

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

October 14, 2014

Memorial Hall – Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale
5:00 P.M.

Chairman Peterson called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m. on October 14, 2014 in Memorial Hall in the Memorial Building, 19 East Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale IL.

Present: Chairman Peterson, Commissioner Bohnen and Commissioner Harloe-Mowery, Commissioner Hutter and Commissioner Gonzalez

Absent: None

Also Present: Village Planner, Sean Gascoigne

Minutes

Chairman Peterson introduced the minutes from September 9th, 2014. Commissioner Bohnen made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Harloe seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

Chairman Peterson moved on to the agenda's discussion points and summarized the progress of the ongoing mapping project. He indicated that they were still waiting for a response from the Art Institute and would revisit once they were able to reconnect. He then stated that the intent would be to include photos from the Historical Society, as well as a web based mapping product.

The Commission moved on to the discussion point regarding the budget increase, summarized the proposed changes to the budget and confirmed the process needed to move the requested changes forward.

General discussion ensued regarding the proposed changes to the budget and Commissioner Harloe suggested that the Commission outline the spending from 2014, in an attempt to explain the Commission's need for additional money in their budget. The Commission also addressed the different areas of the budget to confirm that the appropriate funding was being requested.

Chairman Peterson introduced the discussion on the proposed changes to the ordinance. He indicated that the requested changes had been made, but that the Village Attorney had offered some additional thoughts for the Commission to consider.

Commissioner Bohnen offered his thoughts and indicated that the attorney's comments didn't necessarily reflect the position and intent of the Commission. He stated that he did

not feel the Barrow's request should have been approved and that the Attorney's comment suggested that their situation should be considered, although that was not the intent of the Commission.

General discussion ensued and the Commission agreed that the ordinance should proceed as originally proposed by the Commission at the last meeting, and should not include the suggested considerations expressed by the attorney.

Chairman Peterson introduced the discussion on the two-tier landmarking process and summarized the intent of the proposed program.

Commissioner Bohnen suggested that the Commission reserve discussion this topic, until the Chairman has had the opportunity to present the revised budget to the Village Manager to confirm that the budget will support the requested process.

General discussion ensued and the Commission agreed with Commissioner Bohnen's suggestion.

Mr. Gascoigne summarized the progress to date for the research pertaining to the protection of historic homes. He explained that the Village Staff was finalizing the process of surveying other Village's regarding their requirements relative to bracing and shoring. He then indicated that as the results can be documented, Mr. McGinnis would then take these findings back to the Zoning and Public Safety Committee for further discussion as to how they wanted to proceed.

With no additional discussion, Commissioner Bohnen identified a program that he came across regarding a website designed to showcasing local homes. He indicated that, depending on the specifics, this type of program may be beneficial to the Commission in their efforts to document homes and complete the mapping project.

Chairman Peterson entertained a motion to adjourn to the workshop at 5:28.

Commissioner Hutter motioned to adjourn to the workshop. Commissioner Harloe seconded. The motion passed unanimously and the Commission opened the workshop. Chairman Peterson introduced the workshop regarding the fence code regulations and the Commission brainstormed on the current requirements and suggested including this item on the next agenda to discuss the possibility of amending the language for fences in the front yard as the Commission agreed that fences contributed to the curb appeal and historic integrity of the Village.

Adjournment

Chairman Peterson suggested the Commission use this conversation as a starting point for a discussion at next month's meeting on the feasibility of changing the language.

With no additional discussion, Chairman Peterson entertained a motion to adjourn the workshop. Commissioner Bohnen motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Harloe seconded and the workshop was adjourned at 6:05 p.m. on October 14, 2014.

Respectfully Submitted,

Historic Preservation Commission
October 14, 2014

Sean Gascoigne
Village Planner

PROPOSED HPC 2015 BUDGET

Revised Draft November 11, 2014

| 7707 | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-------|-----|---------------|
| Historic Preservation Commission | | | | | |
| Historic Survey | 300c60 (Woodlands) | | | 0 | |
| Neighborhood Meeting | Miscellaneous Costs | | | 0 | |
| Preservation Month | Miscellaneous Costs | | | 300 | |
| Public Hearings | Legal notice, court reporter | | | 300 | |
| Training | State Conference | | | 0 | |
| National Trust Forum/HPA/LPCI | Annual Dues | | | 300 | |
| Miscellaneous | Meeting expenses | | | 100 | |
| | Current Budget | | | | 1,000 |
| Maps | | | | | |
| | Update Historic Maps | | | | |
| Set up of maps | | 1 | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Color printing of maps | | 200 | 12 | | 2,400 |
| | Map Budget | | | | 3,900 |
| Preservation Workshops (2 total) | | | | | |
| Workshops | | | | | |
| Coffee & donuts | | 2 | 250 | | 500 |
| Professional Fees | | 2 | 650 | | 1,300 |
| Promotion | | | | | |
| Additional Ad's in the paper 1/4 page | Hinsdalean (every other ad free) | 8 | 108 | | 864 |
| | HPC Workshops | | | | 2,664 |
| 2nd Tier Landmarking | | | | | |
| | Promotion and plaques for homes | | | | |
| Plaques | Bronze plaques | 15 | 250 | | 3,750 |
| | 2nd Tier Landmarking | | | | 3,750 |
| HPC Historic Preservation month | | | | | |
| Prizes | | | | | |
| Coloring contest 4-5 years 1st prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 5 | 20 | | 100 |
| Coloring contest 4-5 years 2nd prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 3 | 20 | | 60 |
| Coloring contest 6-8 years 1st prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 5 | 20 | | 100 |
| Coloring contest 6-8 years 2nd prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 3 | 20 | | 60 |
| Coloring contest 9-10 years 1st prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 5 | 20 | | 100 |
| Coloring contest 9-10 years 2nd prize | Deep Creek Art lessons | 3 | 20 | | 60 |
| Middle School 1st prize | Ebert Studios work shop | 1 | 95 | | 95 |
| Middle School 2nd prize | Ebert Studios work shop | 1 | 95 | | 95 |
| Middle School 3rd prize | Ebert Studios work shop | 1 | 95 | | 95 |
| High School 1st prize | Starbucks or Hinsdale gift card | 1 | 100 | | 100 |
| High School 2nd prize | Starbucks or Hinsdale gift card | 1 | 75 | | 75 |
| High School 3rd prize | Starbucks or Hinsdale gift card | 1 | 50 | | 50 |
| Promotion | | | | | |
| Additional Ad's in the paper | Hinsdalean (every other ad free) | 10 | 135 | | 1,350 |
| Posters for store windows/train stations | | 75 | 5.5 | | 413 |
| Hand out flyers | | 300 | 2.75 | | 825 |
| Holder boxes for flyers | | 15 | 25 | | 375 |
| | HPC Historic Preservation month | | | | 3,953 |
| | Proposed 2015 budget | | | | 15,267 |

VILLAGE OF HINSDALE

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 14 (HISTORIC PRESERVATION), CHAPTER 4 (WITHDRAWAL OF LANDMARK DESIGNATION), RELATIVE TO STANDARDS FOR WITHDRAWAL OF HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATIONS

WHEREAS, the Village of Hinsdale ("Village") is authorized pursuant to Article 11, Division 48.2 of the Illinois Municipal Code (65 ILCS 5/11-48.2-1 *et seq.*), to enact ordinances for the purposes of protecting, preserving, enhancing, and regulating buildings, structures, objects, sites, and areas of historical, cultural, or architectural importance; and

WHEREAS, Title 14 of the Village Code of Hinsdale ("Village Code") establishes a procedure by which such buildings, structures, objects, sites, and areas can be designated as local historic landmarks and historic districts; and

WHEREAS, Title 14 of the Village Code also provides, under Section 14-4-1, for the withdrawal of a previously granted local historic landmark designation in certain specified circumstances; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees acknowledge that where the owner of the structure, building or site demonstrates that he or she is experiencing significant and continuing financial hardship of a nature that has, and will going forward, negatively impact the ability of the owner to adequately maintain the structure, building or site, withdrawal of a historic landmark designation may be appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees find that the Village Code provisions relative to landmark designations should provide flexibility to the Historic Preservation Commission and Board of Trustees to recommend and allow the withdrawal of a historic landmark designation in instances where an owner is experiencing significant and continuing financial hardship of a nature that has, and will going forward, negatively impact the ability of the owner to adequately maintain the structure, building or site, and that the detailing of such a standard in the Village Code is in the best interests of the Village and its residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Hinsdale, DuPage and Cook Counties and State of Illinois, as follows:

SECTION 1: Recitals. The foregoing recitals are incorporated into this Ordinance by this reference.

SECTION 2: Title 14 (Historic Preservation), Chapter 4 (Withdrawal of Landmark Designation), Section 1 (Conditions for Withdrawal) is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

14-4-1: CONDITIONS FOR WITHDRAWAL:

The designation of a structure, building or site ~~or area~~ as a landmark may be withdrawn under any of the following conditions:

A. The structure, building or site ~~or area~~ has ceased to meet the criteria for designation because the qualities which caused it to be originally designated have been lost or destroyed, or such qualities were lost subsequent to nomination, but before designation;

B. Additional information shows conclusively that the structure, building or site ~~or area~~ does not possess sufficient significance to meet the designation criteria;

C. The original designation was clearly in error; ~~or~~

D. There was prejudicial procedural error in the designation process; or

E. The owner of the structure, building or site demonstrates that the designation is creating a significant and unknown financial impact, that he or she is experiencing significant and continuing financial hardship of a nature that has, and will going forward, negatively impact the ability of the owner to adequately maintain the structure, building or site.

SECTION 3: Severability and Repeal of Inconsistent Ordinances. Each section, paragraph, clause and provision of this Ordinance is separable, and if any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Ordinance shall be held unconstitutional or invalid for any reason, the unconstitutionality or invalidity of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect the remainder of this Ordinance, nor any part thereof, other than that part affected by such decision. All ordinances, resolutions or orders, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed.

SECTION 4: Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

PASSED this _____ day of _____ 2014.

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

APPROVED by me this _____ day of _____, 2014, and attested to by the Village Clerk this same day.

Thomas K. Cauley, Jr., Village President

ATTEST:

Christine M. Bruton, Deputy Village Clerk

DATE: October 20, 2014
TO: Chairman Saigh and the Zoning & Public Safety Committee
FROM: Robert McGinnis MCP, Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner
RE: **Bracing/Shoring Plan Requirement**

This item was discussed at ZPS Committee in July of this year as a result of the incident at 206 N. Washington and a recommendation that followed from the Historic Preservation Commission. At that meeting staff agreed to research other communities to find out what sort of language any of them had in place, if any, to deal with the issue of bracing and shoring of structures under construction.

Our research found that most communities do not have ordinances in place that specifically deal with this issue. Most see it as a "means and methods" issue to be handled by the owners and their design team. Others use general language in the "Submittal documents" provision of the model codes to assert their right to require a bracing/shoring plan.

If the Trustees feel that the language in the model code is not specific enough and that a local ordinance is a better way to clearly illustrate the requirement, staff found language that Oak Park is presently considering adding to its code that grants specific authority to the Code Official to require these documents. The text for each of the available options is as follows;

1. Existing language in our adopted model code

2006 International Residential Code R106.1 Submittal documents.

Construction documents, specifically inspection and structural Observation programs and other data shall be submitted in one or more sets with each application for a permit. The construction documents shall be prepared by a registered design professional where required by the statutes of the jurisdiction in which the project is to be constructed. Where special conditions exist, the building official is authorized to require additional construction documents to be prepared by a registered design professional.

2. Proposed Language

9-1-3-1 Requirements not covered by code.

The Building Official shall have discretion to impose additional requirements not specifically covered by this code necessary for the strength, stability, or proper operation of an existing or proposed installation; the construction, repair, alteration, change of occupancy or addition to buildings and structures; and the relocation of all existing buildings, in the interest of public safety, health, and general welfare.

Staff feels that either approach accomplishes the same goal; that of making sure that someone on the design team has taken the time to look at this aspect of a project.

Should Committee feel that creating a separate amendment to the model code and adding this proposed language has merit, staff will bring it back with an Ordinance for consideration and approval.

Cc: Kathleen A. Gargano, Village Manager