

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

DATE: March 4, 2020

DRAFT

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: City Council Chambers, Urbana City Building, 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois

MEMBERS PRESENT David Hays, Alice Novak, Gina Pagliuso, David Seyler, Kim Smith

MEMBERS EXCUSED Renee Pollock, Trent Shepard

STAFF PRESENT Lorrie Pearson, Director of Community Development Services Department; Kevin Garcia, Planner II; Marcus Ricci, Planner II

OTHERS PRESENT Susan Appel, Andrew Fell, Susan Reimer

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Novak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 8, 2020 rescheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was presented for approval. Mr. Hays noted a correction to the spelling of his name in the vote on Page 9. It should read "*Hays*". Ms. Pagliuso moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Smith seconded the motion. The minutes were then approved as corrected by unanimous voice vote.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Communications received for Case No. HP-2020-EH-01

- Letter from Andrew Fell
- Sales Sheet for 4 Buena Vista Court submitted by Andrew Fell Photos taken and submitted by Susan Reimer
- Photos of other bungalows at Buena Vista Court submitted by Susan Reimer
- Letter from Susan Appel in opposition

5. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

7. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

8. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

HP-2020-EH-01 – A request by Andrew Fell for a Certificate of Economic Hardship at 2 Buena Vista Court to replace original windows, rather than restore the originals, due to the additional expense and time required for restoration.

Chair Novak opened the public hearing for Case No. HP-2020-EH-01. She briefly reviewed the public hearing process.

Marcus Ricci, Planner II, presented the staff report for the case. He presented a brief background of the subject property. He noted that he spoke with Nick Hanson, Building Inspector for the City of Urbana, who informed him that one egress window would be required in each sleeping room and one in the basement. He showed photos of the interior of the home. He talked about the Certificate of Appropriateness that Mr. Fell had previously applied for. He reviewed the budget that the applicant submitted as Exhibit C of the Certificate of Economic Hardship application. He noted the difference in the space there would be between the storm window and the window with the existing condition of the wall versus a new wall. He summarized staff's analysis of the five factors the Commissioners should consider to determine if there is an economic hardship in this case. He presented staff's recommendation to deny the request. He noted that the applicant was present to answer questions from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Chair Novak asked if the Historic Preservation Commission members had any questions for City staff.

Ms. Smith asked staff to clarify the additional savings of \$14,300 if the applicant replaced the windows. This included the loss of rent for three months and the additional cost to heat the home during the time it would take to restore the original windows. Mr. Ricci stated that this was a bare-bones simplistic reduction in cost. One could come up with additional things as well.

With there being no further questions for City staff, Chair Novak opened the item for public input.

Andrew Fell, applicant, approached the Historic Preservation Commission to speak on behalf of his application. Mr. Fell began by stating his appreciation to the Commission on their efforts of historic

preservation. He stated that he felt there were two issues of the economic aspect for the windows. They are time and money.

With regards to money, he stated that it is not just about the cost of refurbishing the sash and the windows. He said he was confused why the Commission was encouraging him to find cheaper estimates when he would want the best company to restore the windows; not the cheapest. He finds this counter-productive to what historic preservation should be about.

He has an estimate from Restoration Works to restore the sashes and the storm windows for \$24,000.00. He said, say he finds a cheaper vendor to do them for \$12,000.00. The cost to replace the windows that were approved to be replaced is under \$7,500.00, so he is \$5000.00 in the hole already. The house had no insulation and no way to run utilities in exterior walls, so he framed in a 2' x 4' wall around the exterior. Because the windows open in, the hinge is on the inside face of the wall. Because the wall is now 4" fatter, he has to move the hinge for each window inside the house and rebuild the entire frame of each window to extend the jamb out and still let the window fit where it needs to on the inside. Each one of the windows were site built and none of them are the same, so each window opening has to be framed out and custom fit. He obtained an estimate from a finish carpenter to do this, and it will take approximately 10 hours per window opening. That is 11 windows at 110 hours, which will cost about \$5,000.00. In addition, he has to deal with the storm windows because they are different sizes as well, which will cost at least another \$1000.00 to have fitted. The windows will have to be caulked, primed, painted, have all new hardware installed, mortice the hinges, weather strip the windows. The finish carpenter estimated 3 hours per opening to do this and, the cost will be approximately \$2,000.00. The Urbana Property Maintenance Code requires that each window have a screen, which none of the windows currently have, so this would cost another \$4,600.00. This all totals \$24,620.00.

The replacement windows that were approved to put in as egress windows in the house would be custom-sized to fit the window opening. They would not need storm windows because they have a thermally built-in sash. They would have screens and new hardware. They are pre-finished. The only thing he would have to do to install the new replacement windows is scrap the opening after the old windows are out, remove the brick mold, put the new window in and put the brick mold back on.

The cost to replace all of the windows would be \$17,165.00. The cost to restore most all of the windows is \$29,000.00, which is more than he paid for the house.

With regards to time, he mentioned that he had submitted the application in time for the Commission to meet in February. He did not know why the meeting was not held, so four weeks of this time is on the City of Urbana. To have the windows restored, Restoration Works would need the windows for ten weeks. He is almost to the point of renovating the house to where he cannot do anything without the windows being in place to help secure the house from water leaks, etc. A finished carpenter with an assistant can get them installed in three weeks after he gets them back from Restoration Works. So, they are approximately 22 weeks out from completing the renovations. He figured he would rent the house out for \$1,000.00 a month, so he will have lost out on \$5,000.00 of rent.

He summarized by saying that it would cost him an additional \$23,000.00 and 22 weeks of time to complete the renovations. He does not have either to spend on this little project, so it is an economic hardship on him.

Mr. Hays asked for clarification on why Mr. Fell would need to wait for the windows to come back in order to complete the build-out. Mr. Fell explained that the building is not weather tight, and he does not want to install outlets that would get rained on. There are certain limits on what he is willing to risk having installed and ruined and a limit on the risk that he is willing to take. This is a money pit of a project, and he does not have extra money to spend on it.

Ms. Pagliuso stated that the windows appear to be boarded up in the photos provided. She asked if they were all boarded or are they opened up. Mr. Fell stated that some of the windows are boarded and some of them still have the aluminum storm windows on the outside, but the sashes are not there or are partially missing.

Chair Novak asked for clarification that Mr. Fell purposely removed the windows in the beginning of the project prior to getting a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Fell stated that two of the windows were completely gone when he purchased the building and he removed the other windows.

Mr. Seyler wondered if it would be possible to create pockets for the windows to open into. Mr. Fell stated that anything is possible, but there is a diminishing return on what is reasonable to spend to make custom things like this. Mr. Seyler commented that it would be much simpler than building new frames and moving the windows forward. Mr. Fell replied that it would be trading one expense for another in his opinion.

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Fell had concerns with condensation when the air space is increased to 7-1/2 inches. Mr. Fell replied yes. Air space over 4 inches is worthless and makes it almost pointless to put storm windows on.

Ms. Pagliuso asked if Mr. Fell had heard of Indows, which are storm windows installed on the inside. Mr. Fell stated that he has used Indows on other projects; however, the windows on the subject house open inwards.

Ms. Pagliuso stated that she understood about Mr. Fell's want to have the best company restore the windows if directed to do so. However, she had 11 double-hung windows (22 sashes) restored on her home by a different company for less than \$7,000.00. The company came in and removed the windows, restored them, brought them back and installed them. She does not feel that using a vendor other than the one that Mr. Fell had spoken with would reduce the quality of her renovation.

Susan Reimer approached the Historic Preservation Commission to speak in favor of the proposed request for a Certificate of Economic Hardship. She stated that everyone in Buena Vista who owns a bungalow is pleased with Mr. Fell's decision to purchase the property at 2 Buena Vista Court and renovate it. While she appreciates the role of the Historic Preservation Commission, the expense to renovate the proposed house is so much. She and her husband own the two bungalows in the center. They restored the windows on the one bungalow, but it did not cost them as much because the windows were not in bad shape, unlike the windows at Mr. Fell's property. She stated that

when the storm windows are on, it destroys the look of the 9-lite windows. She talked about the other bungalows in the courtyard and noted the different elements that are not in character with the Spanish Bungalow style. She believed that the Commission should allow Mr. Fell to replace the windows rather than restore them since he is willing and vested in renovating the property and keeping it as close to the original design and architecture as possible.

Chair Novak stated that the Commission was only implementing the Historic Preservation Ordinance that was established 20 years ago. The review process provides for people not having to make changes to make something look more historic or to restore something at that particular time. So, the Ordinance assessed all of the bungalows for integrity and their significance to the bungalows as a group. It would be more of an impact if a couple of the bungalows were missing and not the entire district was left. As it was at that time and still is, there is a great deal of integrity for those buildings. They are on the National Register of Historic Places as well as locally landmarked.

Susan Appel approached the Historic Preservation Commission to speak in opposition. She read her letter for the record.

Andrew Fell re-approached the Commission to rebut. He stated that he resented being called out as basically being a liar in front of the Historic Preservation Commission. Without all of the facts, speaking out against his case does not sit well with him. He takes exception to a lot of what was said [by Ms. Appel].

Ms. Appel re-approached to state that she was basing her comments on what she read in the staff memo and voiced her opinion.

With no further input from the audience, Chair Novak closed the public input portion and opened it for discussion and/or motion(s) by the Commission.

Commission members asked Ms. Pagliuso questions regarding the restoration of her windows. She answered the questions. She stated that everyone gets to choose their own vendor. The vendor she used may not be the right vendor for the proposed project. She only was sharing her experience.

Mr. Hays stated that he has nothing to base a comparison on with other estimates, because there are not any presented to the Commission.

Ms. Smith stated that the costs for the finished carpentry do not seem out-of-line to her. Mr. Seyler agreed. Ms. Smith pointed out that the total cost is almost \$20,000, which would be almost two years of rental income. This is a significant amount.

Ms. Pagliuso stated that the term “substantial” comes up many times when the Commission is to determine what the hardship should be. With regards to criterion A, which is a substantial decrease in the fair market value of the property as a result of the denial of the certificate of appropriateness, she stated that the Commission and staff do not know if it would be substantial or not based on the staff report and on common sense. With regards to criterion B, which is a substantial decrease in the financial return to owners of record or other investors in the property as a result of the denial of the certificate of appropriateness, she stated that \$20,000.00 was not *not* substantial. She stated that Mr. Fell did not claim criterion D, which states the structural soundness of any structures on the

property and their sustainability for rehabilitation, to be an issue. She does not believe that the window replacement or the renovation affects criterion E, which is the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure, or in the case of proposed demolition, the economic feasibility of improvement on the property.

Chair Novak agreed with Mr. Hays that the Commission does not have enough to compare to give context to the estimate from Renovation Works. Therefore, she felt there was insufficient case made for a Certificate of Economic Hardship.

Ms. Smith pointed out that Mr. Fell is required to provide one egress window in each bedroom. One bedroom would then have two windows that do not match the new egress window

Chair Novak mentioned that Buena Vista Court has been a historic district since 2004 on the National Register of Historic Places and then became a local historic district. It has been out there for a long time that these are protected properties. There are rules to follow. Because of that, they need to make extra effort to be sure that the best solution is on the table to the highest extent possible. Some of the bungalows have integrity issues but they have been that way since before the local designation was implemented.

Ms. Smith stated that she finds it hard to make a decision. Mr. Fell took a house that was falling apart. The roof was caving in areas with a hole all the way down to the basement. Without his investment, this house may not have withstood a few more months or the winter of standing up. He has spent a lot of money in renovations so far and now the Commission is asking him to spend a year of rental income on the windows. He has saved this property. It puts her in a difficult situation because she sees that the windows are historical elements that should be kept but she feels that the house way on its way to being destroyed. If you look at the Buena Vista Court historic district, it needs some help.

Mr. Hays agreed but felt like he did not have enough information to make a decision. Mr. Fell is an expert in this kind of work. The liability of dealing with the windows should have been considered right from the start. Was there something revealed along the way that was unexpected or unusual that would not have been factored right from the beginning? There may be information or a story that relates to what the Commission is being asked to consider. There are all sorts of things that the Commission could be sympathetic to; but when they look at the factors the Commission members are supposed to consider, he doesn't know how to connect what was expected to what the specifics are now.

Chair Novak did not understand why the windows were taken out to begin with prior to the public hearing for a Certificate of Appropriateness. She wondered if there was an assumption that the windows would be replaced from the start. Mr. Hays recalled that most of the windows were stored in the basement after being removed, and that most of them were in good condition. He did not know how the condition of the windows from 2 Buena Vista Court compared with the windows that Ms. Reimer had restored in terms of understanding how much it would cost to repair and restore the proposed windows right.

Ms. Pagliuso wondered what building out the walls would do for replacement windows. Would the finish carpentry work need to be done if the windows were replaced?

Mr. Fell re-approached the Commission to help answer the questions. He stated that he took the windows out to keep the house from falling down. They took out the hinge pins to remove the windows and stacked them in the basement. One window was gone when he purchased the house, and another window was in pieces and will not go back together. The window he brought in during the Certificate of Appropriateness public hearing was middle-of-the-road in terms of quality. He does not have all of the storm windows either. He, then, explained how the new windows would be put in. His plan is to use a drywall return jamb that butts up to the window. It is much easier to construct and would not require the finished carpentry.

Chair Alice wondered if Mr. Fell had ever done a project before that reused the historic windows or called for the restoration of historic windows. Mr. Fell said yes. He noted a few projects that he had restored the windows for, including Louise Kuhny's home. Chair Novak asked if Restoration Works was used to restore the windows. Mr. Fell replied that he did not remember who did the restoration.

Ms. Pagliuso referred to Exhibit C of the Certificate of Economic Hardship application. Attachment 4 states that the estimated cost to rebuild only the first floor windows is \$23,400. Would the company be making brand new windows? Mr. Fell explained that the company would be making storm windows that were missing and windows that are beyond repair.

Chair Novak moved that the Historic Preservation Commission deny Case No. HP-2020-EH-01 on the grounds that insufficient evidence was provided to support the request. Mr. Seyler seconded the motion.

Ms. Smith asked the Commission if they denied the request, what additional information would be required. Chair Novak replied that she felt they would need at least two more estimates. The information should be provided in table form as to replacement windows versus rehabbed old windows. Mr. Hays agreed because there is a lot of complexity to restoring them. Seeing them stacked out would be helpful.

Mr. Garcia pointed out that the motion should be specific and address how the evidence meets the criteria / five factors that the Commission was to consider when making a determination.

Ms. Pagliuso felt a continuance would be more in-line rather than a complete denial. The last paragraph in Article XII-6.D.3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance states, "*The Commission may solicit expert testimony to evaluate information provided either as part of a Certificate of Economic Hardship application or at the public hearing, and may continue the public hearing to provide time to evaluate new evidence.*" If they deny this case, then it shuts the door on it, and the applicant would more than likely appeal. Does it make sense to ask for more information and continue the public hearing rather than denying it outright?

Chair Novak asked City staff who would be responsible for obtaining the two additional estimates. Kevin Garcia, Planner II, replied that the burden in this type of case would be on the applicant. Mr. Fell would need to obtain the two additional estimates.

Ms. Smith stated that she would like to see more evidence than just two additional estimates. She would like to see a summary of replacement versus restoration for the windows and what the loss of income will be. Mr. Hays agreed because without knowing the measure of that the Commission members do not know some of the relative terms, such as “substantial”, or how it compares. If new windows are put in, there would still be a cost, which would be presumably okay. What the Commission is being asked to assess is the relative consequence of something. They won’t know the consequence until they have additional estimates that would allow the members to see the total differences. He felt that there was not enough information to judge the difference. If the normal course is to deny the case based on this, then that is one thing. However, if there is a way to have the information made available to them to be able to make a judgement, then it seems worthwhile.

Chair Novak withdrew the motion from the floor. Mr. Seyler withdrew the second.

Ms. Pagliuso moved that the Historic Preservation Commission continue the public hearing for Case No. HP-2020-EH-01 until the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission to obtain more information to allow them to make a definitive decision. Ms. Smith seconded the motion.

There was discussion on what additional information the Commission would require to have to be able to make a decision.

Mr. Fell re-approached the Commission to comment and ask the following questions:

1. He requested that the Commission be specific in the information they need, so that the case is not delayed a second time.
2. While he understood that the Commission needs to continue the meeting, he wanted to let the members know that by continuing the meeting, it only compounds his problem.
3. What are his procedural options with a continuance? Can he appeal this to the City Council? Does he have to wait through the continuance to be denied at a future meeting before he can appeal?

Mr. Garcia replied to Mr. Fell’s question stating that according to Section XII-6.D.3, the Commission has the right to continue the meeting and make a decision at the meeting on the continued date. Then, Mr. Fell would have the right to appeal.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Fell if he preferred that the Commission take a vote on the case at this meeting or if he would be okay for the Commission to continue the case. Mr. Fell responded that the decision is up to the Commission. If they deny the case at this meeting or at a future meeting, he plans to appeal their decision. His economic hardship increases if they delay their decision.

Chair Novak asked Mr. Fell if he was open to allowing a company who charges less to perform the restoration. Mr. Fell said yes.

Ms. Pagliuso asked if the Commission allowed him to replace the windows, would they look like the existing windows. Would they be 9-lite windows? Mr. Fell said yes. They would not be true divided lites, but from 20 feet away, a person would not be able to tell the difference. They would have a muntin on the inside and one on the outside. They would be in a pattern that matches the existing windows. The windows would be swing out casement, because double-hung windows would be too small for safety reasons and they would not match the existing windows.

Chair Novak requested the following additional information:

- Each action that would need to be done for installing replacement windows versus restoration of the existing windows
- True added cost or less than cost for rehabilitated windows

Mr. Ricci mentioned that in anticipation of the Commission possibly needing additional expert opinions, he contacted Bill Rose, of the Building Research Council. Mr. Rose said that he would be willing to review the application and provide his opinion. Chair Novak thought this would be a great idea.

Mr. Hays wondered if it would be reasonable and appropriate to understand what costs were anticipated when first taking on the project so the Commission members could understand if there is a substantial decrease in the fair market value in a financial return to owners. It seems like how he would understand what is substantial would not be a dollar amount, but it would be relative to what was anticipated. The windows are a significant feature of the house. Is there something about it that makes it a reasonable basis for this case? He would not want the windows to pay the price of a cost that was unanticipated somewhere else in the project.

Chair Novak wondered if they could request dates of when window companies might have been consulted. Mr. Ricci said that staff could ask for that information.

Mr. Garcia advised the Commission to keep their requests for more information related to the criteria that the Commission should use in determining if there is an economic hardship. There was discussion between City staff and Commission members about requesting anticipated project costs to determine if the applicant assumed in the beginning to replace the windows.

Chair Novak asked Mr. Fell to approach the Commission to answer a few more questions. She asked him when replacing the windows factored into the project. Mr. Fell explained that when purchasing the property, he knew it was part of a historic district and that there would be certain things, such as the windows, that he would need to get approval from the Historic Preservation Commission to do. He was not aware of how much it would cost to replace or restore the windows at that time. When he found out how much it would cost for each, he applied for a Certificate of Economic Hardship.

Ms. Smith asked how they quantify “substantial decrease”. Chair Novak replied that is why the Commission is asking for more information. Ms. Smith stated that once she sees the information she won’t know if it is “substantial” or not. To her, spending \$24,000.00 more to rehab the existing windows is equal to losing two years of rent and she would consider that to be substantial. Mr. Fell stated that he had included a spreadsheet in his application indicating some hard costs and some estimated costs. Those costs total half as much the amount of what the house would be worth when he is finished rehabilitating it. Every cost causes him to take a financial hit on the house.

Chair Novak stated that with all of his experience, surely he must have known that it was going to cost a lot of money to rehab the house considering the condition it was in and known that it was in a National Historic District. Mr. Fell stated that he knew all of this and that he would risk spending more than the house would be worth; however, he would like to minimize that risk.

Mr. Hays did not understand why there were not more estimates to help the Commission understand the economic hardship and to find what the lowest cost would be to get the job done correctly. Mr. Fell explained that it will cost approximately \$12,000.00 to have the windows installed; that does not include the cost of the existing windows being restored or the cost of purchasing new windows. In addition, he would lose around \$5,000.00 in rent. This totals \$17,000.00, which he considers an economic hardship.

Chair Novak restated the motion, which is for the Historic Preservation Commission to continue Case No. HP-2020-EH-01 until the Commission's next regularly scheduled meeting on April 1, 2020 with the expectation that there will be additional bids and clarification on the true expenses comparing replacement windows with historic window rehab.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Hays	-	Yes	Ms. Novak	-	Yes
Ms. Pagliuso	-	Yes	Mr. Seyler	-	Yes
Ms. Smith	-	Yes			

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

9. NEW BUSINESS

Review of Bylaws

Chair Novak opened this item on the agenda. Marcus Ricci, Planner II, presented a staff report on the proposed update to the Historic Preservation Commission bylaws. He noted that the proposed change is to add language allowing "electronic attendance" by commission members.

Chair Novak asked if electronic attendance is used very often by other boards and commissions. Kevin Garcia, Planner II, replied that the City Council uses it occasionally. He has seen it happen about five times in the six years he has worked for the City of Urbana. Although it is not used very often, it is convenient when an expert wants to weigh in on a case.

Mr. Hays asked for clarification in that a commission member could not call in to a meeting to attend electronically when he/she is on vacation. Chair Novak said that was correct.

Ms. Pagliuso asked if there were any other changes to the bylaws that the Commission members felt might be needed. There were none. Mr. Ricci stated that if any of the members came up with a change to make a list and the Historic Preservation Commission could discuss it at a future meeting.

Mr. Hays asked if there were any other reasons that the Commission should add for not allowing electronic attendance. Mr. Garcia stated that the proposed language is directly from the Illinois State statute. It is the recommendation of the City Clerk to match the State's rules.

Ms. Smith moved that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the proposed revisions to the bylaws as pertained to video and telephone conferencing. Ms. Pagliuso seconded the motion.

There was no discussion. Chair Novak called for a voice vote, and the motion was passed unanimously.

10. MONITORING OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

- Ms. Smith stated that she noticed two of the three signs were down in front of the ZTA house. Mr. Ricci mentioned that he spoke with Pierre Moulin, owner of the ZTA house, about the remaining sign, and it is permitted because it is considered a subdivision sign that identifies the property; however because it is on a historic landmark, he would be required to get a Certificate of Appropriateness. He would also be permitted to have a Property Exchange sign and City staff will work with him to try to do something appropriate. He asked the Commission members if they preferred the sign to be wall-mounted or free standing. The Commission members agreed it should be free standing.
- Mr. Ricci mentioned that Jonah Weisskopf, owner of the Freeman and Sutton houses, had installed railings under the requirement of his insurance company for liability reasons. He plans to install permanent railings and perhaps a permanent step and porch railings on the Sutton house. He informed Mr. Weisskopf that permanent railings would need a Certificate of Appropriateness. He talked about other potential work that Mr. Weisskopf was considering that would be considered major work and require review by the Historic Preservation Commission.
- Mr. Ricci stated that Chair Novak would be composing a letter for the Dairy Barn manager's house. There are two or three sash windows missing and had been boarded up.
- Ms. Pagliuso noticed that the University of Illinois had done some foundation work on the Mumford House. The rest of the house is in the same condition as it was before. There is more work that needs to be done.

11. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

There was a brief recess taken. The meeting then resumed.

12. STUDY SESSION

Discussion of Activities for Historic Preservation Month

Mr. Ricci explained that due to staff constraints, there is not a lot of time allotted for City staff to help with any activities. The City of Urbana can provide supplies, print brochures or flyers, and help with advertising.

He recommended the Commission have a Downtown Urbana National Register Historic District Walking Tour, which could lead into checking on the remodeling of the Urbana Landmark Hotel. Chair Novak agreed with Mr. Ricci about the walking tour. Mr. Ricci talked about his idea of having people on the walking tour being able to see what changes, if any, are made to the hotel at the time of the walking tour. Ms. Pagliuso and Mr. Hays agreed to form a sub-committee to

organize the tour. Mr. Ricci stated that he would contact Ms. Pollock to see if she is interested in being part of the sub-committee as well.

Chair Novak noted that Brian Adams had agreed to do a lecture on the hotel at the Urbana Free Library Auditorium on May 7, 2020. Brian and she plan to hold an event on “How to Research Your Old House” either on May 14th or May 21st at the Urbana Free Library. She also has the Auditorium at the Urbana Free Library reserved for May 28th, so if anyone knows someone or a business who might be interested in giving a lecture on historic preservation, please let her know.

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Mr. Ricci announced that there is going to be a Downtown Dialogue event, which is a three-day program that promotes downtown revitalization and community development on Main Street.
- Ms. Appel announced that Friday, March 6th is the deadline for the Preservation and Conservation Association grant to attend the Main Street Conference in Springfield, Illinois on March 18th – 20th.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Pagliuso moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m. Ms. Smith seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned by unanimous voice vote.

Submitted,

Marcus Ricci, AICP
Historic Preservation Commission Recording Secretary