

**MINUTES**  
**Historic Preservation Commission**  
**July 9, 2008**  
**Municipal Complex, 100 W. Woodstock Street, Crystal Lake, IL**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Alt called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. on July 9, 2008, at the Municipal Complex in Crystal Lake.

**II. Roll Call/Attendance**

Present were the following Commission members: Brice Alt, Diana Kenney, LeeAnn Atwood, Sandra Price, Tom Nemcek and Bob Wyman. Also present was Eric Helm, Assistant to the City Manager. Anthony Rubano of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, arrived at 8:30 PM.

**III. Public Comment**

There was no one in the public who wished to speak.

**IV. Discussion of Window Review Guidelines including Presentation by IHPA Architect**

The Commission reviewed the 30-minute video, "Windows – Preservation Treatments" by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. City Staff Helm distributed interior and exterior pictures of the windows at 127 College Street. At this meeting the Commission was not making a decision regarding the appeal of the Commission's denial of the certificate of appropriateness for 127 College Street.

Following the video Member Kenney introduced Anthony Rubano from the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). He described the standards used by the IHPA to evaluate window changes for the Property Tax Assessment Freeze Program. For primary facades, replacement windows must match the original in size and style, however aluminum clad, with powder-coated paint, windows are allowed.

Several Commission members asked what makes a window too deteriorated to be repaired. Mr. Rubano stated that if a professional restoration contractor states that the windows cannot be restored, the windows are too deteriorated for repair.

Several Commission members asked how storm windows are treated. Mr. Rubano stated that storm windows are sometimes referred to as the "secondary glazing" due to their role in protecting the main windows. A cyclical reglazing is necessary and locks should be evaluated to identify whether they appropriately seal the window. He stated that the 1" – 2 ½" of air pocket between the window and the storm window eliminates perceived drafts. An approved storm window has the following attributes:

- Must have a powder coated "paint-like" finish (cannot be anodized aluminum)
- Cannot pan over the sill
- Must fit within the brick mold
- Fit over the interior or exterior of the window, since they are meant to be a protective layer.

He stated that the storm window's material is not as important as the profile and design of the storm window. The IHPA does not mandate that the existing storm windows be kept. The IHPA may approve new storm windows, but request that the owner "store" its existing storm windows. Member Kenney agreed and does not believe that the Commission should require property owners to install wood storm windows. Mr. Rubano stated that the Commission can establish its own rules, but should be consistent.

Several Commission members asked how the IHPA differentiates between primary and secondary elevations. Mr. Rubano stated that a building could have three facades: primary, secondary and tertiary. He stated that the first job of the Commission is to determine what is the primary, secondary and tertiary façade of the structure in question. Regarding primary facades, these are highly visible from the roadway and contribute to the architectural significance of the structure. Changes to the primary façade must match very closely to the original. He stated that the IHPA allows the homeowner to have one tertiary façade, so that the homeowner can make major changes, like an addition or a porch. Regarding 127 College Street, the façade facing the roadway is definitely primary. The side of the house facing the northeast could be considered primary. The other side of the house may be secondary, with the back of the house labeled tertiary.

Member Kenney asked how the IHPA addresses the replacement of "non-historic" windows or other "non-historic" elements. Mr. Rubano stated that if the existing window is not historic, the IHPA would approve an aluminum clad window replacement. The IHPA allows the homeowner to keep existing, non-historic elements. Also, the IHPA does not require that the homeowner demolish these items; but, if the owner is going to replace these existing features the changes must conform to the IHPA standards.

Member Nemcek asked about using replacement oak, instead of pine. Mr. Rubano stated that, similar to new pine, oak trees are forced to grow very quickly and are not as good as the original "old growth" oak. About 70% of the original historic windows are pine; but the quality of new wood is very poor.

Regarding 127 College Street, Member Kenney stated that the biggest issues facing the Commission are the treatment of the storm windows and the treatment of the non-original side kitchen windows. Member Wyman asked how the Commission should address storm windows. He stated that metal clad storm windows should be allowed, since they serve to protect the historic windows. Member Kenney, Member Price and Member Atwood tended to agree as long as the storm window meets certain design requirements. Chair Alt stated that he would grant a certificate of appropriateness for a "non-wood" storm window, but would only give façade grant funding to storm windows that match the original in design and material. Member Nemcek feels that replacement storm windows should match the original in design and material.

**V. Member Inquires and Reports**

None.

**VI. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Member Kenney moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 p.m. Member Wyman seconded the motion. On voice vote, all voted aye. Motion passed.