

**MINUTES**  
**Historic Preservation Commission**  
**January 7, 2010**  
**Municipal Complex, 100 W. Woodstock Street, Crystal Lake, IL**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Alt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**II. Roll Call/Attendance**

Present were the following commission members: Chair Brice Alt, Diana Kenney, Tom Nemcek, LeeAnn Atwood, Sandy Price, Michelle Rozovics, and Bob Wyman. Staff member Elizabeth Maxwell, Planner, was present.

**III. Public Comment**

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

**IV. Approval of Minutes of the December 3, 2009 Regular Meeting**

Member Wyman noted that he was not present at the December meeting and so could not have made a motion to approve the November minutes. Member Kenney stated that she had made the second. Chair Alt moved to approve the amended minutes of the December 3, 2009 regular meeting. Member Wyman seconded the motion. On voice vote, all members voted aye. Motion passed.

**V. Discussion of the 2010 Trolley Tour**

Chair Alt asked the commission to review the letter he had written to Lakeside and Lakewood regarding the Trolley Tour. The commission decided to have the letter reflect the entire time the trolleys would be on the road and not just the tour times so the letter will be amended to reflect a 9:00 am start and 3:00 pm finish. Chair Alt stated that he would like a map of the tour route to include with the letters. Member Kenny said that the commission needed to do another drive to finalize the tour route. Once the tour route is finalized they can assign the different properties to members for research. Member Nemcek asked that the commission meet on Sunday the 10<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 am for another tour drive. He also stated that he will try to print note sheets with pictures of the historic houses on them so the members can take notes during the drive. The commission also discussed meeting at the Colonel Palmer House to research what information is already available. The members set the date of January 16<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 am. The commission asked staff to provide the tour insurance.

**VI. Presentation on a proposed Downtown Historic District**

Member Kenney provided the commission with a handout of the power point presentation. She stated that this was a preliminary analysis and some properties can be removed or others may be added after further research. The District would encompass the east and west sides of the north block of Williams Street, Woodstock Street, the Train Depot and the east side of Main Street to the Witte Building. The district would be a local historic designation which would help the commission determine eligible grant funds. In the future the properties could also be on the national register and qualify for tax benefits. Member Wyman stated that when they propose this district they should have a handout illustrating the current and future benefits to help property owners decide to be a part of the district. Member Kenney began the presentation. The commission discussed and made determinations on the following properties.

- 1) 51 N. Williams Street. Member Kenney reported on the changes to the windows and door opening from the original elevation. The commission discussed that some of the original indented sign area may still be under the current awnings. The commission decided that this building was contributing to the district.
- 2) 53-63 N. Williams Street. Member Kenney explained that there were significant changes done to this building. The previous owner, Dan Malone, removed a portion of the roof, changed the windows and constructed a mansard roof to the front of the façade. He had also owned the Crystal Lake Bank & Trust building and when that mansard roof was removed very little of the original façade remained. The commission had little hope that the original façade could be restored. They decided this building was not contributing because the current improvements were not reversible. Member Atwood asked what contributing and not contributing means if they will all be within the district. Member Kenny said only contributing buildings will be eligible for tax benefits and grant monies.
- 3) 67 N. Williams. The original brick now has stucco over it. The commission felt that the façade still looked similar and the current changes may be reversible. They decided rather than giving it a flat not contributing they created a third category, not in present state (NIPS). The commission felt that a property under the NIPS classification could be eligible for their grant funding if the owner were to use the money to restore the façade back to the original design.
- 4) 69 N. Williams Street. The commission stated that this is a contributing building.
- 5) 71 N. Williams Street. Member Kenney pointed out that the entry had been changed and the windows were replaced with modern windows. The commission discussed that any time a new business moves into a building they make minor changes and that this building was indeed contributing to the district.
- 6) 73 N. Williams Street. The façade has been altered from the original construction but the current owners have made significant positive renovations to help restore the original look. The members felt that this building was contributing.
- 7) 79-81 N. Williams Street. This building currently houses a hair salon and Pilates studio. The original arched elements on top of the parapet wall have been removed and the brick or tile has been covered up by wood siding. Member Kenney believed that the original decorative tile was simply hidden under the wood siding. The commission agreed that further discussion with the current property owner and research of the history of the building was necessary. The building could be classified under NIPS if the original materials were still present.
- 8) 83 N. Williams Street. The commission said this building was contributing.
- 9) 87 N. Williams Street. The current owners, the Ornelas, went to the IHPA for approval on their proposed changes to the current façade. It is clear that the current façade does not look exactly like the original façade but has copied some of the original façade elements. Member Rozovics said that most of the current facades do not look like the original construction and the commission should have criteria on how to determine if it is contributing or not. The commission found that additional research was necessary to determine if this building was contributing. Member Kenny was going to look for a photo from the 40's or 50's.

- 10) 89 N. Williams Street. The current façade looks very similar to the historic façade. Chair Alt thought that the façade was constructed of EIFS panels, a modern material. Member Kenney wasn't sure. The commission felt that even if the materials were modern, the look was the same and that it was a contributing building.
- 11) 91 N. Williams Street. The commission noted that this building was constructed in the late 1960's or early 1970's and so did not qualify to be historic.
- 12) 50 N. Williams Street. The commission stated that this façade has been well maintained from its original condition and that it is definitely a contributing building.
- 13) 58 N. Williams Street. The façade has been almost entirely changed from the original construction. The commission wondered if the original window and materials on the second floor were simply covered over with drywall or if they were removed. Additional research was needed and this building could be placed in the NIPS category.
- 14) 60-68 N. Williams Street. The building is too new and does not have any contributing elements.
- 15) 70 N. Williams Street. This is the Bank & Trust which also had the mansard roof. The current façade is an improvement, but not historically accurate. This building does not contribute to the district.
- 16) 72 N. Williams Street. The façade had changed from the 1918 original photo illustration. The current façade was completed in the 1930's and would qualify on its own as a historic façade. The commission decided this was a contributing building.
- 17) 76 N. Williams Street. The façade has been maintained close to the original construction. Member Kenney noted the VJ KNOX sign needed to be removed and hoped the original Home State Bank sign was still underneath. This is a contributing building.
- 18) 80 N. Williams Street. There have been alterations to the original construction. Additional research is needed before the commission can make a determination.
- 19) 86-90 N. Williams Street. Member Kenney pointed out that the original windows were changed to standard rectangular windows but many of the other features have remained the same. She questioned how these two buildings were able to be constructed on one property. The commission found this is a contributing building.
- 20) 85 Woodstock Street. The commission found the façade is historically accurate and this is a contributing building.
- 21) 77 Woodstock Street. The commission found that only the windows have been altered and the remaining elements of the façade are historically accurate and this is a contributing building.
- 22) 73 Woodstock Street. The commission was unsure of the construction date. Member Kenney will do some additional research on this property before the commission can make a determination.

- 23) 71 Woodstock Street. Member Kenney stated that this building also needs additional research to find the original build date and façade materials. The commission decided that it would qualify as NIPS if historic materials were found under the wood siding.
- 24) 65-69 Woodstock Street. Chair Alt sees this building as similar to 71 Woodstock Street that this style is not contributing to the district. Member Kenney stated that the building was constructed in 1959 and would qualify as it is over 50 years old. Chair Alt said the district should reflect a period of historical significance and not just anything over 50 years old. Member Nemcek agreed that just because the building was old enough to be considered historic that it may not be contributing to the look of their district. The commission decided that the building did not contribute to the district.
- 25) 88 Woodstock Street. Although this building is a nostalgic icon downtown its modern construction precludes it from being historic.
- 26) 70 Woodstock Street. This building was found to be contributing.
- 27) 92 Railroad Street. The commission felt the building was contributing. Member Kenney stated she would do more research and acquire photos of the building to be sure of its historical accuracy.
- 28) 110 N. Main Street. Member Kenney noted the second story arched windows were changed to standard rectangular windows, the cornice and detail work along the top have been removed and the brick has been covered by stucco. The members felt that the current façade is tasteful, but it is not historically accurate. Member Nemcek compared this to 87 N. Williams Street, which was also not historically accurate but the commission said it was contributing. Member Price noted that the 87 N. Williams street owners consulted the IHPA on the changes and received their approval whereas this property did not try to maintain any of the historical elements. The commission agreed that some parts of the building were close to the original design and the massing of the structure was the same and decided it could fall under the NIPS category.
- 29) 101 N. Main Street. The building is currently covered with aluminum siding. The commission placed this in the NIPS category stating if the original materials were under the aluminum than it can be reversed.
- 30) 105-107 N. Main Street. This building has been maintained similar to its original construction. The commission determined it was a contributing structure.
- 31) 109 N. Main Street. The window openings were altered and the first floor storefront was shortened. The commission agreed there were too many changes and this façade would not contribute to the district.
- 32) 111 N. Main Street. The current façade remains very similar to the original construction. The commission decided this was a contributing building.
- 33) 115-119 N. Main Street. The current façade has slight alterations to the second story bay window area and the top, “Mugge” sign was removed. The current façade is historic in its own right. The commission decided this was a contributing building.
- 34) 121 N. Main Street. The commission agreed this was a contributing building, but wanted to be clear that the fire house addition was not.

35) 125 N. Main Street. The commission agreed this was a contributing building.

The commission will make a determination on the questionable properties at their February meeting. Member Kenney will proceed with preparing the documentation for the Downtown Historic District.

**VII. Discussion of façade grant disbursement request for 263 King Street.**

Member Kenney stated that she was impressed with how nice the façade renovation looked. The other commission members agreed. Member Kenney made a motion to approve the grant disbursement, Member Price seconded the motion. On voice vote, members Alt, Kenney, Price, Atwood, Nemcek and Wyman voted aye, member Rozovics abstained. Motion passed.

**VIII. Member Inquiries and Reports**

Member Kenney reported that there was a fire in the attic of the Michael Walkup house. The inspectors had declared it uninhabitable. The Walkup family is currently in a hotel and will need to rent a house while working with the insurance company to repair the damages. Member Kenney said that this house is a historic property through the County. If this property were annexed to the City it would lose its county protection. Member Kenney discussed that staff needed to ensure that upon annexation the City check to see if a property is designated historic. If indeed it is, language shall be included in the Council approval Ordinance or Annexation Agreement that requires the property to apply for City historic designation.

Staff Planner Maxwell reported that the grant reimbursement check from IHPA for the printing of the walking tour brochure was received.

**IX. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Alt moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. Member Kenney seconded the motion. On voice vote, all voted aye. Motion passed.