1957. The building was originally terracotta. The applicant showed the attendees how the berm would be 20ft out from the building and explained that it would be 2ft tall. The windows could be opened by four inches. The repairs to the building were discussed including the brick repaired to stop expansion, anything broken would be replaced, the vertical cracks in the tower would be fixed, cracked brick replaced, and the original striped glass block would replace broken blocks and nonmatching blocks would be removed. Vents would be removed and replaced with glass block. The handicap ramp was described to the Commission and would extend for a gentle slope. A new granite piece would be placed onto the building and an automatic operator would be installed for the two doors. Along the wing the air conditioning unit on the far left would be removed and the other unit would stay.

**4. Recess to Return to 100 North Island Avenue**

The meeting was recessed at 6:04pm.

**5. Meeting Re-Called to Order at 100 North Island Avenue**

The meeting reconvened at 6:21pm.

**6. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Chair Hagemann; Vice-Chair Roller; Commissioners Sherer, Sullivan, and Bus

**Members Absent:** Commissioner Hohmann

**Also Present:** Mayor Schielke; Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Scott Buening, Director of Community Development; Anthony Isom, Administrative Assistant to the City Administrator; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

**7. Approval of Minutes: August 14, 2017**

**Motion:** To approve the minutes from August 14, 2017

**Maker:** Sherer

**Second:** Bus

**Voice Vote:** 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent  
Motion carried.

**8. Items to be Removed, Added or Changed**

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

**Motion:** To approve the agenda

**Maker:** Sullivan

**Second:** Sherer

**Voice Vote:** 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Absent  
Motion carried.

**9. 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.

**10. COA Review Continued: 901 North Batavia Avenue**

**Facade Revisions (Evergreen Real Estate Group, applicant)**

Chair Hagemann noted that this COA Review has been continued from the August 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. Block stated that the Kane County Historic Preservation Review and the Conditional Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were provided to the Commission as requested. He summarized the documents and stated that the Kane County Document requested removal of the large windows proposed on the wings of the building. Kane County requested that all the windows be

consistent with the subsill windows on the main portion of the building. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), represented by Anthony Rubano, will be submitting a part-two approval letter with a number of conditions. Kane County wants to see the documents they submit with those responses to those conditions. Block stated that they are happy to share those with the HPC as well and feel that everyone seeing the same documents makes a lot of sense. There are a number of other items in the Kane County Conditional FONSI that are related to other topics that are not relative to historic preservation.

The proposed sub sill windows were discussed. The windows would be flat and consistent with the masonry but there will be some areas that would look visually not complete as the rest of the building, which is why they are proposing the landscape in front of the windows.

Dennis Langley discussed the site plan and the accessible parking routes. The access road drive was discussed and how they plan to swoop the drive in between the two existing trees.

Dennis Langely distributed a rendering of the Campana building. He explained that the rendering is to scale and shows the lighting of the building and the parking lot. The historic photo of the building was used to determine how the building would be lit at night. Lighting would be placed in spaces that we are not using, even in the upper part of the tower, to replicate how the building was lit.

Sherer asked about the landscaping. Langley stated that the proposed landscaping is allowed based on the new use they understand that there is a need for it and Batavia has a requirement for foundation landscaping as well. The rest of the open field was their primary concern so we are keeping the trees and adding a few trees. The trees that they are adding are what was found in the historic images. There was a line of trees along Fabyan. The oval and open lawn is very much considered a part of the historic nature of the building. Block spoke to the Secretary of the Interior Standards and what that conceptually allows and doesn't allow from the perspective of making changes. Block introduced John Kramer, consultant, to give an overview of the standards.

John Kramer, Historic Advisors of Chicago, 3 West Jackson, addressed the Commission. The Secretary of the Interior Standards are the design standards that the National Park Service, State and the Batavia HPC are supposed to follow. We are to retain existing features if possible and if not repair or replace in kind with something compatible. In terms of the landscape, Anthony Rubano at the State was concerned about keeping the landscaping to a minimum. The proposed landscape plans are a compromise addressing the local landscape requirement and the fact that there was very little landscaping on the property. We will be adding trees along the south end of the property to keep with the historic nature. There are aerials that show that landscaping. The landscaping is to block the views of the windows as much as possible.

Block stated that when fully grown the intent of the landscaping is to be just a little bit higher than the sill height of the window so that it just blocks that without blocking much of any of the glass block. Bus asked for the staff to look more closely at the landscaping plan and encourage more native plantings. Roller agreed that she too would like to see more native plantings on the berm.

Chair Hagemann opened the floor for public comment and noted that the only thing under the purview of the Commission are the modifications to the exterior of the building and how it would impact its historic significance.

Jenna Dempsey, Allendale, BFA of Graphic Design from University of Illinois, is pleased to see how people are restoring the historic integrity of the building. She asked about the visibility of the reverse side of the window. She asked if the image on the window could fade over time with sun exposure. Langley answered no. Dempsey asked if the windows would be laid out in exact symmetry. Langley stated that they would be laid out in a regular pattern like the State Historic and National Historic Agencies have requested. Dempsey asked about the pieces of the Stealth screen. Langley stated that they would be installed in panels and look like one solid piece. He encouraged everyone to visit the Stealth website for more information. Dempsey asked if the nonmatching glass blocks would be replaced. Langley stated that they would be replaced with original glass block taken from the north elevation and put it in the tower so that the tower would have all original 12x12 glass block. She asked what they are screening the mattress store with. Langley answered that the landscaping is part of the City of Batavia landscaping ordinance. Dempsey asked if there would be deciduous trees. Langley stated that the intent is to have both evergreens and deciduous trees screening the windows. She asked who would be in charge of maintaining the plants. Chair Hagemann stated that the maintenance has nothing to do with this Commission. She asked if there would be anything to prevent the residents from using the backside of the berm as patio space. Chair Hageman stated that has nothing to do with this Commission. Hagemann suggested that questions be answered at the end of the public testimony to be consistent with other meetings.

Lisa Dechiera, from Landmarks Illinois, shared that Landmarks Illinois had this building on the state-wide endangered list in 2006 and have been monitoring this building for a long time. She stated that it is impressive to see some interesting design solutions come forward that allows this building to have a future. This is a challenging building physically as well as its layout. If we are to see this building have viability going forward and have economic viability, this plan to reuse for residential is an important use because it will bring the economic investment that is needed. There are challenges to the façade in multiple places and if that is not repaired in short order we are going to see further deterioration coming up in a number of years. This is an important investment. The agencies that have reviewed this are extremely strict in their review of the Secretary of Interior Standards. We are excited to see that this building was so important and that there was an opportunity to create design solutions like the windows that allows for meeting code for the residential reuse. She stressed that it is remarkable to see this type of work come together and the solution brought to you. She hopes that you would support it as we do.

Bus asked what about this building in 2006 made Landmarks Illinois place it on the endangered list. Dechiera answered that they saw that this building needed investment and improvements. There were some design solutions put forward which would not have merited approval by the Secretary of Interior standards. If this project is using tax credits than those standards would be the baseline of what needs to be reviewed to retain historic integrity.

Guy Prisco, Holmstad, addressed the Commission. He stated that he is very concerned about this building and the use being proposed. Chair Hagemann stated that the use has nothing to do with this Commission. Prisco stated that it does because the use has to do with the modifications to the historic nature of the building. Chair Hagemann stressed that the Commission has no say over the use of the building. Prisco stated that the proposed windows are taking up a large portion of the wall and the wall will be greatly affected by the windows and there will be very little left of the wall when the windows are put in there. He added that the glass block and proposed windows eliminates any insulating value of the wall.

Emily Ericson, 1851 Allen Drive, stated that the proposed subsill windows and the berm cover up changes the integrity of the historic nature of the building. The tower is the biggest, most visible piece from all areas around the building. The tower being changed takes away from the historic nature of the Campana sign and the historic tower. The proposed changes to the tower should be looked at and addressed and she does not feel that it is a feasible alternative.

Joe Kefer, 1740 Pheasant Run Place, brought the Commissioners a ninety-three page letter submitted by Samantha Malusky, his wife. Kefer stated that she unfortunately could not attend tonight's meeting due to health reasons. What the letter discusses are specific references to the Batavia Historic Preservation Code and addresses the issues and items discussed and relates them to the code and argues that the code does not allow for these changes to the structure. Part of the code says health and safety and welfare for the occupants of the building. There is an overarching argument that it is not according to the Historic Preservation Code. Also discussed in the letter is the Department of Interior Guidelines on what the building needs to adhere to. Kefer asked how far the windows open that are subsill along the ground. Are you considering any items related to the racetrack or is it outside your jurisdiction. Chair Hagemann stated that it is not outside of the jurisdiction. Kefer asked about the lights showing that they are on the ground trying managing the historic view of the east façade. There needs to be a sidewalk around the racetrack in relation to the health and safety for the tenants. People will be walking to the building at all hours of the day. It is not only going to be used for parking but it is going to be a roadway for entrances and exits. There needs to be a safe way to get to the building without getting hit by a car. There needs to be a sidewalk. Kefer stated that this issue was addressed at the 8-16-17 Plan Commission meeting and Mr. Block said that Mr. Rubano addressed this and it is very complicated. Kefer admitted that he was paraphrasing. Kefer stated that he spoke with Anthony Rubano and he informed him that a sidewalk has never been proposed for the racetrack and he is more that willing to consider any proposal from Evergreen. What we are dealing with are the health and safety for the residents of the building and the developer responds that it is complicated. It is unacceptable. He would like Evergreen to ensure that a sidewalk is put in so that people could get to the building. Kefer stated that the developer also told the Commission that they would have to approve the windows before a sample could be provided. Now there is a sample. He submitted that it is very relevant and to be careful when the developer says he can and cannot do something. Requiring a sidewalk is in line with the Historic Preservation Code that says any changes need to be for the health, safety and welfare of the tenants.

Bus stated that the parking area should not be referred to as a racetrack and suggested referring to it as an ellipse. Bus asked Buening if a sidewalk is a requirement. Buening stated that the City requires a sidewalk to get to the building to a public street and the developer has provided that

along the Fabyan side and that would meet the requirement of the code. Bus asked if a sidewalk would be required around the ellipse. Buening stated that he would have to double check but he does not feel that it would be a requirement. Bus stated that if the City of Batavia requires a sidewalk the sidewalk would be there.

Kefer asked the developer to submit plans for a sidewalk.

Steven Cooper, attorney representing Mr. Kefer, stated that Phil Bus knows better than anyone in this room that, whether or not something is required, the City has the power to negotiate whatever they want in a PUD. If you feel that it is appropriate you could make it a condition for approval.

Sherry Lindy shared her concern with the wheelchair ramp not having a railing on it because railings are used when you lose your balance when you are maneuvering up a ramp. You need something to lean on otherwise you will fall completely over. In the wintertime with ice and snow that is a safety concern. It should have further discussion because it would affect the look.

Jennifer Beale, 712 Forest Avenue Geneva, shared that she has a background in Chemistry. She asked about lamination process. Is the lamination process a process of spraying microscopic beads on the glass or on a layer of plastic in between layers of glass. Langley stated the latter. Beale asked if it is similar to tinting car windows. Langley stated that it is a film that is printed on the glass and similar to safety glass with a printed pattern on it. She asked if it would be possible to reveal the chemical compound to be used on the glass. She is wondering because when the compounds when exposed to sunlight could fade over time.

John Hunter, Allendale, shared that he works at the Campana building on the second floor. He asked if it is true that the fluted glass is like safety glass and non-breakable in an emergency. Regarding the sidewalk, he wonders if Kane County would require a sidewalk adjacent to a parking lot in this type of situation. The members of the public would like to view a sample of the window up close to get a feel of it. He asked does the drawing of the slip road take into account the KDOT study, which provided further setbacks into the property. Is there a sample of the granite steps that will be extended further from the door. How does the berm effect drainage. Are the parking lot lights no longer 8-10 ft tall or are they shorter now. He stated that he does not see the berm on the rendering. He added that he does not think we should be hiding the front façade of the building. The endangered list questioned asked by Mr. Bus did not receive a satisfactory answer and he would like to see photographic evidence from 2006 and compare it to how the building looks now.

Emily Ericson stated to be careful to think that this is the only use for the building. This isn't the only answer to the building. Hunter concurred. Ericson concluded it doesn't mean the failing of the building.

A masonry mock up and the glazing were shown to the meeting attendees. Langley stated that the frame would be a beige color. There is a film inside two layers of glass (it is a laminated glass product) and then there would be more layers of glass on that to make it an insulated glass product. They would be working to get the image as close as possible to the surrounding brick. It

is non-glare glass and they intend to keep the plane and the solid look of the wall. Another sample was ordered with adjustments and they will bring it in. What one would see is a solid wall and the plan is to keep the solid look of the wall. Langley stated that the printing process is on dots. They print on the white side and it allows you to see through it. Buening asked if it was similar to the decals on city buses and Langley answered yes. Hagemann asked if this would fade over time and Langley stated that he would have to get that information. Lagley stated that once a reasonable sample is received they would order an actual window and photograph it and document it and get both the State's and Federal's approval. Sherer asked if the sample shows how it would be to look out the window. Langley answered yes, it is similar to looking through sunglasses. Bus asked about the r value of that product. Langley answered that the u value is .35 and is a high performance window. Block stated that it would be better than any un-insulated portion of the wall. They are planning to insulate the wall on the inside. There will be eighty windows in the east elevation and comes out to four windows per unit. Roller asked if the glass would be able to be broken in an emergency. Langley stated that because of its location it would have to be tempered glass with safety glazing and there is no requirement that this window be an egress window. The building has all the appropriate exits, is sprinklered, fire alarmed and with fire rated walls. It is not like detached residential where there has to be egress out of the bedroom window.

The Stealth material sample was distributed to the Commission for review. Lagley noted that this is the seven-foot band that would be at the top of the building. The material is fiberglass. On the rendering it is shown on top of the Campana sign. The idea is to hide the cell towers as best as possible and the idea came from the National Park Service.

Chair Hagemann asked the developer to answer any questions they could that was brought up at tonight's meeting. Block stated that the specific species is listed on the landscape plan and was submitted to the Commission. In regards to the depth of the berm and if people would use that as patio space, he stated that they would discourage people from doing that. If there is a problem they would address it as a management company.

Block asked if Landmarks Illinois could further discuss the endangered listing. Dechiera stated that they take nominations from the public annually on buildings that they feel to be vulnerable and threatened. Our staff and board review the nominations. Back in 2006 the feeling was the building needed substantial investment to be improved. We all realize that this is a difficult building to reuse and to invest in and we wanted to bring attention to it due to the architectural and historical significance. It is a building worthy of preservation.

Block stated that the cell towers on the side of the building detract from the aesthetic of this as a historic building. The screening allows for maintaining the pure geometry of the tower and they and the State Historic Preservation Office believes that this is the best solution for the cell towers.

Block continued addressing the questions presented at the meeting. He stated that they would look into the chemical compound for the windows. The windows would have a four-inch stop to them. The parking lights are ten feet tall. Because of the slope, a handicap rail is not a requirement. It is something that they could look into and look at the texturing of the walkway to

ensure that it is as resistant to slipping as possible. We feel that it is better from a historic perspective to keep the vertical elements to a minimum. Buening answered that the County has no jurisdiction over sidewalks in this area because it is a municipality. Buening stated that drainage of the berm would be addressed at the time of permits if this is approved.

Bus encouraged the developer to work on a more interesting landscape plan that offers a variety of indigenous northern Illinois species. Sullivan stated that in the past we have told other property owners they had to replace like for like materials and that is not being followed here. He asked if this change is over the threshold of changes we approved in the past. Albertson stated that he is not sure that the HPC has seen anything in this context before. Albertson continued that the Commission has been willing to work with property owners to come up with the best solution and gave the example of the buildings on Batavia Avenue and the windows. A true like for like replacement would be true divided light. We have allowed applicants to take advantage of newer materials with a similar look like simulated divided light. Sherer stated that one thing to keep in mind is that they are proposing eighty windows in the front of the building, which would totally change the original architecture of the building. She noted that the architect agreed that it would change the architecture of the building at the last meeting. Roller stated that the Stealth enclosure looks significantly better than the antennae on the exterior of the building. She agrees with not touching the glass block because the glass block is what makes this building. She believes that keeping the windows below the sill and using innovative technology is a great idea. There are plantings on the building now and we are continuing that and agrees with indigenous species for plantings but understands the evergreen for the linear aspect. Hagemann agrees with the Stealth enclosure to hide the antennae. Hagemann feels that the lighting brings back more of the historic view of the building. The attempts to hide the windows are acceptable and the overall aspect of preserving the rest of the exterior of the building outweighs the negative.

Hagemann asked if the Commission wanted to act on the COA. Sherer stated that she would like more time to review the materials that were given to the Commission. There was no objection from the Commission. Sullivan asked if there was a timeline for the Commission to act on the COA. Albertson stated that there is. The Commission could continue this to one more meeting and that meeting the HPC would have to act on the COA unless the developer agrees to an additional continuance. The next meeting would be September 11, 2017.

**Motion:** To continue the COA Review to the September 11, 2017 HPC meeting

**Maker:** Bus

**Second:** Sherer

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

**Nay:** None

5-0 Vote, 1 Absent, Motion carried.

## 11. 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**

There were no updates at this time.

## **12. Other Business**

Sullivan announced that on September 17<sup>th</sup> the Batavia Arts Council is hosting an event that includes a tour of the historic Joel McKee house at 345 North Batavia Avenue. Sullivan would forward the information to Jeff Albertson.

## **13. Adjournment**

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Hagemann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:52pm; Made by Bus; Seconded by Sherer. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith