



**NAPERVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DRAFT MINUTES OF AUGUST 4, 2015**

Call to Order		7:00 p.m.
A. Roll Call		
Present:	Doyle, Hall, Jacks, Lucibello, Peterson, Grinell (non-voting)	
Absent:	Fissinger, Martinez, Anderson (non-voting)	
Student Members:	Prabhu, Shura	
Staff Present:	Planning Team – Gabrielle Mattingly, Erin Venard	
B. Minutes	Approve the minutes of the May 5, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.	
	Motion by: Doyle Second by: Lucibello	Approved (5 to 0)
C. Old Business		
D. Certificates of Appropriateness		
D1. COA # 16-2711 28 N. Loomis Street	The petitioner, Marshall Dennison, requests approval of COA # 16-2711 in order to remove a window opening and add two new window openings on the corner side elevation at the property located at 28 N. Loomis Street.	
	Marshall Dennison, spoke as the petitioner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General contractor. • 2 story renovation; home was built in 1880; proposing to keep the 1880s look, with modern style. • Project involves adding a double window over the bath tub; the single window is currently over the shower. • The window will be a double hung, aluminum clad wood window. 	
	Historic Preservation Commission inquired about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hall – Dimension wise, does the window keeps in size with the rest of the façade? Dennison – It is a little bit shorter. • Jacks – Is the back portion of the house original? Dennison – I do not think anything is original, the house is approximately 100 years old. • Hall – In Attachment 3, the dashed line is the window to be removed and the darker lines are the windows to be added. Dennison – Yes. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacks – Is there a door to be added? Dennison – There is already a door there. Everything on the wall will be painted. • Hall – Can staff add any comments? Venard – Staff finds that the size and placement is of the window is appropriate. 		
	Public Comment: None		
	The Historic Preservation Commission moved to approve COA #16-2711, a request to remove a window opening and add two new window openings on the corner side elevation at the property located at 28 N. Loomis Street.		
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> Motion by: Doyle Seconded by: Peterson Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger </td> <td> Approved (5 to 0) </td> </tr> </table>	Motion by: Doyle Seconded by: Peterson Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger	Approved (5 to 0)
Motion by: Doyle Seconded by: Peterson Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger	Approved (5 to 0)		
D2. COA # 16-2823 142 N. Columbia Street	The owner and petitioner, Ashley Crawford, requests approval of COA # 16-2823 in order to change the porch style at the property located at 142 N. Columbia Street.		
	<p>Rob Crawford, spoke as the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved in approximately one year ago. • Have completed interior improvements and exterior improvements, including an outside walk, patio, hardie board, windows, and landscaping. • Porch is starting to deteriorate. • Think the proposed porch style aligns with the original style. 		
	<p>Rosie Owens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern is the original siding; should not be changed. • Do not want the houses to all be cookie cutter. • Prefer no improvements that are not original should be done. 		
	<p>Rob Crawford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We did quite a bit of research and found a home that had a similar, original porch. 		
	<p>Historic Preservation Commission inquired about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterson – From an originality standpoint, can you tell the siding on the porch is similar to the siding on the house? A. Crawford – It is not the original siding. It was aluminum. • Grinnell – Unfortunately, the Settlement did not have an older picture of the house. In reviewing the design guidelines, McCallister and Lee, and the houses on your block, most arts and crafts/bungalow have solid 		

style porches. I don't think we are saying that you cannot take the porch off; the question is what style is most appropriate and what keeps the character of the home.

- A. Crawford – We did get approval to replace our current siding with hardie board. Grinnell – We love that you have done the research. There are several porches similar to the style that you have proposed, but they tend to be on foursquare style homes.
- Peterson – Is it your intent to tear of the entire structure of the porch?
A. Crawford – No.
- Peterson – Do you know what exists as a foundation underneath the porch? A. Crawford – No.
- Peterson – The picture used as an example shows a stone pier? My concern is that you don't know what you will expose under the porch.
- R. Crawford – We need to move forward with the project this year because the stairs are starting to fall apart; we are also replacing the hardie board.
- A. Crawford – We want to maintain the historic-ness of our house, but also want it to look nice.
- Peterson – The portion of the porch that flares could have a stone pier; part of the COA approval might be that you would have to do some sort of stone pier.
- Grinnell – If there is a decorative stone under the porch, then it is indicative that it was not original to the house.
- Peterson – I can't imagine it is impossible to see under the porch.
- Jacks – Is there a coal furnace? There could be a coal room under the porch.
- Grinnell – It may be worth taking a small area off while replacing the siding.
- Hall – I don't have a problem with the railing; but do have a problem with the idea of ripping off the skirting with no idea of what is underneath.
- Peterson – Are you going to submit a building permit? Crawford – The building permit was approved conditioned upon approval of the COA.
- Hall – The issue I see it is underneath the porch, if you have pyramidal footing you are in trouble.
- Peterson – The drawing may not represent what you are able to do.
- Doyle – If you had a column that was more circular or did not had lattice work around it, what would it would like? Without knowing what is inside, we don't know.
- Lucibello – Does it flare out on both sides? A. Crawford - Yes.
- Jacks – It is my speculation that it is coal storage and it was original to the house. It is my recommendation that you take a look.
- Hall – I agree that it is probably a concrete footing where it flares out.
- R. Crawford – I have pulled the stairs off, there is not concrete.
- Jacks – The house at 118. S Washington; is that a comparable to this?

- Hall – Our purpose is not to throw road blocks at you. Would you be amenable to continuing and coming back with a drawing?
- A. Crawford – I am ok with doing it exactly how our neighbor’s porch is done.
- Peterson – If looking under the structure tells us the solid siding is original, are we ok with making changes to the porch style?
- Hall – According to the application, the foundation is not changing; that is where we get hung up. They are proposed a pretty dramatic change to the front elevation.
- Lucibello – Are you working with a contractor? Will you need plans?
A. Crawford – Yes.
- Shura – It depends on the originality of the style of the porch to the home.
- Lucibello – I do not want to default to the idea that the porch looks like the neighbor’s. I love both styles, but they aren’t necessarily the same style house.
- A. Crawford – The style on our house is definitely more typical.
- Venard – Staff finds that the proposed porch is a discernable alteration and a compatible improvement with the original structure.
- Hall – The application says the foundation will remain the same. A. Crawford – We can amend the application if necessary.
- Peterson – You need to investigate the options.
- Hall – I am not asking you to open up your porch. The sample photo looks great.
- Jacks – The builder should be able to this for you.
- Grinnell – The Commission should provide direction for the petitioner; is the Commission willing to approve that much of a change in porch style?
- Hall – Are the Commissioners present willing to approve a porch similar to the depiction in the sample photo?
- Jacks – I am not. The house at 118 S. Washington doesn’t have a similar porch.
- Owens – Are we willing to take a craftsman house and put a foursquare porch on it? Do we want to keep a craftsman style front on it? We are changing the entire architectural style.
- A. Crawford – There are houses in the District with mixed styles.
- Hall – I would recommend tabling it; revising the drawing.
- Peterson – We should not ask them to do that if we aren’t willing to vote for the change in style.
- Jacks – I would vote no because I think the porch is original to the house and the proposed porch is not consistent with the neighborhood.
- Peterson – I am torn. I agree if it is original, that is what is meant to be there. But I don’t think what you are proposing is absurd. So I would say yes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doyle – I want to see what is there; I like what you are proposing. I am a maybe. I am not against it. If it is the original porch, it should stay there. • Hall – Very close; don't have a problem with replacing the way it looks as long as it is historically accurate and aesthetically pleasing. The carte blanche with the lattice troubles me. • Lucibello – Table it. Not enough information. Does it make sense to keep the bottom half how it was, then have spindles? 		
	<p>Motion to table COA #16-2823.</p>		
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="457 627 1243 884"> <p>Motion by: Lucibello Seconded by: Doyle</p> <p>Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1243 627 1484 884" style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Approved (5 to 0)</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Motion by: Lucibello Seconded by: Doyle</p> <p>Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger</p>	<p>Approved (5 to 0)</p>
<p>Motion by: Lucibello Seconded by: Doyle</p> <p>Ayes: Doyle, Hall, Peterson, Jacks, Lucibello Nays: None Absent: Martinez, Fissinger</p>	<p>Approved (5 to 0)</p>		
<p>E. Reports and Recommendations</p>			
<p>F. Correspondence</p>			
<p>G. New Business</p>			
<p>H. Adjournment</p>	<p>8:15 p.m.</p>		