City of Woodstock  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Regular Meeting  
Monday, April 26, 2021 7:00 p.m.  
-REMOTELY HELD MEETING-

Due to the current COVID-19 public health emergency, this meeting will be conducted remotely.  
Members of the public can attend online using this link:  
https://zoom.us/j/98227967580?pwd=K3k0UTdXaSs4bTV0ZW54NDkyTjF6dz09

Alternately, the public can listen and comment by telephone by dialing (312) 626-6799 and entering Meeting ID: 982 2796 7580 when prompted. Passcode: 442831. When using this method to attend, members of the public can comment by dialing *9 at the appropriate times during the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, questions may also be forwarded via email to dmoore@woodstockil.gov.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

2. MINUTES  
a. Approve minutes of March 8, 2021 -Special Meeting  
b. Approve minutes of March 22, 2021

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - In accordance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act, the general public may address the Commission regarding any matter on the agenda or not on the agenda.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS  
a. 101 S. Jefferson Street demolition—Certificate of Appropriateness

5. REPORTS AND DISCUSSION  
a. Review and discuss new development review criteria in the Historic Preservation District  
b. “Pride” artwork/mural  
c. Benton Street buildings improvements -126 & 220 N. Benton St.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS  
a. Completed Woodstock train station modifications and proposed warming station—Certificates of Appropriateness  
b. 220 N. Benton Street -glass block window removal—Certificate of Appropriateness

7. ADJOURNMENT

If reasonable accommodations are necessary for persons who, under the American’s with Disabilities Act, have a “disability,” please contact the Building and Zoning Department at 815-338-4305 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting so that accommodations can be provided.
MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
March 8, 2021  
City Council Chambers

The Special Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Woodstock was called to order by Chairman Donovan Day at 7:00 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 virtually, via Zoom webinar due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Governor Pritzker’s stay-at-home mandate.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT VIRTUALLY: Marti Dejon, Jennifer Wegmann-Gabb, Erica Wilson and Chair Donovan Day.

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: none

STAFF PRESENT VIRTUALLY: City Planner Darrell Moore and Executive Assistant/ Chief Deputy City Clerk Jane Howie.

OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUALLY: Barbara Nielsen, Sue Stelford.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

Motion by J. Wegmann-Gabb, second by M. Dejon to accept the Minutes from the February 22, 2021 Commission meeting. E. Wilson requested changes to the February 22, 2021 Minutes, as she noted items that she wished included for the record.

E. Wilson opined there should be changes on page 6, letter B, pertaining to the train station alterations, as there was not enough elaboration of what was discussed. She’d like some things to be on the record for this issue. For the sentence that says impact to exterior, should explain scope of work, comprehensive renovation that included full roof replacement, sign replacement, painting, gutter and downspouts, sidewalk and ADA curb-cut replacement, tuckpointing, and replacing the brick at the bottom with the stone. Then, two more sentences down from there, there was discussion about how to get this information shared with the commission, she had asked D. Moore to provide an explanation as to why the oversight of this project was given to Public Works instead of the Building Department as would have been standard procedure for a project of this type, and how Public Works was deemed qualified to manage this scope of work that included life-safety updates, changes to site grading and comprehensive exterior renovations of a contributing building in the historic district. Further down, E. Wilson wanted to have included the worst part about the brick being replaced on the station with stone is that it is completely unnecessary and a waste of money that could have been used elsewhere. She continued on to say that there’s been no upgrade to safety, durability or longevity of the building by replacing brick with stone, as both are masonry materials and provide an equivalent measure of protection to the building. There also was concern about the tuckpointing, if that was done properly, and it may or may not result in the further damage to the remaining historic brick on the building. Finally, E. Wilson also requested that there be some public acknowledgement from the City Council, or whoever is taking responsibility for this terrible error
by approving this scope of work without oversite by the Building Department and the Historic Preservation Commission. M. Dejon agreed with E. Wilson about these corrections.


PUBLIC COMMENT:
D. Moore asked if anyone wants to make a comment about an item on the agenda or an item is not on the agenda. No comments.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS
a. 120 N. Benton Street: Doors, Windows, Masonry – Certificate of Appropriateness
D. Moore said introduced applicant Thomas Cyrwus, who is proposing masonry repairs on the building at 120 N. Benton Street, on the Jefferson Street side. Mr. Crywus explained some of the modifications / upgrades he is interested in having done, including a new egress staircase on the lower level as well as closing off some of the window openings. He also mentioned he wishes to change one of the existing doors and window to provide natural light to the staircase.

Mr. Crywus continued on to say that he’d like to enclose, with brick, a door on the second floor, along with the other window to the right of that door. He added that the Building & Zoning Department would like the window 36” above floor level. In addition, he’d like to remove and replace some loose mortar and extend some existing brick, remove existing sills and add a masonry finish to match the existing, remove the awning and improve the appearance. Mr. Crywus proposed using vinyl windows, double-hung, if possible, with arched transom above. He explained his plans for further renovations.

E. Wilson asked for further detail on how they intend to clean and repair the masonry wall and if they’ll use high pressure water or do a manual scrubbing. Mr. Crywus said detergent would be used to remove stains from the brick along with 3000 psi water. In response, E. Wilson said 3000 psi water sounds very high. Mr. Cyrwus said they can select an alternative; the existing brick is in rough condition. His plan includes removal of some of the bricks where the face is falling off, repairing the parapet, and resetting with compound or use metal coffings in one or two sections. E. Wilson said it’s important to put flashing over the parapet wall to keep water from getting through. Mr. Crywus explained the process they would use. He added that the owner wants to secure the roof so that there are no water issues. With regard to the tuckpointing, Mr. Crywus said the back area is the only part that needs to be repaired, and once the mason inspects the area, he’ll advise how much tuckpointing is necessary. Mr. Crywus said they’ll use the appropriate mortar and sand to match the existing color. He added that they intend to hire someone who has experience with historic buildings. In response to a question from E. Wilson, Mr. Cyrwus said they’d like to infill the brick that’s recessed to create an architectural design, which also applies to the brick arch above the windows.

J. Wegmann-Gabb would like the arches and sills to remain so that it reflects where the original pieces were. E. Wilson opined it may be difficult to find the arched profiles, and she has concern using vinyl windows. However, being the rear façade, this will need further discussion. M. Dejon also expressed her concern about using vinyl. Mr. Cyrwus explained that the wish to create an egress from the upper section for the second building next door, combining the buildings to allow for this.
D. Moore said Tony Lombardo is here representing the building owner. D. Day thanked Mr. Lombardo for being here. Mr. Lombardo confirmed that they are planning on replacing the roof of the building; they’re acquiring proposals. Regarding the windows, he opined that they can get vinyl windows to fit in the shapes. He added that the general contractor is very familiar with tuckpointing this type of building. In response to a question from M. Dejon, Mr. Cyrwus said the door at the bottom will be replaced. D. Day expressed his concern about the flat door and said that he’d prefer some details; he’s also concerned about the vinyl windows. E. Wilson agreed that if the door is an entrance, it should have panelization instead of a flat door, and she doesn’t like the vinyl windows either. E. Wilson added that the Commission prefers aluminum clad or something similar to that style. In response to a question from D. Day, J. Wegmann-Gabb said she doesn’t care for them bricking in the windows. E. Wilson agreed that she doesn’t care for this either, but she does understand the desire. She also noted that they should be brick infilled rather than feathered in. J. Wegmann-Gabb agreed with the concept of the window openings being acknowledged that they had been there. She has more questions about the vinyl windows, as she knows they’ve come a long way in recent years. She added that she’s more open to the concept of vinyl windows.

Mr. Cyrwus said they’d match the vinyl windows to the dark brown color to match the brick. E. Wilson asked her fellow Commissioners if they are treating this as a rear façade or a secondary façade because it’s facing a main street. She said typically the Commission doesn’t allow vinyl windows in the historic district. In response to a question from J. Wegmann-Gabb, Mr. Cyrwus said the lower level is about 14.5’ from Jefferson Street, and the second floor is recessed approximately 46’.

M. Dejon opined she’d like more care to be taken to make the best changes to the building pertaining to the historic nature of the building; a better precedent, as well. She opined she doesn’t like the fact that the Commission would allow these materials just because it’s the back of the building. D. Day agreed with M. Dejon, as did E. Wilson. D. Day said there is a consensus that Commissioners are not in favor of vinyl windows, but overall the Commissioners are in favor of this plan. It was noted that infill is OK, but be careful with the soft brick. Commissioners were also concerned with the flat panel door as they’d prefer a metal paneled door. Mr. Lombardo said there are only a couple of apartments and they are following a strict budget without cutting corners. Mr. Cyrwus added that they’re dealing with four windows including the arched transom on the second floor. D. Day asked if this applies to façade funding. In response, D. Moore said this would qualify under the façade program. D. Moore will forward the grant paperwork to Mr. Cyrwus. D. Moore briefly explained the program.

D. Day asked if there were any comments from the public. A bit of discussion ensued pertaining to either going through the Certificate of Appropriateness or just making a motion.

Motion by J. Wegmann-Gabb to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness but note that the windows be of a higher quality material (not vinyl), and that the metal door on the lower level include panels, that special care be taken with the bricks while they’re being cleaned, that infilling of windows be done so as to showcase that there were openings there before. Second by E. Wilson.

b. Former Die Cast site development proposal: “Central Station” Pancor Construction Development, LLC — Certificate of Appropriateness

Applicant Pete Nelson, Pancor Construction and Development, LLC, Alex Vaysman.

D. Moore said representatives from Pancor Construction are here. They’ve been putting their proposal for the Die Cast site together for several months. The site has been vacant for several years now. D. Moore continued on to say that the brownstones are at the center. And the 1-acre property to the south is the area in question this evening for review. He shared images which had been provided by the applicant; includes two buildings, the building to the north is Phase 1.

Mr. Nelson stated that there are many elements to this proposal, and they’ve been working with the neighbors and City staff to get them to this point. He added that this is a very unique site and they don’t want to take away from the brownstones that are already there. They’d prefer to blend in to the area, with Phase 1 including 44-units. It is their desire to be part of, and contribute to, the community and provide for the needs of Woodstock.

Mr. Vaysman gave a quick history about his introduction to Woodstock. He said he’s happy to have the opportunity to expand on the idea that’s already in place at this site. The idea is to tie this in to the overall Woodstock Downtown Plan, while planning to add to the Square without taking away from it. They derived their inspirations from timeless architecture and they’ve studied many developments around the world. There is a theme that they’re looking to transfer here. They looked at how to phase this project to achieve some of the ideas that were put together when Woodstock’s Downtown Plan was compiled. Three phases of development; Phase 1, 44-unit building; Phase 2, 72-unit building; Phase 3, future townhome development site. He added that the design of the building has everything to do with the Square. They took into consideration the height of the townhome, honoring their site lines to the Square. They wish to mimic the heavy cornices which define the Square. And, bring the visual scale down with mansard roofs, which have been added to these buildings. He explained further details of the buildings. They won’t disturb the green space west of Wheeler Street, but instead use it at a gathering site for outdoor activity. They aren’t looking to add commercial to the (Phase 1) site as they wish to focus on the Square. The buildings open up toward the Square and they create architectural visuals along Clay Street.

Mr. Nelson said he liked the gateway from the typewriter company, which is being incorporated into the development design; D. Day opined that he liked that throw-back, too. Mr. Vaysman said there are so many elements that have influenced their designs.

In response to a question from D. Day, Mr. Nelson said the grounding elements surrounding the buildings would include brick veneers, cast stone if they use stone, faux brick and stone base, mixed materials, all to give a row house type of look.

D. Day said he’s really impressed with the design, and he pointed out several details that he really liked. J. Wegmann-Gabb. said she loves this plan. In response to a question from M. Dejon, Mr. Nelson said the face will be true brick along with synthetic stucco that looks similar to limestone. This will allow for minimized maintenance and it will look the same in ten years. Mr. Nelson said this will be a very smooth finish that more closely resembles limestone. In response to a question from E. Wilson, Mr. Nelson said dryvit is still in the picture, but it traps moisture. They are considering 3-4 different products that have ventilation, a drain screen, or are breathable. E. Wilson said she really likes their design, it’s beautiful and sensitive to existing residents. She was concerned with aesthetics; she’d like to see updated renderings. Mr. Nelson said they need to represent this
better so that one can see the recessed areas. Mr. Vaysman explained the elevations of the buildings and additional information about the mansard roofs.

In response to a question from D. Day, Mr. Nelson said they’d love to put wood windows in, however, they’re looking at vinyl clad windows, as the selection in clad windows is astounding. They’re easy to maintain with a reasonable price point. They’re focusing on the darker colors. They have not selected a window manufacturer yet; they’re open to suggestions.

This project would like to be presented to City Council in April, they will be looking for comments.

D. Day said, regarding vinyl windows, he doesn’t have a problem with vinyl windows here since it’s a brand-new building and it’s off the Square. E. Wilson said one of her concerns with vinyl is that they may have to be replaced in 10-15 years.

D. Day thanked Mr. Nelson and Mr. Vaysman for these new renderings. And he asked for comments. M. Dejon said she likes the idea of making this look like different buildings. However, she’s not a fan of vinyl windows; she hopes they’ll look into other options. E. Wilson asked if they believe they’ll have any other changes to these designs.

Mr. Vaysman thanked Darrell Moore and Garrett Anderson for all their assistance on this project and injecting the City’s ideas into their design.

D. Day asked for any public comments. B. Nielsen, a resident of the Brownstones adjacent to the site, said Mr. Vaysman keeps saying that he has the blessings from the residents at the brownstones. She said her neighbor, John McNamara, who’s an architect, submitted a letter highlighting the residents’ thoughts on the architectural concepts for Phases 1 and 2. She said the architecture of the proposed development does not represent what’s in the City. She doesn’t believe the renderings are similar to the current brownstones. In response, Mr. Vaysman said they’ve made many changes from their first designs in an effort to not take away from the brownstones but instead to add to them. M. Dejon asked Ms. Nielsen about her concern; is it the overall size of the buildings or the amount of people that will be there. Ms. Nielsen said both the size and overall look of the buildings; the color, indentations, the increase in traffic and architectural renderings. She opined it looks like a massive block of apartments. She said they have a lot of concerns because of the density. M. Dejon said she understands her concerns as this will be a big change.

D. Moore said there was a bit of miscommunication that the elevations were the most up to date version of this design. He said the building material images were placed on the three-dimensional renderings by Mr. Vaysman, but that it was the two-dimensional elevation drawings that are a better representation of the current proposal, so there was a bit of confusion. Responding to questions from D. Moore, Mr. Vaysman clarified that the grill patterns for windows and doors will be what was presented tonight. Mr. Vaysman further explained that the exterior materials would include stone, brick, stucco, and not-wood. The panels with the ‘X’ would look like a copper insert, but it would not be metal. D. Moore asked about the material around the base. He opined it looks like cinder block. Mr. Nelson said this would be cast stone, which can look like cinder block. They plan to go one step beyond that so it looks like chiseled stone. Mr. Vaysman explained the connection between them, which makes them look more like stone. D. Moore said from his perspective, he wants to make sure that the Commission has enough information to make a decision. D. Moore is looking for feedback from the Commissioners, and asked if they’d like more information. E. Wilson said
she’d like to see these elevations fully rendered. M. Dejon agreed, and said she’d like information on the specific details once they’re decided on. D. Moore said a Certificate of Appropriateness will be necessary before the building permits are issued. In response to a question from Mr. Nelson, D. Day said based on the renderings shared tonight, the Commission is mostly supportive, basically design wise and material wise. He added that the Commissioners would like to view the finished renderings to see the look and feel of it. Mr. Vaysman thanked the Commission for the feedback. He added that he’d love to show the Commissioners all the products. D. Day said they appreciate the materials that they’re going with and that they would love to see the materials in person, if they’re available.

D. Moore said they can vote to now with conditions or continue this to a future meeting to continue. D. Moore noted that this commission is scheduled to meet again in two weeks as today’s meeting was a Special Meeting.

Mr. Nelson said they now know what the Commission is looking for, they’ll keep things straightforward. D. Moore said the next commission’s meeting is March 22, if this will be continued to that time.


REPORTS AND UPDATES: none.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:
Completed Woodstock train station modifications and proposed warming station – Certificates of Appropriateness
D. Moore said he’s waiting on more information from City Engineer Chris Tiedt. He wants to provide all the information that the City has. Metra is also getting close to erecting a new warming station on the other side of the tracks.

ADJOURNMENT:

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Howie
Chief Deputy City Clerk
The Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Woodstock was called to order by Chairman Donovan Day at 7:00 PM on Monday, March 22, 2021 virtually, via Zoom webinar due to the COVID-19 pandemic and Governor Pritzker’s stay-at-home mandate.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT VIRTUALLY: Marti Dejon, Jennifer Wegmann-Gabb, Erica Wilson and Chair Donovan Day.

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: none

STAFF PRESENT VIRTUALLY: City Planner Darrell Moore and Executive Assistant/Chief Deputy City Clerk Jane Howie.


ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:
The March 8, 2021 Minutes were not available for review. This item will be included on the next meeting’s agenda for acceptance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
D. Day asked if anyone wants to make a comment about an item on the agenda or an item is not on the agenda. No comments.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS
a. Former Die Cast site development proposal: “Central Station” Pancor Construction Development, LLC – Certificate of Appropriateness

D. Moore shared photos of material samples provided by Mr. Vaysman. Mr. Vaysman thanked the Commission for their input at the last meeting. He shared areas that they have changed after receiving the Commission’s feedback, such as a lighter color for the mansard roofs and variations in window grille patterns. He showed updated renderings and pointed out the specific colors that have been selected. E. Wilson thanked them for the updates. In response to a Commissioner question, Mr. Vaysman said the wall system they plan to use will have internal drainage and will be a system that will last. E. Wilson is concerned that the EIFS/stucco doesn’t tie in to the look of the Square, and she’s also concerned about the maintenance of this product with it being on the first floor. In response to a question from E. Wilson, Mr. Nelson said at the ground level, there’s a reinforced system which makes it more durable and reinforced. Mr. Vaysman shared that the Fairfield Inn they built a year and a half ago has this same material on the first floor, and it has held up really well. Mr. Vaysman added that the EIFS/stucco will be smooth, but you will see the joints. E. Wilson asked for clarification regarding the window samples provided. Mr. Vaysman stated the casement window sample was provided only to demonstrate how they will use windows that are black on the outside and white on the inside. E. Wilson said the corner seams are unsightly and she’s concerned about the wear and appearance over time. Mr. Vaysman agreed and said they will be using a better
product, which will have color all the way through. Mr. Vaysman continued on to explain that the windows will be one solid piece of glass with a spacer inside.

M. Dejon said she’s not a huge fan of the stucco, and she’s also concerned with it being on the ground floor as it’s a fragile product. She wants to make sure that the appearance will hold up over the years. Mr. Nelson added that they are looking at the products with maintenance in mind. D. Day thanked Mr. Vaysman and Mr. Nelson for the updated renderings and additional information.

M. Dejon asked how the Commission will know that the appropriate products are going to be used once construction gets started. D. Moore said the process begins with the Commission’s recommendation, and any specifics should be stated separately and part of the motion. It will then go before the Plan Commission and then on to City Council. He added that the Site Plan will come before this Commission for recommendation first.

D. Day proposed that a potential condition for approval could be that, if any materials vary from the brick and stucco-style rendering presented at the meeting, then new review and approval from this Commission is required. M. Dejon agreed that if any obvious changes are planned, this Commission should be consulted prior to moving forward.

The Commission then discussed if the use of vinyl windows was appropriate. E. Wilson raised this point. M. Dejon opined that she doesn’t care for the look of the vinyl windows. J. Wegmann-Gabb noted that, according to the applicant, the window corners will be nicer than the sample window that was shared tonight. D. Day said he is OK with the vinyl windows because he likes the design of them. J. Wegmann-Gabb is OK with the vinyl windows, as well. Mr. Vaysman advised that the window display this evening is just a sample window and that no corner seams will be visible on the windows to be used. Mr. Nelson said this window has a heat-welded seam, so up close you will notice the seam a bit. In response to a question from D. Moore, Mr. Vaysman said they’ve selected Quaker windows as they’ve had good experiences with them. He noted that Quaker windows have approval from Marriott Hotels.

E. Wilson stated that she is also concerned about the ratio of stucco used on the buildings. D. Day said he’s OK with the amount of stucco and J. Wegmann-Gabb agreed. M. Dejon said there’s more stucco than she’d like to see; less stucco would be better.

Mr. Nelson stated they agree to not deviate from what is being approved here this evening. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Vaysman agreed that the colors presented tonight will be the colors used. M. Dejon said the ratio of stucco to brick to other products and materials should remain as presented, as well. D. Moore said he assumes that if the builder decided to add more brick (and less stucco) that the Commissioners would be happy with that. There was a consensus of agreement from the Commissioners.

D. Day asked for a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following condition; any changes required to the exterior materials, colors or ratio of EIFS/stucco shall be required to return to the Historic Preservation Commission for approval.

REPORTS AND UPDATES: none.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:
   a. Completed Woodstock train station modifications and proposed warming station-Certificate of Appropriateness
   b. “Pride” artwork/mural in the historic district

D. Moore said he’ll have a report next month with the train station improvements and the proposed warming station. Also, in the next month or two Commissioners will see a proposal for a painted rainbow-colored mural on the public stairs in the Square. He explained that the Woodstock Pride group had ‘painted’ the stairs with chalk for their Pride Fest event in 2019, and they’d like to make this feature permanent. M. Dejon asked about future projects in the historic district, as she’s concerned about buildings being taller than four floors, and she’d like to know what Commissioners should focus on when builders/developers are presenting. In response, D. Moore said he will tailor a presentation to include that specific concern for a future Commission meeting. D. Moore added that there might be a proposal for the Pioneer Center, at the corner of Jackson and Jefferson Street, in the near future.

ADJOURNMENT:

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Howie
Chief Deputy City Clerk
Category 2 Certificate of Appropriateness

Staff Report

Demolition of 101-109 South Jefferson Street

APPLICATION

Received: April 2021
Applicant: Throop Street LLC, owner
Request: The applicant has proposed the demolition of the building in order to prepare the property to be a “ready-to-build” site.

BUILDING/SITE INFORMATION

The building at this location is comprised of five separate structures, mostly erected between 1922 and 1948. Initially used as an automobile and agricultural equipment sales, the buildings would go on to be known as the location of Bakkoms Hardware and the Woodstock Daily Sentinel. About 30 years ago the structure was remodeled and converted to office and schoolroom spaces. The large storefront windows were mostly covered over. In the years since, Pioneer Center has operated offices and programs out of the building. The building was sold in 2021 to the current owner.

BUILDING DESIGNATION AND STATUS:

- [ ] National Register District
- [X] Local Historic District
- [ ] Designated Landmark
- [X] 50+ Years
- [ ] Contributing
- [X] Non-contributing
- [ ] Intrusive

Which facade(s) will be affected by the proposed work? 
- [X] Primary
- [X] Secondary
- [X] Tertiary

What is the existing condition of the affected facade(s)? 
- [ ] Original / mostly original
- [ ] Partially altered
- [X] Significantly altered
The applicant is requesting permission to demolish the building at 101-109 South Jefferson Street. The building is located in the Downtown Business Historic Preservation District.
The building is currently vacant and in need of repairs and improvements. The applicant has explored renovation costs for the building and has estimated more than $3 million of work is required. The condition of the roof trusses is of particular concern. There are currently temporary support braces in place for the roof. Additionally, the exterior shows signs of distress, including peeling paint and damaged siding. The building’s location has been identified in the Woodstock Downtown Plan as a possible location for high-density residential. Even if renovated, the one-story building is a poor candidate for that use.

Woodstock Historical Structures Survey 2014 Entry

According to the Woodstock Historical Structures Survey (2014), the building is non-contributing with “poor” historic integrity, thought the condition at that time was rated as “good.”

Approval of the requested Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the structure should be based on Section 7.7.5.4 of the City Code (below). Based on the current state of the building and its designation in the Historic Structures Survey as “non-contributing,” the commission has suitable grounds to approve the demolition, if it is also determined that doing so “will not adversely affect the character of the historic preservation district.”
The criteria for the granting of Certificates of Appropriateness or Hardship from the Historic Preservation Commission Regulations section of the City Code:

7.7.5.4: DEMOLITION:
Before granting a request for a certificate to demolish a structure which has been designated a landmark or a structure within a historic preservation district, the commission must find that at least one of the following conditions exist:

A. The demolition request is for an inappropriate addition, or a nonsignificant accessory structure, provided that the demolition will not adversely affect those parts of a building or buildings which are significant as determined by the commission; or
B. The demolition request is for a noncontributing building and the demolition will not adversely affect the character of the historic preservation district; or
C. The building and zoning officer for the city certifies that demolition is required for the public safety because of an unsafe or dangerous condition; or
D. The property owner shows that failure to allow demolition would involve a substantial hardship, economic or otherwise, pursuant to the provisions of section 7.7.5.6 of this chapter. (Ord. 2604, 1-16-1996)

7.7.5.6: HARDSHIP:
A. A certificate of hardship shall be issued by the commission upon a finding by it that all reasonable use of, or return from, a designated landmark or property within a historic preservation district would be denied a property owner as a result of the disapproval of a certificate of appropriateness.

B. The commission may solicit expert testimony, or the applicant may submit evidence, concerning any of the following items at the time of the public hearing on the certificate of appropriateness:
   1. Any substantial decrease in the fair market value of the property as a result of the denial of the certificate of appropriateness;
   2. Any substantial decrease in the pretax or after-tax return to owner(s) of record or other investors in the property as a result of the denial of the certificate of appropriateness;
   3. Any additional cost of work necessary to comply with the standards and criteria for the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness;
   4. In the case of a proposed demolition, the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure on the property.

C. The commission may adopt procedural rules concerning the types of information, evidence or expert testimony that it considers necessary to make a determination on an application for a certificate of hardship.

D. Upon a finding by the commission that without approval of the proposed work all reasonable use of, or return from, a designated landmark or property within a historic preservation district will be denied a property owner, then the application shall be delayed for a period not to exceed sixty (60) days. During this period of delay, the commission shall investigate plans and make recommendations to the city council to allow for a reasonable use of, or return from, the property, or to otherwise preserve the subject property. Such plans and recommendations may include, but are not limited to: a relaxation of the provisions of this chapter, a reduction in real property taxes, financial assistance, building code modifications, and/or changes in zoning regulations.
ACTION BY THE COMMISSION

The approval being sought from the commission is only for the demolition of the building, not any particular future use. The approval may take one of two forms—a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Certificate of Hardship. Possible actions:

1. The applicant persuades the commission that a Certificate of Appropriateness is warranted and the commission votes to approve it. After such time, the applicant is free to proceed, subject to relevant city permits.

2. The applicant fails to persuade the commission that a Certificate of Appropriateness is warranted and the commission votes to deny. The applicant then attempts to persuade the commission that a Certificate of Hardship is warranted.
   - If the commission concurs that there is a hardship, the ordinance requires a “delay” in an approval to provide the commission with time to investigate alternatives.
   - If the commission does not believe additional information is likely to be found, it can elect to forego the “delay” and vote immediately.
   - If the commission wishes to conduct further investigation, the hearing shall be continued to a date not more than 60 days out.
City of Woodstock
Application for Certificate of Appropriateness

Address of property: 101-109 S. Jefferson St. Date filed: 4-19-21

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant's Name: Throop Street LLC
Applicant's Address: 244 W. Judd St., Woodstock IL
Daytime Telephone Number: 815-276-2535 Email address: jprinduille@gmail.com

Relationship to Property Owner: Owner
(ie. owner, lessee, architect, contractor, attorney)

OWNER INFORMATION (If different than applicant)

Property Owner's Name:

Property Owner's Address:

Daytime Telephone Number: Email Address:

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Year Built: Post 1922 (earliest of the 5 buildings that make up the structure)
Original Name of Structure: Bakkens (circa 1938)
Original Use of Structure: Agricultural Equipment/hardware sales
Common Name or Current Business:

Current Use(s): Vacant

TYPE OF WORK Check all that apply.

EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS

☐ Storefront Remodel  ☐ Windows  ☐ Doors  ☐ Siding  ☐ Roof
☐ Porch/Railings  ☐ Awning  ☐ Fence/Gate  ☐ Lighting  ☐ Painting
☐ Stairs  ☐ Gutters  ☐ Landscape  ☐ Masonry
☐ Other

NEW CONSTRUCTION/DEMOLITION/RELOCATION:

☐ New Structure  ☐ Addition to Existing Structure ☒ Demolition
☐ Relocation of Existing Structure
SCOPE OF WORK:

DESCRIPTION OF WORK: Please describe in detail the work to be done. The description should include information about the current state of the property, historic features, materials, methods, design, measurement, project phasing, reason for work and expected completion date. Demolition requests must include the proposed reuse of the site. Relocation requests must include information about the new site. Additional pages may be attached.

See attached

COST OF WORK: The Historic Preservation Commission strongly recommends that applicants obtain a detailed cost estimate or estimates before you proceed with your project. Have you obtained a cost estimate for the work items and products described above?________________________

Woodstock Building & Zoning Department 121 W. Calhoun Street, Woodstock, Illinois 60098
(815) 538-4305 www.woodstockil.gov bandzdept@woodstockil.gov
ALL APPLICATIONS MUST INCLUDE:

 provincia Photographs of the existing structure and site (digital, black and white, or color prints are acceptable.)

If the project includes any new construction or reconstruction, also include:

☐ Sketches and/or architectural/designer plans and elevation drawings
☐ Proposed materials and colors
☐ Manufacturer’s photographs, illustrations, cutsheets and/or specifications (including warranty information, if applicable.)
☐ Site plan, with dimensions, if applicable

If material changes are proposed, also include:

☐ Sketches and/or architectural/designer plans and elevation drawings indicating location of changes
☐ Samples of new materials
☐ Proposed colors
☐ Manufacturer’s photographs, illustrations and/or specifications (including warranty information, if applicable).

If a relocation project, also include:

☐ Photographs and description of new site
☐ Site plan of new location

Applicant Signature: [Signature]

Applicant acknowledges the proposed project will comply with the Woodstock City Code including, but not limited to the Woodstock Historic Preservation Ordinance, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines for Properties within the Woodstock Downtown Business Historic Preservation District. Applicant also acknowledges that if granted, the Certificate of Appropriateness is only for the project and materials as approved, and that applicant will contact the Building & Zoning Department prior to making changes that deviate in any way from the approved Certificate of Appropriateness.

FOR INTERNAL USE

Date received: ___________________ Received for Completeness by: ___________________

Type of Review: ☐ Category I Administrative ☐ Category II HPC

COA Meeting Date: ___________________

Applicant has received: ☐ Design Guidelines ☐ Window or Door Policy ☐ Awning Policy

Applicant has been advised of: ☐ 20% Federal Tax Credit
☐ Illinois Property Tax Assessment Freeze Program

Woodstock Building & Zoning Department
121 W. Calhoun Street, Woodstock, Illinois 60098
(815) 338-4305 www.woodstockil.gov bandzdept@woodstockil.gov
Description of Building Condition 101–9 S. Jefferson:

The building at 101-9 S. Jefferson Street consists of at least five separate structures that have been combined into a single structure over a period of 40 to 50 years. In the late 1980s or early 90s, the resulting structure was renovated from storefronts into office and school-room space. Storefront glass along the west and north was removed and window openings were reduced.

Four of the structures are of bowstring truss construction. Older wood bowstring trusses are known to be of poor design. In the 1970s, after many bowstring-truss-roof failures in the Chicago area due to heavy snow, the load-bearing strength of Douglas fir (of which most bowstring trusses, including these, are made) was lowered by over half from what was previously estimated. The trusses in this building must be rebuilt and/or repaired for safety reasons. In one of the structures, three trusses are cracked and have so completely failed they are now held up with 16 temporary posts on the ground floor and several more supporting them in the basement. We have discovered probable truss failure in other parts of the building. Many unknowns remain.

Based on preliminary discussions with contractors and tradesmen, the estimated cost of restoration would exceed $3 million.

Scope of project if building were to be restored:

- Roof tear off to lighten load on trusses and restore water tightness
- Roof replacement with insulated membrane material, includes later reworking of parapet walls after facade renovation
- Demolition of 22,000 sq. ft. of interior walls and ceilings to expose trusses (44 rooms).
- Engineering analysis of the roof and building (footings, exterior walls, etc.)
- Truss reinforcement and repair
- Redesign and rebuild 22,000 sq. ft. interior into rentable space, including architect and engineering fees and associated structural repairs that would undoubtedly be required in parts of the building to assure safety
- Restore the facades of disparate buildings that were built and/or significantly renovated in different eras, perhaps to their original looks, with new storefront glass, restored brick and block. This would create an eclectic, non-uniform look.

Future use of the site:
This demolition is the first step in a phased redevelopment of the site. The plan is to create a ready-to-build site. The next phase will be to plan for the type of building we wish to construct. When that has been determined we will return to the commission with those plans and building elevations for approval.