

MINUTES
Historic Preservation Commission
July 8, 2010
Municipal Complex, 100 W. Woodstock Street, Crystal Lake, IL

I. Call to Order

Member Rozovics called the meeting to order at 7:21 p.m.

II. Roll Call/Attendance

The following commission members were present: LeeAnn Atwood, Diana Kenney, Tom Nemcek, Michelle Rozovics and Bob Wyman. Member Sandy Price arrived at 7:35 p.m. Chair Alt was absent. Staff member Latika Bhide was present.

III. Public Comment

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

IV. Approval of Minutes of the June 3, 2010 Regular Meeting

Member Nemcek moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2010 regular meeting. Member Wyman seconded the motion. On voice vote, Member Kenney abstained, all other members present voted aye. Motion passed.

V. Congratulations to Members Atwood and Wyman

The members extended their boisterous congratulations to Members Atwood and Wyman on their reappointment to the Commission.

VI. Proposed Ordinance changes

The Commission discussed the proposed Ordinance changes that were presented at the previous meeting. The suggested amended language provides three alternatives:

Proposal A: Members of the Commission must state if they have a conflict of interest and abstain from voting on any matter before the Commission in which they have a conflict. A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which a public official's decisions are influenced by the official's personal interests.

Proposal B: No property owned by a current Historic Preservation Commission Member shall be eligible for grant funding.

Proposal C: Any member of the Commission is prohibited from receiving any substantial benefit or profit out of any contract or grant monies received as part of the Historic Preservation Commission whilst he or she serves on said Commission.

Member Nemcek said that he was in favor of Proposal 'C'. Member Atwood said she was not clear what the difference was between Proposal 'A' and the current Ordinance. Member Rozovics said that we could add to Proposal 'A' something to the effect that a member with a conflict of interest must leave the room to avoid the appearance of impropriety, unless their opinion is sought by other members. Member Kenney said that she did not feel there was any need to leave the room. Member Rozovics said that she felt Proposal 'C' has vague language. Member Kenney posed the question that if Raue House received funding from the Commission, would it be considered that she (personally, as an employee of Downtown Crystal Lake) was receiving substantial benefit? Member Rozovics asked what substantial benefit was? Was it monetary? Would \$500 be considered substantial? Member Kenney said she agreed and she was therefore not considering Proposal 'C'. Member Nemcek said that based on this discussion, he would like to change his preference to Proposal 'B'. Member Atwood said that she was on the fence. She appreciated people with a passion for history

serving on this Commission and therefore was not in favor of completely disallowing them from applying for grants. She wondered if there was a way to combine Proposals 'A' and 'B' or if there was a way to tighten the criteria. Member Wyman said that one of the reasons he landmarked his property was because of the grant money. Member Nemcek said that perception was reality and Commission members accepting grants just did not look right. Member Rozovics said that she depended on the grant money to get work done. Member Nemcek said that he would still prefer to give the money to other people. Member Wyman said that the other thing to keep in mind (with the possible addition of the Historic District) is the fundraising. He said that the Commission needed to get more money in our coffers. Member Price asked if members on the Commission could apply after September? Member Rozovics said that she is happy to volunteer her time and efforts to the Commission, but that she does not want this to be a 'Pay to Volunteer' deal. Member Kenney said that they should tighten the criteria; they would like to help as many properties as possible.

Member Rozovics called for a voice vote on the various options. No one was in favor of keeping the existing Ordinance. There were 5 members (Rozovics, Kenney, Atwood, Wyman and Price) in favor of proposal 'A' and one member (Nemcek) in favor of Proposal 'B'. The Commission voted to change the Ordinance language to match Proposal 'A'.

The Commission then discussed the grant disbursement scenarios. The Commission decided to eliminate the options that they did not want to discuss further. Options b (lottery), c (once a year), d (separate commercial and residential), e (2 cycles, split grant money), f (2 cycles, priority), h (separate commercial and residential) and i (varying maximum amounts) were all eliminated. Member Nemcek said that he was not in favor of cycles as people needed to work on their projects based on their needs. Staff Bhide said that accepting applications in a number of cycles was provided as an option as it would allow the Commission to evaluate the relative merits of the projects as their money was limited. Member Atwood said that it would also provide the Commission an opportunity to send direct mailings to the landmarked owners regarding an upcoming deadline. The Commission also discussed option g. Member Rozovics felt that 5 years was too long a time period for a property that had previously received funding to remain ineligible. The consensus was that properties that have previously received funding would be eligible to apply every other year. The consensus of the Commission was to include option j within the eligibility criteria (with the changes discussed), and options k and l within the language in the enabling Ordinance pertaining to the Commission's Authority and Duties.

Option j was modified to read, "Structures classified as Not in Present State (NIPS) are eligible to apply for a façade grant allocation as long as the structure is brought closer to its historic state. Non-contributing properties are not eligible to apply for a façade grant allocation". It was also decided that the definitions for Contributing structures, Noncontributing structures and Not in Present State would need to be added to the Ordinance.

The Commission then discussed the revised (draft) Façade Grant Application. The Commission concurred that were not in favor of increasing the grant amount to \$1,000 for commercial properties. They were also unanimous in rejecting the proposed requirement that improvements (funded using grant money) must remain in place for 5 years. The Commission had previously discussed the various funding allocation scenarios. The Commission decided that they would discuss the eligibility criteria and the criteria for evaluating grant funding at the next meeting.

VII. Member Inquiries and Reports

Member Price said that the Historical Society float had won 2nd place in the parade. Member Kenney said that total credit for the float goes to Member Price.

Member Kenney said that the Crystal Lake Historical Society is in the final phase of fundraising for the restoration of the Union Soldier Statue Restoration Project. They now need to raise less than \$10,000. The restored soldier will be installed in time for the 150th anniversary of the start of the Civil War and the 175th anniversary of the founding of Crystal Lake.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, Member Kenney moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m. Member Price seconded the motion. On voice vote, all voted aye. Motion passed.