CITY OF URBANA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, November 4, 2026
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801

AGENDA

A. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Declaration of Quorum

B. Changes to the Agenda

C. Approval of Previous Minutes

Minutes of September 2, 2026 Regular Meeting

Minutes of October 7, 2026 Regular Meeting

D. Written Communications

- Email from Mo Chase (IDOT) regarding Section 106 Sequence #264222 (Florida Avenue Project), dated October 20, 2026

E. Audience Participation

F. Continued Public Hearings

G. Old Business

Bylaws Revisions

H. New Public Hearings

I. New Business

Certificate of Appropriateness Application Revisions

J. Monitoring of Historic Properties

K. Staff Report

L. Study Session

Historic Preservation Plan and Downtown Design District Conversation

Section 106 Sequence #264222 (Florida Avenue Project)

M. Announcements

N. Adjournment

PUBLIC INPUT

The City of Urbana welcomes Public Input during open meetings of the City Council, the City Council's Committee of the Whole, City Boards and Commissions and other City-sponsored meetings. Our goal is to foster respect for the meeting process, and respect for all people participating as members of the public body, city staff, and general public. The City is required to conduct all business during public meetings. The presiding officer is responsible for conducting those meetings in an orderly and efficient manner.
Public Input will be taken in the following ways:

Email Input
In order to be incorporated into the record, emailed public comments must be received prior to 5:00 pm on the day preceding the meeting and sent to the following email address: **Planning@urbanail.gov**. The subject line of the email must include the words **"HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION - PUBLIC INPUT"** and the meeting date. Emailed public comments labeled as such will be incorporated into the public meeting record, with personal identifying information redacted.

Written Input
Any member of the public may submit their comments addressed to the members of the public body in writing. If a person wishes their written comments to be included in the record of Public Input for the meeting, the writing should so state. Written comments must be received prior to the closing of the meeting record (at the time of adjournment unless otherwise noted).

Public Hearing
Any person desiring to appear at the public hearing and present testimony may speak during each public hearing at the time they appear on the agenda. This shall not count towards regular Public Input for the meeting. The Public Hearing is an opportunity for comments and questions to be addressed specific to each case. Board or Commission members are permitted to respond and engage during this time and/or the Chairperson may direct the applicant to respond during rebuttal. Comments unrelated to any of the public hearings listed on an agenda should be shared during the Public Input portion of the meeting where Verbal Input guidelines shall apply.

Verbal Input
Protocol for Public Input is one of respect for the process of addressing the business of the City. Obscene or profane language, or other conduct that threatens to impede the orderly progress of the business conducted at the meeting is unacceptable.

Public comment shall be limited to no more than five (5) minutes per person. The Public Input portion of the meeting shall total no more than one (1) hour, unless otherwise shortened or extended by majority vote of the public body members present. The presiding officer or the city clerk or their designee, shall monitor each speaker's use of time and shall notify the speaker when the allotted time has expired. A person may participate and provide Public Input once during a meeting and may not cede time to another person or split their time if Public Input is held at two (2) or more different times during a meeting.

The presiding officer or public body members shall not enter into a dialogue with citizens. Questions from the public body members shall be for clarification purposes only. Public Input shall not be used as a time for problem solving or reacting to comments made but, rather, for hearing citizens for informational purposes only.

In order to maintain the efficient and orderly conduct and progress of the public meeting, the presiding officer of the meeting shall have the authority to raise a point of order and provide a verbal warning to a speaker who engages in the conduct or behavior proscribed under "Verbal Input". Any member of the public body participating in the meeting may also raise a point of order with the presiding officer and request that they provide a verbal warning to a speaker. If the speaker refuses to cease such conduct or behavior after being warned by the presiding officer, the presiding officer shall have the authority to mute the speaker's microphone and/or video presence at the meeting. The presiding officer will inform the speaker that they may send the remainder of their remarks via e-mail to the public body for inclusion in the meeting record.

Accommodation

If an accommodation is needed to participate in a City meeting, please contact the City at least 48 hours in advance using one of the following methods:

Phone: **217.384.2440**

Email: **Planning@urbanail.gov**

Watching the Meeting via Streaming Services

All City meetings are broadcast on Urbana Public Television and live-streamed on the web. Details on how to watch are found on the UPTV webpage located at https://www.urbanail.gov/executive-department/page/urbana-public-television.

CITY OF URBANA

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING **DRAFT**

DATE: September 2, 2026

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING:	David Hays, Dr. Kathryn Holliday, Dennis Roberts, Angela Urban, Andrew Weiss
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Laura O'Donnell
STAFF PRESENT:	Evan Alvarez, Principal Planner; Kate Himick, Planner I; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II
OTHERS PRESENT:	Susan Appel, Tracy Chong, Christopher Hansen, Dannie Otto, Lauren Senoff, Phyllis Williams

A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Urban called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared with a majority of the members present.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

C. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Minutes of July 1, 2026 Regular Meeting

The minutes of the July 1, 2026 regular meeting were presented for approval. Mr. Hays moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the minutes. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Mr. Hays made the following corrections to the minutes:

- Page 3, Paragraph 2, 2nd Bulleted Item – Change William's to Williams'
- Page 4, Written Communications – He said that the communications are listed but there is not a summary of the communications. Ms. Himick replied that staff can summarize the content of each communication and add it to the minutes. *{Correction: Staff do not provide summary of written communications in minutes. If someone wants to see a copy of a communication, they may contact the Planning Division staff by calling 217-384-2440 or by email at Planning@UrbanaIL.gov.}*
- Page 8, Paragraph 1, Third Line – Change Evan's to Evans'

Dr. Holliday made the following corrections to the minutes:

- Page 4, Last Paragraph, First Sentence – Change director to Chair

Chair Urban made the following corrections to the minutes:

- Page 10, Paragraph 2 – Does not make sense. *{NOTE: Staff made the following changes, "Ms. Urban texted ~~that~~ the issue~~s are~~ is that facts were not fully provided, there were missing minutes, the lack of knowledge ~~of~~ and the exclusion of the Commission from the process, and the representation that the Commission was included in the process."}*
- Page 10, Last Paragraph, Line 6 – The use of dots (…) makes it feel like information is missing. Ms. Himick stated that most of the minutes are transcribed mostly verbatim, and the way people speak does not translate the way people write. So, when someone takes a pause or switches their train of thought, that is what the ellipses are denoting. Chair Urban recommended writing Pause in brackets. *{NOTE: Staff made the following changes, "One of the things that the Commission is asked to do is to collaborate with all of the other units of Urbana government, including ~~…~~ all the commissions, the City Council, the Mayor, etc. and the community members towards a holistic vision."*
- Page 11, Paragraph 1 – the use of italics around (Vice Chair Hays mentioned that Mr. Evans believes this was intentional.). Chair Urban said that this does not need to be in italics. *{NOTE: Staff removed the italics}*

The minutes were approved unanimously as amended by voice vote.

Minutes of August 5, 2026 Regular Meeting

The minutes of the August 5, 2026 regular meeting were presented for approval. Ms. Holliday moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the minutes. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote as written.

Minutes of August 19, 2026 Special Meeting

The minutes of the August 19, 2026 special meeting were presented for approval. Mr. Weiss moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve the minutes. Dr. Holliday seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote as written.

D. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- Email from Jane McClintock dated September 2, 2026 regarding Case No. HP-2026-COA-01
- Chair Urban mentioned a correspondence that she received regarding the Buena Vista Neighborhood 100th Year Celebration
- City of Champaign, Illinois - 2026 Downtown Plan from Dennis Roberts
- Urbana Design Review Districts from Dennis Roberts

E. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Christopher Hansen approached the Historic Preservation Commission to talk about different ways in which the City of Urbana protects its residents. Mr. Hansen showed a photo of his lawn that

Jason Arrasmith, Environmental Compliance Inspector, had taken when citing him for the grass being too long and violating an Ordinance. Mr. Hansen stated that he went through the appeals process with the City Administrator to get the citing overturned because his lawn was not too long. Mr. Hansen stated that Mr. Arrasmith had not done his due diligence and had lied about the issue.

Mr. Hansen spoke about the property at 310 West Illinois Street. He stated that Ameren had buried a power line last year along the corner of the property to the duplex being built next door. When they buried the line, he noticed that it was rather shallow in the ground. He noted that he measured it and discovered it was only 14-15 inches deep with no conduit protection. Mr. Hansen stated that this is a violation of the National Electrical Safety Code, which Ameren is supposed to follow. He stated that he complained about it, but he cannot get anyone to do anything about it.

Mr. Hansen also showed a photo of his neighbors pointing bright spotlights at his house. He noted that he contacted the City about it, and that no one seems to care, except when they are hassling Ms. Chong about repairing her porch at 404 West Illinois Street.

Chair Urban said that if his comments are about the Certificate of Appropriateness in Case No. HP-2026-COA-01, then he will have time during the public hearing to speak on it. She said that she is unclear about whether he is talking about the case or about specific issues he has mentioned. Mr. Hansen replied that he is talking about ways in which the City is protecting its residents from whatever it is they think they need protecting from.

Mr. Hansen showed a picture of the alleyway behind his home. He explained that he had contacted the City and City staff laid new asphalt in the alley in order to regrade it and try to keep it from flooding. Mr. Hansen stated that his neighbor tore out the asphalt that the City of Urbana had installed to create flooding again. He noted that he contacted the City of Urbana, and he cannot get anyone to fix it. Mr. Hansen expressed that this was done without a permit and is totally illegal, but the City is hassling Ms. Chong about repairing her porch at 404 West Illinois Street.

Mr. Hansen stated that Mr. Sacks also built a 9-foot fence without a permit, and it is over the height limit allowed. He expressed that the City does not care and is not doing anything about it, but that the City is hassling Ms. Chong about repairing her porch at 404 West Illinois Street.

Mr. Hansen expressed concern that the City harasses people they do not like and does not pay attention to actual safety matters or that Ms. Chong is improving the neighborhood. He stated that 404 West Illinois Street is now more dangerous because there is no porch on the house.

F. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

G. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

H. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. HP-2026-COA-01 – A request by Tracy Chong for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the previous wood front porch with a new porch at 404 West Illinois Street.

Chair Urban opened the public hearing for Case No. HP-2026-COA-01. She reviewed the procedure for a public hearing.

Kate Himick, Planner I, presented the staff report for this case to the Historic Preservation Commission. She began by stating that 404 West Illinois Street is a Historic Landmark and is also known as the Ezekiel Boyden Home. She showed where the property is located on a map. She provided context about the origination of the Certificate of Appropriateness request. She talked about compliance and enforcement of work performed on the exterior of a local landmark.

Ms. Himick provided background information on the existing structure and locations. She described the previous porch and its condition prior to being demolished and to the proposed changes to the front porch. She reviewed the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness approval according to Section XII.7.C of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance and how they relate to the proposed request.

Ms. Himick reviewed the options of the Historic Preservation Commission and presented staff's recommendation, which is as follows:

Based on the material provided in the application and without the benefit of additional evidence that may be presented at the public hearing, City staff recommend that if the Commission were to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, it be with the following conditions:

1. That the porch be reconstructed in a manner consistent with the significant original qualities and character of the structure, as determined by the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission.
2. That a building permit is submitted for the work proposed, and that detailed drawings, elevations, material specifications are provided with the submission that clearly identify how the porch will be constructed in a manner consistent with the criteria listed in the written staff report, as determined by the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ms. Himick showed photos of the previous porch provided by the applicant and photos provided by the staff of the City's Building Safety Division.

Chair Urban opened the hearing for public input. She invited the applicant to speak.

Tracy Chong, applicant, approached the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that she loves the house and cares about it, which is why she wants to replace the front porch. It was in very bad condition. Anyone could trip on the warped boards.

Ms. Chong said that initially she planned to just replace the top boards, but upon opening it, she discovered that the inside was rotten and the footings were not up to code. She said that she feels the City has spent so many resources on this when there are so many other issues going around. She mentioned that there is a big hole in the sidewalk next door and that across the street, there is water flooding. She stated that holding this meeting is costing the City a lot of money and that she does not have childcare so she could attend this meeting. She said that she feels that not everything should have to follow the same blanket rule, and that it should match the scope of the problem. Ms. Chong expressed that this situation could have easily been reviewed and decided offline rather than wasting everyone's time and wasting City resources.

Ms. Chong said that a building permit has not been issued and will not be issued until she gets approval for the proposed Certificate of Appropriateness. She said that she is open to answering any questions the Commission may have.

Dr. Holliday stated that it appears the one thing missing from the application is a plan for the replacement of the porch. She stated that she understands that the porch needed to be replaced. She explained that a Certificate of Appropriateness gives the applicant space to talk about what materials Ms. Chong wants to use and what construction method Ms. Chong will use to replace the porch. Dr. Holliday expressed that if Ms. Chong would provide that information, then it would make it much easier for the Historic Preservation Commission to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness. Without the information, it makes it difficult for the Commission to approve it, because they do not know what they would approve.

Ms. Chong stated that she did not know if there is a name for the construction of the porch. She plans to use treated lumber and install proper concrete footings at the appropriate depth. She noted that the bottom of the concrete footings would be 24 inches followed by the concrete tube that is below grade.

Mr. Hays thanked her for buying the home. He agreed that the porch was in terrible condition. He stated that he believes the solution is probably much simpler than it seems. He explained that we want to ensure that the applicant is spending money on something that is not going to fall apart.

Mr. Hays stated that for the Historic Preservation Commission, the main question is what the new porch will look like. The one thing that the Commission is asked to ensure is that the new porch conforms to the appearance of what had been approved before. He explained that the Commission needs a drawing or sketch, some sort of statement that says what materials will be used and what design the porch will have. Dr. Holliday pointed out that it is not the position of the Commission to suggest what the design should be. Mr. Hays said that they need to know if the new porch will conform to the criteria, which basically has to do with appearances.

Ms. Chong said that she is not going to hire a designer and design something crazy. She stated that the appearance would not change from what it was; however, the structure would be different because the foundation and underlying footings will be different. She noted that if the work was already done before the Commission found out about it, they would not know the difference.

Mr. Roberts stated that it would be comforting and support Ms. Chong's request if the Commission knew who would be doing the work. He asked if Ms. Chong was doing the work herself, if she had hired a repair person, if there was a contractor who will be doing the work instead, and if they specified what kind of materials they want to use. He noted that if the Commission had a sense that the new porch would be constructed by someone who is reliable, that would be a significant way of supporting the request. He stated that if Ms. Chong will be doing the work, then the Commission will probably want to see how things are going. A reliable contractor or repair person would have to vouch for the safety of their work and that would be significant to know that it is being done appropriately.

Ms. Chong stated that they are going to do the work themselves. She explained that she has a trusted handyman that she has used for her houses and that she has experience with many construction companies and has found them to be problematic. She noted that her handyman will build the new porch under her direction, that everything will be approved by her, and that the quality will be good. Mr. Roberts stated that the Commission would want to see the bid and the material list that the handyman will use. Ms. Chong stated that there would not be a bid. Her understanding is that through the building permit process, City staff will be checking whether the quality is up to code.

Ms. Himick stated that Ms. Chong will need to apply for a building permit. She explained that the building permit application must include a detailed plan outlining the construction process and should provide all necessary dimensions, information about the materials being used, specifics about the attachment details, footing information, stair design, and information regarding the installation of a railing, if applicable. On the building permit, the applicant will need to list the contractor performing the work along with contact information. This information will need to be provided before the Building Safety Division can issue a building permit. Ms. Chong stated that she intends to comply with Michael Frank, Building Inspector for the City of Urbana.

Dr. Holliday stated that this same information is what the Historic Preservation Commission needs for the Certificate of Appropriateness and noted that it would be nice to have this information with the application.

She pointed out that the current application contains profanity, which she requested be removed before she approves the request. Ms. Himick stated that she checked with the City Clerk to investigate censoring options, and this did not meet the City's threshold of censorship. Ms. Chong stated that it describes the condition of the demolished porch.

Chair Urban thanked Ms. Chong for being present at the meeting, especially since she has a young child. She also thanked Ms. Chong for submitting the Certificate of Appropriateness. As Ms. Chong loves her home, the Historic Preservation Commission wants to help it be the best it can be.

Chair Urban noted that while City staff's time is paid time, the Commission members are all volunteers. She stated that historic preservation, in general, is not against accessibility. The applicant had mentioned in the application that the previous porch was a tripping hazard.

Chair Urban stated that the Commission's difficulty with the application is the level of detail and noted that the applicant stated that the new porch would be structurally different. The Commission understands the footers being different to meet City Code. Chair Urban asked what else would be structurally different and noted that adding details of what materials would be used would support the application. Ms. Chong stated that the new porch will have proper concrete footings underneath and that this will not change the physical appearance of the porch. She added that new wood would be used to build the new porch. She stated that she could have jammed wood or more bricks to temporarily fix the old porch and doing so would have eliminated this whole hassle and problem, but she did not do that. She explained that the new porch will be flat like the picture of the previous porch in 2011.

Mr. Hays reiterated that the question for him is whether the porch will look the same as the previous porch. Ms. Chong said it will look the same. Mr. Hays said that the application Ms. Chong

submitted says that "it will not have the appearance of the current porch" on Page 5, so she may need to amend her application. Ms. Chong explained that it will not have the same appearance with respect to the rotten wood and warped boards. She stated that the new porch will have the same general appearance but will look new. Ms. Chong explained that the porch will have a flat porch style, the same as in the 2011 picture when the Commission approved the property as a local landmark. Mr. Hays said that with this formal statement and a list of the materials, it is extremely helpful.

Mr. Roberts stated that Ms. Chong was speaking in generalities by saying, "It is going to look good. We are going to do a good job." He felt that this is general and vague. He stated that she needs to be more specific about the materials, how they are going to be used and about who will be doing the work and their qualifications. Mr. Roberts expressed that then the Historic Preservation Commission sees that she is prepared to do the job that they are hoping she will do.

Ms. Chong stated that it will be good if this process does not drag on, and she does not have to come before the Commission again next month. She noted that she hopes to proceed with getting a building permit approved and do the work.

Dannie Otto approached the Historic Preservation Commission. He stated that building a new porch is a simple project, and Ms. Chong does not need to have a contractor. He stated that she is capable and allowed to do the work herself and that City inspectors will guarantee that it is done properly. He said that it has saddened him that replacing the porch has gone on this long.

He stated that when he and his wife returned to the United States in 2020, there were bad storms that caused trees to be down. Ms. Chong owned some houses in the next block, and she was the first person out to be cleaning out the storm sewers so they would work again. He noted that she is a real asset to our community, and he feels that the Commission had been patronizing in talking to her. He explained that when he found out that she owns the house at 404 West Illinois Street, he was happy, because he knows that any work will be done properly.

Mr. Otto said that he was glad to see that the handyman had put up the temporary braces and work was starting on replacing the front porch. He mentioned that he and his wife were out of town again for several weeks and came back to find that nothing had happened. He learned that a stop work order had been issued. He stated that we need to figure out a way to get this done rapidly. He stated that we do not have big issues here.

Mr. Otto asked Ms. Chong if there would be concrete and masonry piers below the frost line to support the porch according to Building Code. Ms. Chong said yes.

Mr. Otto asked Ms. Chong if on top of the piers would there be a system of floor joists and on top of that there would be tongue and groove flooring. Ms. Chong said yes.

Mr. Otto stated that this is exactly what was there before, only now it will have the addition of being properly supported rather than just using bricks. He stated that Ms. Chong will be using pressure-treated wood supporting the tongue and groove, and it will be laid back exactly as it was. He noted that the porch was probably not historic, and that the house had been turned as it was moved and

wings had been removed. He stated that the significance of the house is the plaque that says, "Abraham Lincoln slept here."

Mr. Otto stated that we are spending a lot of time writing this report, referring to it as a porch. He noted that he sees a porch missing a floor and that Ms. Chong did not remove the porch but the floor of the porch. He expressed that the porch is still there and is going to stay there.

Mr. Otto stated that Ms. Chong just needs to be allowed to get a building permit to get the floor done as simply and quickly as possible. He stated that the temporary supports are more at risk for vandalism, that it has already been six weeks, and if the Historic Preservation Commission continues the public hearing, it will go another month or six weeks. Mr. Otto stated that legislation says that something like this can be approved by City staff and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Lauren Senoff approached the Historic Preservation Commission. She stated that she lives next door to Ms. Chong, and she has lived there since 1998. She stated that Illinois Street is a very rundown street, and there are many rental properties on Illinois Street that the City did not do anything about for a long time.

Ms. Senoff stated that she appreciates the Commission members volunteering and knows that many of the members have the best interest in the aesthetics of Urbana. She said that Ms. Chong cares as well. She encouraged the Commission members and City staff to go by 312 West Illinois Street, which is a duplex on a single-family lot. She stated that the grass has not been mowed, that there is debris that has not been picked up, and that it is an eyesore. She explained that this is the same property that Mr. Hansen talked about the power line not being buried appropriately and that the owner does not care. She mentioned that there is a gaping hole in the sidewalk that the City should fill in as it is a tripping hazard.

Ms. Senoff stated that Ms. Chong would do a good job and that there is no question about it. She asked the Historic Preservation Commission to not hold her up.

Christopher Hansen reapproached the Historic Preservation Commission. He mentioned that he is a wood worker and has his own shop. He talked about restoring his home back to how it was in 1893 when it was built. He stated that he is really interested in historic preservation; however, this process makes him hate it because this feels hostile. He stated that it makes him want to not continue doing what he is doing, because there is no true appreciation for it, and that it seems like there is hostile sentiment towards people who want to fix things up. He stated that it makes him want to find the rotten wood and put the porch back the way it was at 404 West Illinois Street and that seems to be what the Historic Preservation Commission wants.

Mr. Hansen asked why the City does not address things that are problematic. He stated that he fixed a broken pipe in the right-of-way across the street to stop it from flooding. He expressed that he did this without permission because it needed to be done, and the City was too busy bothering Ms. Chong about her porch.

Mr. Hansen stated that he looked into Aeratis Porch Flooring materials and that they make some of the highest end decking that one can get for porches. He explained that it is a composite material, so

it is not pure wood but looks like pure wood. He suggested that Ms. Chong use this for her front porch. He stated that now he wished he would have gone to the hardware store and picked up some plywood to put down.

Mr. Hansen said that he does not understand why the Historic Preservation Commission is treating her the way they are. He told Dr. Holliday that she should retract saying to Ms. Chong that she could not approve the application because it contains the word "shitty" in it. If not, then Dr. Holliday should resign from the Commission.

Mr. Hansen said that he has seen a lot of work done by reputable contractors and has seen a lot of work done with City of Urbana inspected stickers on them. He stated that has seen a lot of work with these qualities that do not meet Building Code and have problems. He explained that questions about contractors do not necessarily get you to a positive result, and what gets you to a positive result is having someone who truly cares about having quality outcome. This should be your concern.

Chair Urban noted that staff received an email from Jane McClintok regarding this case. She read the letter for the record.

Mr. Hansen reapproached and stated that he wanted to see the case denied so that the proper legal process could go through and see this Commission and this process dissolved in the court system.

Phyllis Williams approached the Historic Preservation Commission. She mentioned that she had previously called the City about one of her neighbors doing work without a permit, and a stop work order was issued. She stated that the process would be simple if the application is completed with diagrams and other required information. Ms. Williams noted that she has applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for installing a storm door on her home. She mentioned that Ms. Chong is able to follow the same process. City staff will make sure that the roof and floor are attached properly.

Ms. Chong reapproached the Commission. She addressed Ms. Williams' comment about her not understanding the process. She stated that she needs the Certificate of Appropriateness before applying for a building permit. After submitting a building permit, the City's Building Inspector, Michael Frank, will inspect the work at every stage of the construction. Ms. Chong said that she never said she would not follow the process. She believes the whole point is to be up to code and make sure construction is okay at each step.

With there being no further input from the audience, Chair Urban closed the public input portion of the hearing. She opened the hearing for Commission discussion.
Dr. Holliday reminded the Commission that the role of the Commission is simply to review the Certificate of Appropriateness application that has been submitted and that is all. Dr. Holliday noted that the instructions clearly say that plans associated with building permit applications can be referenced, and since a building permit is being pursued, all materials needed for the building permit can be submitted with the Certificate of Appropriateness application.

Dr. Holliday went on to say that Exhibit A gives the criteria that the Commission follows to evaluate if the material included in the application satisfies the Certificate of Appropriateness review criteria. She stated that from her perspective, items number six for deteriorated historic

features and number nine for new construction seemed the most applicable to the application. Especially in number six, it says "where severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features must be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence." Number nine, under new construction, the phrase that is most applicable is "new additions and new construction shall be compatible with the original architecture."

Dr. Holliday stated that next she looked to see if the project description contains enough information. She said that there was some additional information shared at certain points during the hearing that would be wonderful to have systematically included in the application.

Mr. Hays stated that this is the first time that the Commission has seen this case. He apologized for it being a long, complicated process. He said that they do not repair potholes and that are not City Council. They are the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Hays noted that his concern is that the application says the new porch will not have the same appearance as the previous porch. It would be great if the application was amended to say that it will have the same appearance so the Commission could move forward with the application. Ms. Chong asked if the Commission wanted her to remove "not" from that phrase in the application. Ms. Himick stated that the applicant's statements during the public hearing count as evidence and that if Ms. Chong says that the new porch will look like the previous porch, then that is admissible as evidence. Ms. Chong replied that she understands Mr. Hays' issue with the wording in the application, and she had already explained her rationale for writing that the new porch would not appear like the previous porch with rotting wood.

Chair Urban asked for clarification about presenting evidence during the public hearing. Ms. Himick stated that what is said to the Commission during the contents of the public hearing is considered evidence. Evidence can be at the discretion of the Chair about what is evidence; however, the Chair can be overruled by a majority vote of the Commission members. The applicant does not need to go back and submit additional written statements. If the Commission approves the request with conditions, the Commission can add the evidence they have learned as a condition as long as it relates to the review criteria.

Chair Urban stated that Mr. Otto and some of the Commissioners have talked about some of the information that is needed, some of which has been brought forward as evidence. However, it is possible that the Commission does not have all the details needed. Evan Alvarez, Principal Planner, explained that when the applicant applies for a building permit, it will be forwarded to the Planning Division for zoning review, so the process of review is revisited. Chair Urban stated that part of her concern is that there would not be further outside review, so the Historic Preservation Commission needs to do their due diligence looking at these criteria and making sure that they have sufficient evidence.

Mr. Roberts said that the Commission has heard a lot about the floor planking and the foundation, but not about the support posts for the porch roof. He asked about the condition of the support posts. Does the applicant intend to replace them with new porch posts? Will the porch posts be significantly similar to what is shown in photographs of the previous porch? Ms. Chong replied that the existing support posts look in decent condition as of now. From the pictures, one can see that the

support posts are in much better shape than the boards below them. Mr. Robert's stated that he cannot make judgements about the support posts. He stated that he is not a specialist in these things, so he wishes the application were clearer with more information about what the applicant plans to do. Ms. Chong said that she looks at the project as a whole and explained if existing material cannot logically be put back, she will replace it. She noted that you have to be somewhat flexible when doing construction.

Mr. Roberts asked staff if the application had been sufficiently detailed and simple, would staff and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission be able to approve it without bringing it to the Commission. Ms. Himick said that is incorrect. Table XII-1 of the Zoning Ordinance details certain types of work, and there are minor works and major works categories. She read the following, "Building changes and new construction including, porches, decks, and attached steps (including enclosing)" are marked as a major work, requires a Certificate of Appropriateness and Historic Preservation Commission review.

Mr. Roberts asked if the tongue and groove and other building materials were included in the application. If not, then he wished for clarification if it would be hearsay because a neighbor is the one who mentioned what materials would be used. Ms. Himick stated that the building materials were not included in the application, but Ms. Chong responded affirmatively to Mr. Otto's questions about specific building materials, and this would be admissible as evidence for the Commission to include as Findings of Fact or as a condition if the Commission approves the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Dr. Holliday asked if it is possible to edit the text of the application. She stated that she thinks it is important because this creates a record of what successful or unsuccessful applications look like. She felt that it is important to achieve a level of professionalism in the treatment of City staff and Historic Preservation Commission members and the way that the City of Urbana has addressed itself. Ms. Himick suggested that the Commission include additional information with regards to building materials, design, and appearance of the new porch in either their Findings of Fact or in the wording of the motion, such as "that additional evidence was presented during the public hearing that indicated X, Y, and Z about materials, design, and construction." Or the Commission could include it as a condition for approval by saying, "that drawings, elevations, and material specifications provided as part of the building permit meet what was stated as evidence during the public hearing before the Historic Preservation Commission on this date." Ms. Himick would not suggest amending the actual application submitted by Ms. Chong.

Mr. Roberts asked if staff review applications before they are forwarded to the Commission. Ms. Himick said yes. For purposes of processing, this application is considered complete. Ms. Chong answered the questions in the application. Ms. Himick noted that she sent three follow-up emails to the applicant requesting more information. She stated that in terms of the general Historic Preservation Commission Certificate of Appropriateness application itself, it is something that staff and the Commission have within their purview to rewrite without a cumbersome process. This is something that Planning staff have discussed doing fairly immediately after this case is completed, so that we have a greater expectation of communication and what information is required. Mr. Roberts appreciates this because he feels that the application needs to require more detailed information be provided.

Mr. Hays asked for clarification with regard to statements that were made during the public hearing. If there is an incomplete document, then the Commission members can ask questions and the answers become part of the application. He asked if a record of the meeting could also serve as the document, and Ms. Himick replied that it could. Statements made during the course of the public hearing can in fact amend understanding of the case.

Chair Urban stated that she understands that the demolition is not part of what the Commission is looking at, but it is difficult because it is part of the Findings of Fact. She believes that this is part of the concern that has been raised with the application. She stated that technically, demolition should have happened after submitting the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chair Urban stated that she appreciates that the public has come, but it is very difficult to hear so much hostility. She stated that she understands that was even mentioned that there are feelings that Commission members have been hostile. She noted that the Commission is here to look at the criteria and that part of what the Commission is doing is having to ask questions. She stated that the demolition has already happened, that it is in the past, but it is still part of the Findings of Fact. She expressed that if the Commission were to approve this application without it having a great deal of detail, the context should be provided.

Chair Urban talked about the criteria. She stated that Dr. Holliday had previously mentioned #6 and #9 and their relevance to this application. However, there are other criteria. She said that #4 (retain and preserve changes to a property that has acquired historic significance in their own right) was discussed. The porch was built in 1899, which is several years after the construction of the house. She stated that we even saw from the photos that there have been some changes between the 1980s and the 2011 photos. She explained that the question is how we can preserve the changes that have been acquired and are part of the historic significance in their own right and that we have to keep this in mind.

Chair Urban talked about #7 (treatment methods use the gentlest means possible when using chemical or physical). She stated that there has been some physical damage to the historic materials since the porch floor has been removed. She expressed that the question about whether the support posts are going to be removed or not is part of the details that would be helpful to know, and the applicant said that they are not going to be taken down and replaced.

Ms. Himick showed staff's recommendation for a baseline of the Findings of Fact that the Historic Preservation Commission could use. Mr. Roberts stated that another finding of fact to state would be who is going to do the repair. Mr. Hays asked if they were at the stage now where the Commission members say which of the criteria to use as the basis for their Findings of Fact. Ms. Himick said yes, the Commission can discuss which option they are leaning towards, and one of the members would craft a motion to solidify that as your decision. Ms. Himick explained that as part of crafting a motion, the motion should include Findings of Fact, which may be some of the ones that staff recommend. If the Commission chooses to deny the request, then they should give reasons why they are denying it and may recommend ways to comply with the criteria.

Mr. Weiss asked for clarification regarding a building permit. He requested confirmation that a building permit cannot be issued unless the applicant has a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Alvarez stated that is correct. Mr. Weiss said that a building permit would provide a number of the

details that the Commission is asking for. Ms. Himick stated that it is possible to submit a Certificate of Appropriateness application and a building permit at the same time. The building permit could be reviewed by Building Safety staff, but it could not be approved until the Historic Preservation Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Hays reviewed his understanding of the process of the Commission reviewing the application thus far. The application says to described or illustrate, so with the applicant's statement during the public hearing, the application is sufficient. He said that he does not feel that a materials list should be included in the Findings of Fact because there was a verbal description of awareness of what constitutes appropriateness meaning there was an opportunity to ask questions. He stated that questions were asked, including by the neighbor, to which answers were given. The Commission asked questions, and the questions were sufficient. The Commission had a lot of reassurance of expertise of knowledge of awareness, and that is admissible as part of the application. The application does not require drawings because it says "describe or illustrate." He stated that he is not finding stumbling blocks to move forward.

Dr. Holliday asked for clarity on the Findings of Fact. She said that Findings of Fact refer to the ability of the application to address the Certificate of Appropriateness review criteria. Ms. Himick said yes and noted that the Commission could add a Findings of Fact to state something along the lines of "Per evidence submitted to the Commission in the application and within the public hearing held on September 2, 2026, the Certificate of Appropriateness meets / does not meet the criteria outlined in Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance." Dr. Holliday added that if the Commission finds that the conditions of any of the criteria #1 through 10 are met, that it would be a Finding of Fact.

Mr. Hays stated that he believes it meets criterion #4 (even though the previous porch was already demolished, the Commission was told that the new porch would look like the previous porch), #6 (the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials), and #9 (protect the integrity of the property and its environment. New additions and new construction shall be compatible with the original architecture of the landmark or styles within the historic district and in terms of the following guidelines height proportion to structures).

Ms. Himick clarified that these are Findings of Fact and not conditions. The Commission has the power to place conditions on approval as well. The conditions have to relate back to the criteria. She showed a list of suggested conditions by staff.

Mr. Roberts suggested that one of the conditions be that the construction be inspected by the appropriate Building Safety staff. Chair Urban said that this is more along the lines of criterion #1, which says to "Maintain the significant original qualities and character of the building structures, sites, or objects, including if significant apprentices." So, a condition would be that we want to maintain that significant quality and character that was already there.

Mr. Hays asked about #3 of staff's suggested conditions. He stated that the applicant would need to apply for a building permit in order to be able to build the new porch. This should not be a condition for basing his decision to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness. If the applicant does not apply for a building permit, then that is a matter that the City enforces separately from the Historic Preservation Commission. So, he is not sure why we would have that be a condition for this case.

Dr. Holliday believes that the suggestion is because the application was relatively incomplete and the testimony that they heard earlier in this meeting during public input is not written, and the Commission could attach them as conditions. Part of the conditions could include that the building permit comes back for review between staff and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, right? Ms. Himick replied that was the intent. Dr. Holliday stated that she would then not strike this from the condition.

Dr. Holliday said that the Certificate of Appropriateness application is incomplete, so what we are doing is trying to move forward with the best understanding that some of the discussion has been helpful. Her understanding from staff is that the application form will be immediately altered so that future applications will have more instructions about what to include, and the Commission will not encounter this particular situation again. The situation with a very vague incomplete application being approved would hopefully not set a precedent for others to submit incomplete applications going forward. That is part of the issue with approving an application that does not have enough information is then the next applications also do not have enough information, and you are in this situation perpetually. In this case, as a solution to that problem, the idea is that Condition #3 would then ask for the building permit to become a part of this application. So, the Commission members would not approve of something that is completely vague.

Mr. Alvarez pointed out that Condition #3 is less about the necessity of a building permit. "As determined by the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission" is new content in this case, because generally the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission would not review a building permit. He thinks Condition #3 is more about the fact that the Historic Preservation Commission have the ability to verify that the conditions were met as part of the building permit process.

Mr. Hays asked if staff could share any sketches or drawings that are submitted along with the building permit with the Historic Preservation Commission members. Ms. Himick explained that she will be part of the review process on the building permit with regards to ensuring zoning compliance; however, she can discuss the historic compliance with the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. She expressed that they do not want to relitigate a public hearing, as this would simply be for verification purposes that the building permit documents meet the expectations as laid out in the public hearing.

Dr. Holliday stated that if other members are in support of moving in this direction, she would find #3 to be important for the issue of precedent and fairness for others who have actually filled out the application form with a lot more information and for not setting a precedent for future applications. Mr. Roberts said that maintaining #3 is not going to harm the application in any way, but it is a good safeguard.

Chair Urban stated that she understands the reasonings for Condition #3. She talked about Option #2, where the Commission can grant with conditions. She stated that she understands not wanting to set a precedent for an incomplete application, but also, we need to be very mindful of accessibility. We do not want to cause undue stress or make it harder to do something that should be simple. The application is lacking, but she does not want to cause lengthening of this process, because that would set a precedent as well.

Ms. Himick advised the Commission members to be careful of using the word "incomplete" to describe the application. It is technically complete and has been deemed complete as a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that "vague or less specific than you desire" may be better terminology to use.

Mr. Hays stated that while the process would be more expeditious if the Commission did not have to ask questions, he is also cognizant that it has been articulated that verbal content is admissible, meaning that statements made during this public hearing to clarify are as good as in writing. Information that is not in the application has been corrected verbally, and we could also point to the building permit for additional information. He does not need it to come back to him as a condition, because it will be a public document. Ms. Himick said that she could strike the language in Condition #2 and instead of referring to the building permit, the Commission could word Condition #2 to codify what has been stated so there is a written reflection of it. Mr. Hays suggested wording #2 to read as follows: "The porch be constructed per the statements made during the course of the public hearing held on September 2, 2026, including but not limited to, that the newly constructed porch will have the appearance of the previous porch."

Chair Urban asked what would happen if, when reviewing a building permit, the permit did not include information that would satisfy the criteria for the Certificate of Appropriateness, Ms. Himick replied as a condition of approval for the Certificate of Appropriateness, it would have to be met before the Certificate of Approval could be issued.

Ms. Himick stated that there does not have to be a consensus of the Commission members. They can put this to a vote and if a majority passes, it passes. Until they vote, the Commission is able to continue discussing until such time they feel ready to make a motion.

Mr. Roberts stated that he agrees that the Commission would like to see their expectations met. He does not know if there is a way that it will come back to the Commission so that they can feel assured unless they get a report from City staff that the building permit has been approved and that the materials and the process will be carried out appropriately to complete a good project of reconstruction.

Chair Urban stated that her concern with striking Condition #2 is that the building permit will be reviewed by someone else. She stated that Ms. Himick will have to look at it with regard to it being a building permit, because the Certificate of Appropriateness would have already been granted. Mr. Hays asked if it could say that "when a building permit is submitted for the work proposed that copies of the drawings and material specifications be submitted to the Commission." Ms. Himick reiterated that conditions have to relate to the criteria. So, the condition could say, "the building permit would be held by the Secretary of the Commission to verify conformance with the criteria." She said that she does not feel comfortable sending it to the entire Commission as it may violate the Open Meetings Act. Dr. Holliday stated that if this is what the Commission is interested in, then they should keep the original language requiring documentation to go to the Chair of the Commission.

Discussion ensued on how to word the condition. Mr. Alvarez stated that he understands the main value is that it would remand the status for this type of project to a minor work, which is approved by the Secretary and the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, which there is a precedent

for and is consistent with. He said that in light of them just finishing the Section 106 conversation, he would have misgivings about leaning too heavily on the Secretary of the Commission to make that manner of judgment call on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Himick agreed.

Ms. Himick stated that to speak in official terminology, "remanding decision-making powers to staff" should be part of a larger discussion of Historic Preservation article of the Zoning Ordinance, which staff will eventually get to as part of the Zoning Ordinance overhaul. She stated that there is the opportunity to rewrite the Certificate of Appropriateness application to be clearer and to rewrite the public hearing section of the Commission's bylaws, so it is simpler and more digestible.

Mr. Hays asked if Condition #2 could say, "a copy of the building permit will be reviewed by the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission as verification that the criteria set forth in Article 12 of the Zoning Ordinance have been met." Mr. Alvarez said yes, it would have footing elsewhere in the Ordinance.

Chair Urban stated that she and Ms. Himick reviewed whether this case is considered a major work or a minor work, and Ms. Himick mentioned that it clearly falls into major work. She explained that if the Commission approves the Certificate of Appropriateness with a condition, it makes sense that the Commission could bring it over to the other side. Then, it can have the same method as for a minor work.

Chair Urban clarified with Condition #3, that she likes it saying that the newly constructed porch will have the appearance of the previous porch. Chair Urban noted that her concern is that there were a lot of statements and she wondered if there was a need to clarify in some way.

Mr. Hays moved that the Historic Preservation Commission grant the requested Certificate of Appropriateness subject to certain conditions based on the Findings of Fact as follows:

- Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance requires that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued prior to any qualifying undertaking affecting a local landmark or property within a historic district.
- Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance requires that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued prior to qualifying work affecting a designated property. Table XII-1 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that major works, which include changes to and new construction of porches, be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission in a public hearing.
- An application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to replace the previous front porch with a new front porch was deemed complete for processing on August 18, 2026.
- The Zoning Ordinance requires that the Historic Preservation Commission hold a public hearing within 50 days of receiving a complete application. The public hearing was held on September 2, 2026.
- Per written and verbal evidence submitted to the Commission in the application and within the public hearing held on September 2, 2026, the Certificate of Appropriateness meets the criteria outlined in Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically Criteria #4, #6, and #9.

And the conditions then would be as follows:

1. That the front that the porch be constructed in a manner consistent with the significant original qualities and character of the structure, as required by Criterion #1 of review.
2. That when a building permit is submitted for work proposed, a copy of the building permit will be reviewed by the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission as verification that the criteria set forth in Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance have been met.
3. That the porch be constructed per the statements made by the petitioner during the course of the public hearing held on September 2, 2026, including but not limited to that the newly constructed porch will have the appearance of the previous porch, as referenced in the approval criteria in Article XII of the Zoning Ordinance.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Weiss. Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Roberts	-	Yes	Ms. Urban	-	Yes
Mr. Weiss	-	Yes	Mr. Hays	-	Yes
Dr. Holliday	-	Yes			

Chair Urban announced that the Certificate of Appropriateness in Case No. HP-2026-COA-01 with the Findings of Fact and with the conditions as specified is approved.

I. NEW BUSINESS

Bylaws Revisions

Chair Urban opened this item on the agenda.

Chair Urban continued this item to the October 7, 2026 regular meeting. Mr. Weiss moved to continue this item. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

J. MONITORING OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

There was none.

K. STAFF REPORT

Assignment of Historic Property Monitoring

Ms. Himick stated that in the packet, there is a draft spreadsheet for updating the property monitoring assignments. She noted that two new properties have been landmarked since 2024, so they were incorporated into the list. She noted the following changes to the assignments:

- 611 West Oregon Street, Huff House (Dr. Holliday)
- 304 South Race Street, First United Methodist Church (Mr. Roberts)

Ms. Himick said that these seem to make sense geographically.

Ms. Himick stated that in the interest of complying with the Open Meetings Act, the Commission members and staff will no longer be reporting information on each property on a shared spreadsheet. She explained that the options for reporting are 1) Commission members complete a form that they have a link to, 2) Each Commission member has their own spreadsheet copies, and if

they have anything to report, then they send it to her, and she will update the master copy in staff's files, and 3) Commission members note changes verbally during their meetings.

L. STUDY SESSION

Historic Preservation Plan, *Continued*

Ms. Himick noted that this item was continued from the July 1, 2026 regular meeting to this meeting. If the Commission members need more time, they can continue the item to a future meeting date or they have the option to close this item.

Chair Urban recalled that the Commission had talked about each member circling parts of the Plan that they liked and crossing out the ones they do not like. She recommended putting it on hold for now until after they hear the next topic on the agenda.

Potential Downtown Design Review District Discussion

Chair Urban opened this item on the agenda. She invited Mr. Roberts to present his ideas.

Mr. Roberts stated that his intention is to initiate the discussion with the Historic Preservation Commission about creating a design overlay district so that the Commission can support thoughtful new construction, renovation, and repair to the downtown area and give guidance to developers who come to do work in the community in an informative way. He stated that it is the older, significant buildings in our community that are unique to the City. Mr. Roberts expressed that to honor the downtown and its appearance, it is the intent of the Historic Preservation Commission to support its perseverance and its harmony and not to interject construction which is inharmonious or significantly alters the appearance of downtown without prohibiting modernization.

Mr. Roberts noted that the Commission would need to be interested in having development in the downtown area that is compatible with the existing buildings. In doing this, he proposed creating an overlay district. He stated that he also recognizes that the National Register Downtown Historic District is very limited in its scope, and there are parts of the downtown that are not included in the historic district. He noted that if there was development that was egregiously opposing the appearance or the texture of the downtown, it would be harmful visually to the community. He suggested considering expanding the overlay district to include secondary byways, streets, and buildings.

Mr. Roberts clarified that it is not that the Commission does not want modern development, but rather that the development be in proportion and in balance to what is currently downtown. He stated that if an extended overlay district or other guidance in the downtown area had been in place, many of the questions that came up and the disharmony that was experienced by the homeowners on West Main Street about the appropriateness and mass scale of a Planned Unit Development that was reviewed by the Plan Commission in May 2026 might have been alleviated. He noted that there was no guidance or tool that the Plan Commission could refer the developer to in order to help guide making a proposed development more compatible. Mr. Roberts explained that the tools he is suggesting the Historic Preservation Commission create could give guidance if agreed upon by the City Council to adopt. He expressed that a design overlay district would be a useful tool without necessarily being a hindrance to any development in our downtown or future growth and development.

Mr. Roberts expressed that he proposes a rough concept to be worked on by the Historic Preservation Commission members to refine with the guidance of the staff, who are the professionals, for a presentation to the public, review by the public, review by City Council, and hopefully adoption. He stated that it is his hope that in the future this Commission can help craft such a document and present it to the City for consideration. Mr. Roberts stated that he has a list of many similar works of guidance, which have already been adopted by City Council and specific neighborhoods. He also has a list of other communities across the United States that have similar documents.

Mr. Roberts noted that he feels that the kernel of the history of our community resides in the downtown structures. He expressed that there is plenty of room at the periphery and in other parts of the community, such as Philo Road, for modern, new, extraneous development.

Chair Urban agreed that design guidelines are a useful tool. She asked how design guidelines would affect the buffer zone shown in green on the map, with specific reference to the Bennett building and Busey Bank building which do not necessarily conform historically. She asked if the design guidelines would say that these buildings need to be retained in some way and noted that she would need to understand how the buffer would work in the area that is not within our historic district.

Mr. Roberts replied that Mid-Century Modern is becoming part of historic purview of the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted that the Busey Bank is an excellent example of Brutalism. He stated that he is not against these things but that if that design were being reviewed for approval today, perhaps they would have been asked to break up the mass differently so it would fit the scale of three-story buildings that relate to the street.

Mr. Roberts said that on his recent journey, he found that some places had completely remodeled their downtown areas into modern glass skyscrapers, but they left historic buildings along their main streets. He stated that the jarring of old and new buildings without any relevance to size was a concern and that he believes this would need to be evaluated for Downtown Urbana. He stated that it would be useful to have a larger scope of advice for the development of downtown and that the Commission should think about establishing an overlay district and design guidelines for downtown. He noted that there exist vacant lots, which are potentially new construction zones within the city. He explained that it is not his intent to ossify or fossilize the downtown, but that the Commission had held important discussions about the Urbana Civic Center and what its future was going to be, and it is not in the historic district.

Mr. Weiss noted that the City has a Zoning Map and a Building Code which already exist. He expressed that the Historic Preservation Commission is not design police per se for the future. He stated that the Commission wants to retain what they believe the City collectively has value and to adapt to what is here already. He stated that adding this kind of layer of taste, whether you like the Bennett building or not, is kind of irrelevant as it meets the zoning and building. He stated the Historic Preservation Commission is not a dictatorial board.

Mr. Roberts responded that they are an advisory board and might have opinions. He expressed that the way things look in the community is important to creating a sense of place. He noted that

the City of Champaign considers these things, and that Champaign has people in their community who appreciate these kinds of approaches. Mr. Roberts stated that it is just a conversation that he would like to have before deciding that the Commission is never going to have this kind of conversation.

Mr. Weiss noted that whether Busey Bank fits in with what is across the street or not, it is there now; it is the fabric of Urbana, and that becomes historical. He expressed that he would be very cautious about proceeding. He stated that he is not philosophically opposed to the intent but that when getting down to the nitty-gritty, he becomes more circumspect.

Dr. Holliday stated that she appreciates the effort that has gone into thinking about what it means to transition out of a historic district into something else. She stated that lots of other communities have buffer districts, and the City of Urbana does not. She stated that she understands the attraction of the idea of a buffer district because it is a tool.

Dr. Holliday expressed that the second piece of this is the Historic Preservation Plan, because if the Commission is going to completely alter and propose this different way of thinking about preservation, then it has to be part of a historic preservation plan, and it requires public participation in deciding where the buffer zone is. She expressed that it is not the Historic Preservation Commission saying what the buffer zone is, and it is not the Historic Preservation Commission saying what the design guidelines are. She stated that it is a big, long public process of allowing people to speak on this and think about whether everybody wants a buffer zone. She expressed that while she appreciates this and can understand it, she thinks it is intimately connected to rethinking the Historic Preservation Plan. She noted that she does not feel this is the time to work on this with everything going on, revising the Certificate of Appropriateness application, working on surveys, etc. She stated that she would love to introduce an award program for great stewards in the community.

Mr. Roberts stated that he did not imagine working on this until next year. He stated that he would like to have the consciousness of the community think more seriously about the choices that occur because of the conflict already with Planned Unit Developments that come before the community, and there is no guidance.

Chair Urban noted that there is Brutalist and Mid-Century Modern architecture in Urbana. She noted that there are other architectural features within the buffer zone that already exist. Mr. Roberts noted that the Brutalist building is outside the Downtown Historic District. Dr. Holliday said that this is where the big public process is important. Mr. Roberts agreed.

Mr. Roberts spoke about his slideshow and about classifying existing buildings in the downtown area by style. He spoke about development along the Boneyard Creek, along Main Street, and along North Broadway Avenue.

Mr. Hays expressed his concern about making all new developments harmonize with the existing structures downtown and noted that it can become dull looking. He expressed that he was wary of wanting everything to match. He gave examples of collegiate architecture and how buildings did not have to be exactly matched in terms of brick and stone. Mr. Hays also spoke about the design of buildings on the University of Illinois campus and about the design of the Flat Iron Building.

Mr. Roberts said that he wanted to have an opportunity to be thoughtful about how the community grows and remains an appropriate place to enjoy pedestrian interaction, parks, and human space. He thanked the Commission for considering it and noted that if it is part of the overall change in direction of historic preservation purview and is addressed in the Historic Preservation Plan, then the Commission is moving forward. He expressed that the community is currently being designed by whatever the next developer chooses to present. He noted that it is not the smartest way to evolve a community.

Ms. Himick stated that staff is grateful for any well-researched materials and any preservation proposal ideas. At this stage, staff are not sure they can commit staff time to a workflow of such magnitude. It would require department-wide approval, perhaps larger than department approval, and would take substantial text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. She mentioned that staff is getting ready for a complete overhaul of the Zoning Ordinance, and she spoke about the importance of procedure and process. She mentioned that what is intuitive to one listener is not intuitive to someone else.

Mr. Alvarez commented that the Historic Preservation Plan would have more staying power once the Zoning Ordinance rewrite is complete. He said that in December he would like to start talking about what plans to work on in the new year. He noted that staff have been making mighty progress, and we now have a Section 106 process and revised bylaws in place. Staff have been working on the CLG grant and getting the surveys organized. He suggested identifying enthusiastic homeowners or structure owners and proactively start landmarking more properties.

Chair Urban stated that she is grateful for listening to everyone’s comments, especially taking into consideration staff's comments. She said that she would hate for the potential for updating the Historic Preservation Plan to continue to get delayed. She noted that they had talked about when the CLG application process will potentially come open again and that they could potentially submit for a grant to get assistance updating the plan. She hopes that it does not have to be delayed because of the Zoning Ordinance rewrite. She stated that there is some hostility, and perhaps it is because people do not understand. She wondered if there was a way to bring the public in as part of the process and expressed that this might be a benefit as we move forward as a Commission.

Historic Preservation Plan, *Continued*

Chair Urban reopened this item on the agenda. Discussion was held about when to continue this item to on the calendar.

Mr. Weiss moved that the item of Historic Preservation Plan be continued until such time that the Chair and Secretary of the Historic Preservation Commission deem sufficient enough discussion time is available. Dr. Holliday seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

M. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff did not have any announcements to share. Chair Urban stated that the Commission had a special meeting this past month (August) in regard to a combined and signed letter from the

Commission that went to the Federal Transit Administration. She noted that the letter was mailed via United States Postal Service and also emailed in addition to concerning parties.

N. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Roberts moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Holliday seconded the motion.
Chair Urban adjourned the meeting at 10:26 p.m.

Submitted,

Kate Himick

Kate Himick
Historic Preservation Commission Secretary

CITY OF URBANA

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING **DRAFT**

DATE: October 7, 2026

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

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

MEMBERS ATTENDING:	David Hays, Dr. Kathryn Holliday, Angela Urban, Andrew Weiss
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Laura O'Donnell, Dennis Roberts
STAFF PRESENT:	Olivia Jovine, Director of Community Development Services; Evan Alvarez, Principal Planner; Kate Himick, Planner I; Teri Andel, Administrative Assistant II
OTHERS PRESENT:	Susan Appel, Christopher Hansen, Phyllis Williams

A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Urban called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared with a majority of the members present.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

C. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were none.

D. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- Letter and set of Preliminary Plans from Lochmueller Group regarding Florida Avenue Roadway Improvements to Kate Himick dated September 23, 2026 was read into the record by Ms. Himick

E. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Urban reviewed the procedure for public input. She asked if any members of the audience wished to speak.

Phyllis Williams approached the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Williams encouraged the Commission to reconsider the proposed Downtown Overlay Design District.

Christopher Hansen approached the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Hansen requested more bicycle stands outside of the City building and stated that it would be nice to have better places to lock up bikes. He spoke briefly about the first house he purchased in Urbana in 2006. He mentioned that the house was built in 1893 and was falling apart. He stated that he did a lot of work to restore it and has since purchased several more houses.

Mr. Hansen stated that he has done a lot of historic preservation work and has always been interested in it. He explained that he likes bringing homes back to the way they originally were and even has his own woodworking outfit in his shop to be able to make custom trim and wood to match the original 100+ year old wood in houses. He noted that it was his exposure to this group at the previous meeting to make him hate historic preservation because his experience was so "shitty." He said that he uses the word "shitty" on purpose because the Commission said a person cannot use profane or obscene language, which would be against the Open Meetings Act. He said that this is not usually how he talks, but people are allowed to use profane language or obscene language, and the Commission should remove it from their rules on public input.

Mr. Hansen spoke about the Certificate of Appropriateness case regarding 404 West Illinois. He stated that the applicant wanted to redo their porch because it was rotting and falling apart, and this group decided they needed to have a say on it. He stated that the meeting was almost three hours long and said that it makes him wonder why. He said that his best understanding is that Abraham Lincoln might have spent a night in that house at some point when the house was located elsewhere, and so now we have this weird process. He stated that he does not know what the Commission thinks they are doing He stated that it is wrong what the Commission is doing, and the Commission should not exist. He stated that Commission is enforcing an artistic view on other people, which is immoral.

Mr. Hansen spoke about Abraham Lincoln, stating that Mr. Lincoln believed in white superiority. He stated that Mr. Lincoln believed the whites were the superior position and that Mr. Lincoln wanted to keep slavery intact. He stated that Mr. Lincoln said, "if I could save the union without freeing any slave, I would do it." Mr. Hansen noted that Mr. Lincoln endorsed a constitutional amendment protecting slavery permanently, suspended due process so he could lock people up, and had people hanged. Mr. Hansen noted that makes Mr. Lincoln a murderer. He stated that Mr. Lincoln advocated deporting Black Americans, was against Blacks voting, was against interracial marriage, and as a lawyer, represented slaveholders to help them keep their slaves. Mr. Hansen stated concern that what the Commission is doing is saying, "Okay, we like Abraham Lincoln," and because of that, can force a person to do certain things when they have to fix their porch.

Mr. Hansen expressed that he does not think that the Historic Preservation Commission knows what they are doing, and it has made him hate what he does, which is historic preservation. He stated that he does not want to be associated with people like the Commission and expressed that the best way to have historic preservation and show the public what is worth preserving is to put on a tool belt and do the work. He stated that it is not done by forcing people to do strange things to fix their broken porch. He noted that, therefore, he would like to see the Historic Preservation Commission gone and does not see that the Commission has a purpose, expressing that it would save a lot of staff time and City money. He noted that that would stop the Commission from being immoral toward the public, and that the Commission makes people fill out a 16-page application to fix their porch.

F. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

G. OLD BUSINESS

Bylaws Revisions *{Continued from September 2, 2026 meeting}*

Chair Urban reopened this item on the agenda. Kate Himick, Planner I, gave a brief update on the changes that were made to the bylaws. She began by reviewing the framework of policy and regulation, which is as follows:

1. Illinois Municipal Code
2. City Code of Ordinances
3. Zoning Ordinance
4. Commission Bylaws
5. Robert's Rules of Order

Ms. Himick mentioned that one of the changes she made since the Commission's previous review and discussion on the bylaws is the addition of a meeting adjournment time of no later than 11:00 p.m. to reflect City Council practice. The Commission members are allowed to vote to extend adjournment time by either 30-minute or 1-hour increments. She stated that this would provide a general guideline for when meetings are expected to end or could end, but that meetings must end by 11:30 p.m.

Ms. Himick mentioned that the procedure for public hearings for the Historic Preservation Commission had been different than the Plan Commission and from the Zoning Board of Appeals. She explained that staff has quite a variety of different hearing processes to keep up with and that the current process is quite cumbersome and can be quite complex. She stated that it is also vague in what is intended.

Ms. Himick showed a table indicating the steps of procedure already in place for the Champaign's Historic Preservation Commission and the Urbana Plan Commission. She also showed what staff is proposing for the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission. She noted that staff are proposing to follow the Urbana Plan Commission's public hearing process for the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission as well. She assured the Commission members that every opportunity for public comment is maintained and that the new procedures would simply clarify who speaks when and in what nature.

Ms. Himick mentioned that the Section 106 article was still included with room for further additions in the future. She noted that the meeting packet has a cover sheet showing a general overview of the revisions up to now, the previously adopted bylaws from 2020, and a red-lined version, which has become quite cumbersome and messy.

Ms. Himick mentioned that a member of the public pointed out some typos and that staff will be reviewing them. She stated that the Commission is not able to vote to adopt the revised bylaws at this meeting, because it requires five commission members to adopt new bylaws. She noted that there are only four members present.

Referring to Page 16, Former Section E, Mr. Hays asked about the phrase, “The Chair may direct the petitioner to answer such questions during rebuttal. If the petitioner is unwilling to respond to the relevant questions, the Chair shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes.” Mr. Hays explained that this sentence struck him as odd, because it seems to imply an obligation of the petitioner to respond. Ms. Himick stated that this is from the Plan Commission bylaws and that the petitioner does not have to respond. She noted that staff could strike this sentence if desired by the Commission. She explained that it is because there are certain types of hearings within a local body that require cross-examination of a pseudo-judicial operation. She explained that normal Historic Preservation Commission proceedings are not one of them, but it seems to have been City practice that staff incorporate that language across the board. Mr. Hays stated that maybe softening the language would take away the implication that the petitioner should respond. He suggested saying “The petitioner does not respond” as opposed to “is unwilling to respond.”

Dr. Holliday stated that the language does not bother her either way. Chair Urban said the language suggested by staff does not stand out to her either. She added that because it is in the Opponent section, it makes sense to clarify in the minutes if a petitioner does not respond. Ms. Himick stated that she could change the language to “if the petitioner does not respond to the relevant questions.” The Commission agreed to the change.

Referring to Page 17, Section H, Mr. Hays asked about “participants shall not engage in direct questioning of one another except where otherwise required by law or permitted by the Chair when necessary to ensure a fair hearing.” He noted that earlier in the bylaws it states that “members of the public can raise questions of the petitioner.” Ms. Himick clarified the current bylaws of the Historic Preservation Commission were written under the catchall of cross-examination. However, the Plan Commission’s bylaws interpret cross examination as the petitioner can make a statement, the public can respond, the petitioner can then respond to public comments, and then the public can come up a second time. She explained that the phrase is referring to facilitating questions through the times that certain individuals speak as opposed to allowing a back-and-forth conversation. Mr. Hays said that makes sense.

Referring to Page 18, Section L, Mr. Hays asked for clarity on the following sentence, “The Chair shall close the public hearing only after the Commission has taken action on a case.” He noted that it then says, “The public input portion of the hearing may be reopened at the same meeting prior to the Commission's action.” Ms. Himick explained that if the Commission closes the public input portion of the hearing, discusses the cases, and takes action, the public input cannot be reopened after the case is closed. However, public input can be reopened if the Commission is still in deliberation. She noted that this may happen if the Commission wants more input before they make a motion and vote.

Dr. Holliday stated that she really appreciates the detailed work staff did to make things clear and laid out with regards to Section 106. She referred to Page 20, Section H. It states, “The request for comment in a Section 106 review shall be reported on by the Secretary at the next Meeting.” Dr. Holliday asked if it needs to be noted as Written Communication or is there a particular portion of the meeting that should be specified. Ms. Himick stated that typically she would put it under Study Session; however, it broadly depends on when staff receive

information. For example, the letter under Written Communication for this meeting. She said she is leaning towards being listed under Study Session. The language could be changed to say, "shall be reported on as a Study Session at the next regularly held meeting unless otherwise necessary." Dr. Holliday said that sounds great.

Chair Urban stated that there is a table on Page 19 of the packet that addresses Section 106 Initial Review Timeline. She asked if they should include a timetable within the first week of receiving a review request to ensure there is coverage to keep the process moving if the Chair is unavailable. Ms. Himick stated that it is fine to leave it open to interpretation, because Planning staff would not actually need a signature until week four.

Mr. Hays said that in terms of meetings, if the Chair cannot be present, then the Vice Chair fills that role. He asked if it was generally the policy that in the absence of the Chair's availability that the Vice Chair assumes any such role. Ms. Himick replied that the Urbana Zoning Ordinance does mention responsibilities of the Chair, such as signing off on major works versus minor works, reviewing certain matters, etc. She noted that these are specifically directed to the Chair in the Zoning Ordinance. In Article IX.G of the bylaws, it specifically calls out that in the absence of the Chair, the letter shall be signed by the Vice Chair or a separate designated Commissioner. She stated that if both the Chair and Vice-Chair were unavailable, she would start going down alphabetically until she found a Commission member that is available to sign it. She noted that this type of action would mainly apply to Section 106 Review as it is on a sensitive timeline.

Ms. Himick noted that this item would continue to Old Business on the next meeting agenda of the Historic Preservation Commission.

H. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

I. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

J. MONITORING OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

There was none.

K. STAFF REPORT

There was none.

L. STUDY SESSION

Certificate of Appropriateness Application Revisions

Chair Urban opened this item on the agenda. Ms. Himick stated that a revised application is included in the meeting packet. She incorporated language into the existing Certificate of Appropriateness application for clarity and ease of staff processing. The draft includes more

description of required project documentation, a submission checklist, and a disclaimer that if the applicant believes an item does not apply, to please contact staff.

Ms. Himick noted that the existing Certificate of Appropriateness application is also included in the packet. It includes an administrative cover sheet for the property owner information and applicant information, which are consistent across all Planning applications. The application is a historic preservation catchall application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Economic Hardship, Landmark Designation, and Historic District designation.

Ms. Himick stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness section only encompasses one page front and back.

Chair Urban stated that adding the checklist for the applicant should help. It describes in more detail what needs to be done for the application. Mr. Hays agreed.

Dr. Holliday asked if there is a reason that all of the various forms are all in one. Ms. Himick replied that Planning staff manage a large number of applications. Combining all of the Historic Preservation application into one form was done as an administrative effort to reduce the number of applications. If it is confusing for people, then Planning staff can revisit this. Dr. Holliday agreed it would be helpful to move this item to New Business on the next meeting agenda.

Historic Preservation Plan

Chair Urban opened this item on the agenda. She said that she would be okay with tabling this item due to a few commissioners missing from this meeting and possibly revisiting it in the new calendar year.

Mr. Hays asked why a Design Overlay District for the downtown area is coming before the Historic Preservation Commission. He stated that the Commission has never been asked to review anything for the Historic East Urbana Design District and that it is not part of the Historic Preservation Commission's process. Chair Urban stated that this is a discussion that the Commission may want to include as a Study Session item for the November meeting.

Chair Urban explained the only reason she mentioned the Design Overlay District for downtown is because even though it is not tied to the Historic Preservation Plan, it felt like the Commission was putting the cart before the horse. She stated a preference to focus on updating the Plan before considering guidelines.

The Historic Preservation Commission members and staff discussed the next scheduled meetings and the approaching holiday season. Dr. Holliday stated that she preferred to cancel the January 6, 2027 meeting for her schedule. She pointed out that the Commission has a couple of things to vote on in November 2026. Mr. Weiss concurred. Mr. Hays agreed; however, he said that he cannot attend any of the upcoming meetings. Chair Urban stated that the Commission has the option to cancel more than one meeting.

Dr. Holliday commented that a buffer zone around a historic district is involved in a Historic Preservation Commission's oversight. She stated that she believes that creating a design overlay

district without a Preservation Plan telling the Commission what the Commission's goals are for historic preservation is definitely putting the cart before the horse. She noted that she strongly advocates that before creating a buffer zone or a design district around the National Register Historic District downtown, that the Commission should think through what the goals are for historic preservation and set some priorities about what is really important for what the Commission and what the community members would like to see. She feels that a good historic preservation plan would involve not just conversation amongst the Commission, but some ability to reach out to the broader community who also cares and to do that in conversation. She stated that while the idea of a buffer zone design district has a certain appeal, she thinks there are a lot of other ideas out there that the Commission just does not know about yet. She stated that a good plan looks at that broad landscape first before really prioritizing things. She hopes this could be a part of the way the Commission thinks about it.

Mr. Weiss moved that the Historic Preservation Commission hold a study session at the November 2026 regular meeting, so the Commission can speak directly towards the revision of the Historic Preservation Plan and follow-up thoughts on last month's discussion about design guidelines for downtown Urbana. Mr. Hays seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

M. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was none.

N. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Weiss moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hays seconded the motion.
Chair Urban adjourned the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

Submitted,

Kate Himick

Kate Himick
Historic Preservation Commission Secretary

Kate Himick

From: Chase, Monique <Monique.Chase@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 9:44 AM
To: Kate Himick
Cc: Planning; Olivia Jovine; Angela Urban [BC]; Carmen Franks; Evan Alvarez
Subject: RE: Seq.#264222 - Urbana HPC Comments on Florida Ave Roadway Improvements Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from monique.chase@illinois.gov. Learn why this is important

***** Email From An External Source *****
Use caution when clicking on links or opening attachments.

Hey all!

Wanted to give you an update – I'm putting together the NAE for SHPO right now. The local team sent me information on the street lights we were concerned about – they were added in the 2000s, so they are not considered historic. The lights that will replace them are part of another project, so they will be out of my purview. I'm still digging in on the tree removal but it looks like they are not taking place in any areas that we were concerned about.

If there are any other concerns with this project let me know, otherwise I will get this in to SHPO this week.

Thanks!

Mo Chase
Architectural Historian
Bureau of Design & Environment
Illinois Department of Transportation
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, IL 62764
586.246.8072 (cell) | monique.chase@illinois.gov

From: Kate Himick <Kate.Himick@UrbanaIL.gov>
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2026 10:58 AM
To: Chase, Monique <Monique.Chase@Illinois.gov>
Cc: Planning <Planning@UrbanaIL.gov>; Olivia Jovine <Olivia.Jovine@UrbanaIL.gov>; Angela Urban [BC] <Angela.Urban@UrbanaIL.gov>; Carmen Franks <Carmen.Franks@UrbanaIL.gov>; Evan Alvarez <Evan.Alvarez@UrbanaIL.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: Seq.#264222 - Urbana HPC Comments on Florida Ave Roadway Improvements Project

Hi Mo,

Thank you for reaching out! It is much appreciated. I have been in communication with Urbana's engineering staff about some requests for coordination from Lochmueller Group, the project consultant.

Would you have time to speak over the phone or meet via Teams to chat about next steps for the Historic Preservation Commission and engagement with Lochmueller?

CITY OF URBANA

City of Urbana
400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801
www.urbanail.gov

Old Business:
Bylaws Revisions

Meeting: Historic Preservation Commission, November 4, 2026
Location: Council Chambers

Summary of Alterations to 2020 Bylaws:

Formatting Edits:
Adding subsections for clarity
Reordering certain articles for ease of use
Changing "Chairperson" to Chair
Changing "nominator/petitioner" to "petitioner
Changing "she/he" to "they"
Consistent capitalization

Article IV Meetings:
Adding a meeting adjournment time, to reflect City Council practice
Requiring minutes of subcommittees to be kept
Adding new categories to the remote attendance section to reflect the relevant state statute
Clarifying rules around abstentions and conflict of interest

Article VII Procedure for Hearings:
Streamlining procedure to reflect current practice and encourage simplicity
Alterations consistent with plan commission procedures
Clarity on reopening public input during a public hearing

Article IX Section 106:
Creation of initial section 106 procedures
Room for further additions in the future

Attachments:

Bylaws Adopted in 2020
Proposed New Bylaws

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OFFICIAL BYLAWS

City of Urbana, Illinois
Date of Commission Approval: March 4, 2020

Article I. Purpose

It is the purpose of these bylaws to establish a guide for the operation of the Historic Preservation Commission. These bylaws are supplemental to the provisions of Section XII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, which state the Historic Preservation Commission shall adopt rules necessary to the conduct of its affairs and in keeping with the provisions of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article II. Powers and Duties

The Urbana Historic Preservation Commission shall have the powers and duties outlined in Section XII-3F of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article III. Membership, Officers, and Their Duties

The membership, officers, their terms and responsibilities are governed by Section XII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article IV. Meetings

1. Regular meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission (herein after "Commission") shall be determined by the Commission. There shall be a minimum of four (4) meetings per year.

   If a regular meeting date is a holiday recognized by the City of Urbana, the Commission will not meet on that date. In such a case, the Chairperson may designate an alternative meeting date, provided that public notice is given in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

2. Continued meetings shall be at the time and place fixed in the motion for adjournment should the business of the Commission not be completed.

3. All meetings shall be held in the City Council Chambers, City Building, 400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois, unless special conditions require that the meeting take place at an alternate location.

4. The Secretary shall give at least forty-eight (48) hours notice of all meetings to all members, the public, and such media as required by law.

5. Minutes of all meetings shall be taken in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

Attendance

1. Attendance shall be required as outlined in Section XII-3 E of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

2. Members may attend meetings by video or telephone conference in accordance with Illinois Statute 5 ILCS120/7(c) which states in part:

3. If a quorum of the members of the public body is physically present, then a majority of the public body may allow a member to attend by video or telephone conference if the member is prevented from physically attending because of the following:

    a) personal illness or disability;
    b) employment purposes or the business of the public body; or
    c) a family or other emergency.

4. If a member wants to attend the meeting by video or telephone conference, he or she must notify the recording secretary before the meeting, unless advance notice is impractical.

5. A member attending a meeting by video or telephone where a quorum of the members of the public body is physically present, may cast votes.

Quorum

1. A quorum of the Preservation Commission shall consist of a majority of the members of the Preservation Commission then holding office but not less than three.

2. The Chair is a voting member of the Commission and shall vote on all matters except those on which a conflict of interest is declared. If the Chair declares a conflict of interest on any matter before the Commission, the Chair shall step down and the Vice-Chair shall take over as Chair of the Meeting. The Chair shall not resume his/her duties until the Commission finishes business on the matter on which the conflict of interest was declared.

    Each Commissioner has a duty to vote "yes" or "no" on all matters put to a vote. Abstentions, if for reasons of conflict of interest shall not be counted as either a "yes" or a "no" vote and such member so abstaining shall not be counted in determining the total of which a majority is required. Each Commissioner shall have the right to abstain by reason of a stated conflict of interest based on his or her own assessment of the existence of such conflict of interest and the Commission shall have no right to overrule such Commissioner's determination. The Commissioner need not reveal the substance of the reason that he or she feels they have a conflict of interest.

    If a Commissioner abstains but does not announce that such an abstention is based on a conflict of interest, then such abstention shall be recorded as abstained and the Chair shall rule that such abstention "goes with the majority" of those votes actually cast as a "yes" or "no" vote.

Legal Counsel

The City Attorney of the City of Urbana or the City Attorney's designee shall be the legal counsel of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Article V. Order of Business Agenda

The agenda for each meeting and the order of business shall be as follows:

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Declaration of Quorum
2. Changes to the Agenda
3. Approval of Previous Minutes
4. Written Communications
5. Audience Participation
6. Continued Public Hearings
7. Old Business
8. New Public Hearings
9. New Business
10. Monitoring of Historic Properties
11. Staff Report
12. Study Session
13. Announcements
14. Adjournment

The order of business and the agenda may be amended upon the motion and second of any Commissioner with consent of a majority of Commissioners present at the meeting.

Article VI. Procedure for Hearings

The Historic Preservation Commission shall use the following procedure for Public Hearings unless otherwise required by law:

1. The Chairperson shall declare the public hearing open. He/she shall state the case number and nature of the request. The Chairperson shall then outline the procedure to be followed, stating when the nominator/petitioner may present evidence, when the objectors may present evidence, and the procedure for cross-examination. In addition, the Chairperson shall state the Historic Preservation Commission's authority regarding the case and whether or not the Commission has final authority on the matter.

2. Staff presents summary of the case.

3. The nominator/petitioner or his/her representative may make a statement outlining the nature of his/her request prior to introducing evidence.

4. The nominator/petitioner shall present evidence.

    a) Opponents of the request shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity for relevant questioning (i.e., "cross-examination") of the nominator/petitioner, at the discretion of the Chairperson. If at any time the Chairperson determines the questions are becoming abusive, redundant, or irrelevant, he/she may stop the questioning and direct the questioner to move on to the next question. If the

petitioner is unable or unwilling to respond to the relevant questions, the chairperson shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission.

5. Other Proponents of the request who may have relevant information to present to the Commission may be heard at the discretion of the Chairperson.

    a) Opponents of the request shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity for relevant questioning of any Proponent, at the discretion of the Chairperson. If at any time the Chairperson determines the questions are becoming abusive, redundant, or irrelevant, he/she may stop the questioning and direct the questioner to move on to the next question. If the petitioner is unable or unwilling to respond to the relevant questions, the chairperson shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission.

6. Opponents of the request may present relevant evidence. Opponents may include persons not in favor of the petition as proposed, as determined by the Chairperson.

    a) The nominator/petitioner shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity for relevant questioning of any Opponent, at the discretion of the Chairperson. If at any time the Chairperson determines the questions are becoming abusive, redundant, or irrelevant, he/she may stop the questioning and direct the questioner to move on to the next question. If the opponent is unable or unwilling to respond to the relevant questions, the chairperson shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes of the Historic Preservation Commission.

7. Others who may have relevant information to present to the Commission may be heard at the discretion of the Chairperson.

8. Following the presentations by the nominator/petitioner, Proponents, or Opponents, additional comments may be allowed by City staff for clarification or in response to new evidence.

9. The nominator/petitioner may present a summary of his/her petition.

10. Questions from the Commission may be directed at any time to the applicant, staff or public to clarify evidence presented in the hearing.

11. The Commission shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence. The Commission may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, incompetent or repetitious testimony or other evidence.

12. A nominator/petitioner or opponent, or their agent or attorney may submit a list of persons favoring or opposing the application. Such a list will be accepted as an exhibit if it contains a brief statement of the position of the persons favoring or opposing the request together with the signatures and addresses of the persons subscribing to such statement. Said list shall be admissible as evidence if it is received by the Secretary prior to or during the public hearing on the request.

13. In order to facilitate an orderly and timely public hearing, the Chairperson may require advance registration of opponents wishing to ask questions of the nominator/petitioner or other interested parties, including identification of the opponents' area of interest in

questioning and identification of who may be questioned. Advance registration may be by means of speaker cards to be submitted prior to or at the public hearing.

14. The Chairperson shall rule on all questions relating to the admissibility of evidence. The Chairperson's determination may, however, be overruled by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.

15. The nominator/petitioner and opponents should present all evidence they possess concerning the request at the initial phase of the public hearing. Written material from the nominator/petitioner or opponents will be accepted by the Secretary for distribution to the Commission until the close of the public hearing.

16. The Chairperson shall close the public hearing only after the Historic Preservation Commission has taken action on the case. If the Commission has continued the case to a later date, the public hearing may be reopened at the same meeting at the discretion of the Chairperson or on a motion approved by the majority of the Commissioners present and voting.

17. The Commission should include Findings of Fact as part of a motion.

18. The Commission may continue any case due to insufficient information provided by the petitioner in order for City Staff to make a recommendation or the Commission to make a decision. The Commission may also continue any case for the purpose of gathering more testimony or due to the absence of the petitioner at the meeting.

Article VII. Audience Participation

1. Any person addressing the Commission during "Audience Participation" shall be allowed five (5) minutes to speak.

2. It shall be the prerogative of the Chairperson to extend the five (5) minute time limit or if the Chairperson does not enforce or extend the time limit, the extension shall be decided without debate by a motion approved by the majority vote of the members of the Commission present. The Chairperson shall also have the authority to reduce the time limit to three (3) minutes or a shorter time agreed upon by the Commission members.

3. No member of the Commission is obligated to respond to any public input provided.

Article VIII. Determinations

Motions and Procedures

Except as otherwise expressly provided in these Rules and Bylaws, motions and related miscellaneous procedures in Commission meetings shall be governed by the Robert's Rules of Order.

Article IX. Records

1. A file of materials and determinations relating to each case shall be kept by the Secretary as part of the records of the Commission. Said records shall be kept at the office of the Commission.

2. The Secretary or his/her designee shall prepare minutes of every regular or special meeting. The Commission minutes shall be kept as part of the official records of the Commission and approved by an affirmative vote of the majority of the Commission members present.

3. All records of the Commission shall be public records subject to release in accordance with the process outlined by the Freedom of Information Act.

4. In accordance with Certified Local Government requirements, the Secretary of the Historic Preservation Commission will prepare an annual report. The report shall include the following:

    1. Cases Reviewed: Certificates of Appropriateness and Certificates of Economic Hardship
    2. Local Designations: Local Landmarks and Historic Districts
    3. Historic Resource Surveys
    4. National Register Nominations
    5. Historic Property Monitoring
    6. Historic Preservation Commission Activities
    7. Commissioner Attendance Record

Article X. General Provisions

Commissioners shall not communicate with other commissioners outside of Historic Preservation Commission meetings for the purpose of influencing such commissioners to adopt a position on a matter then pending, or reasonably expected to come before the Commission.

Article XI. Amendment of Rules

These bylaws may be amended by an affirmative vote of not less than five (5) members of the Commission. Any such amendment becomes effective at the next regular meeting.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OFFICIAL BYLAWS

City of Urbana, Illinois
Date of Commission Approval: _____

Article I. Purpose

It is the purpose of these bylaws to establish a guide for the operation of the Historic Preservation Commission. These bylaws are supplemental to the provisions of Section XII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance, which state the Historic Preservation Commission shall adopt rules necessary to the conduct of its affairs and in keeping with the provisions of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article II. Powers and Duties

The Urbana Historic Preservation Commission shall have the powers and duties outlined in Section XII-3.F of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article III. Membership, Officers, and Their Duties

The membership, officers, and their terms and responsibilities are governed by Section XII-3 of the Urbana Zoning Ordinance.

Article IV. Meetings

1. Procedures

A. Regular meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission (herein after "Commission") shall be determined by the Commission. There shall be a minimum of four (4) meetings per year.

If a regular meeting date is a holiday recognized by the City of Urbana, the Commission will not meet on that date. In such a case, the Chair may designate an alternative meeting date, provided that public notice is given in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

B. Regular meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. and have a mandatory adjournment at 9:00 p.m. unless time is extended in either 30-minute or 1-hour increments by a two-thirds vote of the members then present. Meetings must end by 11:30 p.m.

C. Continued meetings shall be at the time and place fixed in the motion for adjournment, should the business of the Commission not be completed.

D. All meetings shall be held in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois, unless special conditions require that the meeting take place at an alternate location.

E. The Secretary shall give at least forty-eight (48) hours' notice of all meetings to all members, the public, and such media as required by law.

F. Minutes of all meetings, including those of subcommittees, shall be taken in accordance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

2. **Attendance**

A. Attendance shall be required as outlined in Section XII-3.E of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

B. Members may attend meetings by video or telephone conference in accordance with Illinois Statute 5 ILCS 120/7(a) which states in part:

If a quorum of the members of the public body is physically present, then a majority of the public body may allow a member to attend by video or telephone conference if the member is prevented from physically attending because of the following:

a) personal illness or disability;
b) employment purposes or the business of the public body;
c) a family or other emergency;
d) unexpected childcare obligations; or
e) performance of active military duty as a service member.

C. If a member wants to attend the meeting by video or telephone conference, they must notify the Recording Secretary before the meeting, unless advance notice is impractical.

D. A member attending a meeting by video or telephone where a quorum of the members of the public body is physically present, may cast votes.

3. **Quorum**

A. A quorum of the Commission shall consist of a majority of the members of the Commission then holding office but not less than three.

B. The Chair is a voting member of the Commission and shall vote on all matters except those on which the Chair declares they have a conflict of interest. If the Chair declares a conflict of interest on any matter before the Commission, the Chair shall step down and the Vice-Chair shall take over as Chair of the Meeting. The Chair shall not resume their duties until the Commission finishes business on the matter on which the conflict of interest was declared.

C. Each Commissioner has a duty to vote "yes" or "no" on all matters put to a vote. Abstentions, if for reasons of conflict of interest, shall not be counted as either a

"yes" or a "no" vote, and such members so abstaining shall not be counted in determining the total of which a majority is required. Each Commissioner shall have the right to abstain by reason of a stated conflict of interest based on their own assessment of the existence of such conflict of interest and the Commission shall have no right to overrule such Commissioner's determination. The Commissioner need not reveal the substance of the reason that they feel they have a conflict of interest.

4. **Legal Counsel**

   A. The City Attorney of the City of Urbana or the City Attorney's designee shall be the legal counsel of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Article V. Order of Business Agenda

1. The agenda for each meeting and the order of business shall be as follows:

   A. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Declaration of Quorum
   B. Changes to the Agenda
   C. Approval of Previous Minutes
   D. Written Communications
   E. Audience Participation
   F. Continued Public Hearings
   G. Old Business
   H. New Public Hearings
   I. New Business
   J. Monitoring of Historic Properties
   K. Staff Report
   L. Study Session
   M. Announcements
   N. Adjournment

2. The order of business and the agenda may be amended upon the motion and second of any Commissioner with consent of a majority of Commissioners present at the meeting. Changes to the agenda that include new business shall not be added unless properly noticed per the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

Article VI. Audience Participation

1. Any person addressing the Commission during "Audience Participation" shall be allowed five (5) minutes to speak.

2. It shall be the prerogative of the Chair to extend the five (5) minute time limit or if the Chair does not enforce or extend the time limit, the extension shall be decided without debate by a motion approved by the majority vote of the members of the Commission present. The Chair shall also have the authority to reduce the time limit to three (3)

minutes or a shorter time agreed upon by the Commission members.

3. No member of the Commission is obligated to respond to any public input provided.

Article VII. Procedure for Hearings

1. The Historic Preservation Commission shall use the following procedure for Public Hearings, unless otherwise required by law:

   A. The Chair shall declare the public hearing open. They shall state the case number and nature of the request. The Chair shall then outline the procedure to be followed, stating when Staff may present information, when the petitioner may present evidence, when members of the public may provide input or evidence, and the procedures for cross-examination. In addition, the Chair shall state the Commission's authority regarding the case and whether or not the Commission has final authority on the matter.

   B. Staff presents a summary of the case.

   C. The petitioner or their representative may make a statement outlining the nature of their request and shall present evidence

   D. Other Proponents of the request who wish to speak, who may have relevant evidence to present to the Commission, or who wish to pose questions relevant to the request may be heard. The petitioner shall be given time to respond to public input at a later portion of the public hearing.

   E. Opponents of the request who wish to speak, who may have relevant evidence to present to the Commission, or who wish to pose questions relevant to the request may be heard. Opponents may include persons not in favor of the petition as proposed, as determined by the Chair. Opponents may ask relevant questions of the petitioner by submitting questions to the Commission either in writing or during oral testimony. The Chair may direct the petitioner to answer such questions during rebuttal. If the petitioner does not respond to the relevant questions, the Chair shall direct the Recording Secretary to take note of such in the minutes.

   F. Others may be heard.

   G. Additional comments by City Staff may be allowed for clarification or in response to new evidence.

   H. The petitioner may respond to public input or rebut previously introduced evidence but not introduce new evidence.

I. Opponents may respond to public input or rebut previously introduced evidence but not introduce new evidence.

J. The petitioner may present a summary of their petition or make any last statements.

K. The Chair shall close the public input portion of the hearing and move into Commission deliberation.

2. Principles for Public Hearing Procedures:

A. Questions from the Commission may be directed at any time to the applicant, Staff, or public to clarify evidence presented in the hearing.

B. The Commission shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence. The Commission may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, incompetent, or repetitious evidence presented in the hearing.

C. The Chair shall rule on all questions relating to the admissibility of evidence. The Chair's determination may be overruled by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.

D. Proponents, opponents, or other members of the public providing input during a public hearing shall follow the audience participation procedures given in Article VI, as administered by the Chair or their designee.

E. The petitioner, proponents, and opponents should present all evidence they possess concerning the request at the initial phase of the public hearing. Written material from the petitioner, proponents, or opponents will be accepted by the Secretary for distribution to the Commission until the close of the public hearing.

F. A petitioner or opponent, or their agent or attorney, may submit a list of persons favoring or opposing the application. Such a list will be accepted as an exhibit if it contains a brief statement of the position of the persons favoring or opposing the request together with the signatures and addresses of the person subscribing to such statement. Said list shall be admissible as evidence if it is received by the Secretary prior to or during the public hearing on the request.

G. If at any time the Chair determines that questions are becoming abusive, redundant, or irrelevant, they may stop the questioning and direct the individual to move on to the next question or comment.

H. Participants shall not engage in direct questioning of one another except where

otherwise required by law or permitted by the Chair when necessary to ensure a fair hearing.

I. The Commission may continue any case due to insufficient information provided by the petitioner in order for City Staff to make a recommendation or for the Commission to make a decision. The Commission may also continue any case for the purpose of gathering more testimony or due to the absence of the petitioner at the meeting.

J. In the case of failure of the petitioner to appear, the Chair may entertain a motion to continue the case to the next regularly scheduled meeting or dismiss the case. In cases which are continued or dismissed for failure of the petitioner to appear, the Secretary will furnish the petitioner with written notice of said action. The petitioner shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of the notice of a dismissal to apply for reinstatement of the case. In such cases, the petitioner must file a written request with the Secretary for reinstatement. In all cases reinstated in the above-described manner, the case will be docketed and re-noticed in the usual manner prescribed for new cases.

K. The Commission should include Findings of Fact as part of a motion, whether they are those drafted by Staff, or of a Commission member's creation. If conditions are imposed as part of an approval, such conditions shall be explicitly included in the motion.

L. The Chair shall close the public hearing only after the Commission has taken action on a case. The public input portion of the hearing may be reopened at the same meeting prior to the Commission's action at the discretion of the Chair or on a motion approved by the majority of the Commissioners present and voting.

Article VIII. Determinations

1. Except as otherwise expressly provided in these Rules and Bylaws, motions and related miscellaneous procedures in Commission meetings shall be governed by the Robert's Rules of Order.

2. All public hearing determinations of the Commission shall be made at a public meeting by motion made and seconded. The Chair shall then call for discussion on the motion. After discussion, the Chair shall call for the roll call vote, polled by the Secretary or their designee. Any Commissioner may comment on their vote for incorporation into the minutes.

Article IX. Section 106 Procedures

1. As an expert local body, the Historic Preservation Commission is occasionally invited to act as a Consulting Party in Section 106 proceedings, as outlined in the National

Historic Preservation Act (Pub. L. No. 89-665, as amended by Pub. L. No. 96-515).

2. Upon receipt of an invitation to act as a Consulting Party and/or upon receipt of a request for comment in a Section 106 review, the following timeline shall be followed wherever possible to maintain compliance with the typical 30-day response deadline:

Table 1. Section 106 Initial Review Timeline	
Week 1	An invitation or request for comment is received. The Secretary reviews existing materials (Article IX.3.C), notifies the Commission of the invitation, and requests comments from individual members.
Weeks 2 and 3	Commissioners review the case and return comments to the Secretary.
Week 4	The Secretary completes a response cover letter compiling Commissioner comments. The Chair reviews and signs the letter. The Secretary sends the final response letter, with attachments as necessary.

3. The Secretary shall take the following actions following initial invitation or request for comment:

   A. Calculate the 30-day response deadline and internal deadlines to meet the Section 106 Initial Review Timeline.

   B. Confirm that the agency official coordinating the Section 106 review has the current and correct email contact for the Historic Preservation Commission.

   C. Conduct a review of the following materials for resources within the Area of Potential Effects (APE):

      a) The current listings of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
      b) The listings captured in the Historic and Architectural Resources Geographic Information System (HARGIS)
      c) The current list of Local Landmarks and Local Historic Districts
      d) The current list of locally surveyed historic resources held by the City at the Department of Community Development Services
      e) Surveys conducted by the Preservation and Conservation Association of Champaign County (PACA), which can be accessed at the Urbana Free Library

   D. Notify the Historic Preservation Commission of the invitation/request and transmit (1) the information obtained during the review of specified materials and (2) the deadlines for their comments. All correspondence shall be conducted in a

manner compliant with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et. seq.).

E. Collect individual Commissioner comments through email or make plans to collect comments at a regularly scheduled Commission meeting, if possible.

F. Compile a cover letter to transmit all received Commissioner comments and indicate acceptance/denial of Consulting Party status. The cover letter should include the information obtained during the review of specified materials as well as a brief introduction to Commissioners' comments. The cover letter should include the Commissioners' comments or materials provided as attachments.

G. Coordinate with the Chair to review the cover letter prior to its transmission to the agency official. The letter should be signed by both the Chair and Secretary. If the Chair is unavailable, the letter shall be signed by the Vice Chair or a separate designated Commissioner.

H. The receipt of an invitation to act as a Consulting Party and/or the receipt of request for comment in a Section 106 review shall be reported on by the Secretary at the next regularly held meeting of the Commission during a study session, unless otherwise necessary or suitable during the order of business.

Article X. Records

1. A file of materials and determinations relating to each case or Section 106 review shall be kept by the Secretary as part of the records of the Commission. Said records shall be kept at the office of the Secretary.

2. The Secretary or their designee shall prepare minutes of every regular or special meeting. The Commission minutes shall be kept as part of the official records of the Commission and approved by an affirmative vote of the majority of the Commission members present.

3. All records of the Commission shall be public records subject to release in accordance with the process outlined by the Freedom of Information Act.

4. In accordance with Certified Local Government requirements, the Secretary of the Historic Preservation Commission will prepare an annual report. The report shall include the following:

   A. Cases Reviewed: Certificates of Appropriateness and Certificates of

Economic Hardship
B. Local Designations: Local Landmarks and Historic Districts
C. Historic Resource Surveys
D. National Register Nominations
E. Historic Property Monitoring
F. Historic Preservation Commission Activities
G. Commissioner Attendance Record

Article XI. General Provisions

Commissioners shall not communicate with other commissioners outside of Historic Preservation Commission meetings for the purpose of influencing such commissioners to adopt a position on a matter then pending or reasonably expected to come before the Commission.

Article XII. Amendment of Rules

These bylaws may be amended by an affirmative vote of not less than five (5) members of the Commission. Any such amendment becomes effective at the next regular meeting.

City of Urbana
400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801
www.urbanail.gov

New Business:
Certificate of Appropriateness Application Revisions

Meeting: Historic Preservation Commission, November 4, 2026
Location: Council Chambers

Staff have revised the Certificate of Appropriateness application based on language proposed at the previous meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. Staff have also split the application into different forms, for ease of use.

Attachments:

Revised Historic Preservation Application

CITY OF URBANA

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

There is no application fee for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Based on the level of review for Certificates of Appropriateness as specified in Section XII-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, a public hearing may be required. Should a public hearing be required, the Applicant **is responsible for paying the cost of legal publication fees**. The News-Gazette will bill the applicant directly. Legal ad publication fees vary from $75.00 and up.

NOTE: Fields marked with an * must be completed.

NOTE: If additional space is needed to complete any field, please mark "See Attached" and attach the response at the end of this application.

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Address/Location of Subject Site*

Parcel/PIN # of Subject Site

Lot Size

Current Zoning District **Choose an Option from the Drop Down List**

Current Land Use *(vacant, residence, grocery, factory, etc)**

Legal Description*

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Applicant*

Applicant Business Name

Applicant Mailing Address*

Street # Street Name*

Apartment #, Suite #, Etc.

City* State* Zip*

Applicant Email Address*

Applicant Phone*

Multiple Applicants* No ☐ Yes ☐

***NOTE:** Please attach documentation of additional applicants names and contact information.*

Property Interest of Applicant(s)* **Choose Interest from Drop Down List**

OWNER INFORMATION*

☐ This property has one owner.

☐ This property has multiple owners.
NOTE: *Please attach documentation of additional owners names and contact information.*

Owner Name*

Owner Business Name

Owner Mailing Address

Owner Street #* Street Name*

Owner Apartment #, Suite #, Etc.

Owner City* State* Zip*

Owner Email Address*

Owner Phone*

CONSULTANT INFORMATION

If you are working with an architect, engineer, surveyor, site planner, or attorney, please fill in their information below.

☐ Architect Name

Architect Company

Architect Mailing Address

Architect Email Address Phone

☐ Engineer Name

Engineer Company

Engineer Mailing Address

Engineer Email Address Phone

☐ Surveyor Name

Surveyor Company

Surveyor Mailing Address

Surveyor Email Address Phone

☐ Attorney Name

Attorney Company

Attorney Mailing Address

Attorney Email Address Phone

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Written Questions:

1. Clearly describe the existing conditions and the proposed work to be done, specifying what materials are to be used, what materials are currently in place, the construction method, and the current condition of the relevant parts of the structure. Plans or attached documents may be referenced.*

2. Describe how the proposed work will change, destroy, or affect any external feature of the structure or site.*

3. How will the proposed work affect the preservation, protection, perpetuation and economic use of the structure?*

4. Describe below or attach a statement indicating how the proposed work meets applicable criterion provided in EXHIBIT A (Page 5).*

5. State any additional information you feel that the Zoning Administrator or the Historic Preservation Commission should consider in their determination for the proposed work.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Required Project Documentation:*

As part of your application, please submit the required materials listed below. These materials may overlap with the required materials for a building permit application, and building permit plans may be used when the required details are shown. You may apply for a building permit and a Certificate of Appropriateness at the same time, though a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be issued prior to a building permit.

If you believe that a required item does not apply, please contact Planning staff to confirm what documentation is needed. Planning staff may also request additional information needed to evaluate the proposal.

Please submit or attach the following:

- ☐ Current photographs of the overall building or site, each affected area, and close-up details of affected features.
- ☐ Plans and/or drawings showing the location, extent, dimensions, materials, and appearance of the proposed work. Plans or drawings should clearly identify existing versus proposed conditions.
- ☐ Material specifications identifying proposed products to be used, as applicable.
- ☐ If approval of an addition or detached accessory building is requested, submit a site plan showing the measurements of the lot, the existing buildings and the proposed changes.
- ☐ If approval of a demolition is requested, submit a site plan of the property and the structure(s) to be demolished.

EXHIBIT A - CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW CRITERIA

In making a determination whether to issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Preservation Commission shall consider the following criteria:

1. Maintain the significant original qualities and character of the buildings, structures, sites or objects including, if significant, its appurtenances. Removing or altering any historic or distinctive architectural features should be avoided whenever possible.
2. Retain and preserve the historic character of a property. Avoid removing or substituting distinctive materials or altering features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.
3. Recognize each property as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Do not undertake changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties.
4. Retain and preserve changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right.
5. Preserve distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property.
6. *Deteriorated historic features.* Repair rather than replace deteriorated historic features. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features must be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. *Treatment methods.* Use the gentlest means possible when using chemical or physical treatments. Do not use treatments that cause damage to historic materials.
8. *Archaeology.* Protect and preserve archeological resources in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures should be undertaken.
9. *New construction.* With new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, do not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. Undertake new additions and adjacent or related new construction in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Differentiate new work from the old. To protect the integrity of the property and its environment, new additions and new construction shall be compatible with the original architecture of the landmark or styles within the historic district and in terms of the following guidelines:
    a. *Height:* The height of the proposed building or structure or additions or alterations should be compatible with surrounding buildings or structures.
    b. *Proportions of structure's front façade:* The proportion between the width and height of the proposed building or structure should be compatible with nearby buildings or structures.
    c. *Proportions of openings into the facility:* The proportions and relationships between doors and windows should be compatible with existing buildings and structures.
    d. *Relationship of building masses and spaces:* The relationship of a building or structure to the open space between it and adjoining buildings or structures should be compatible.
    e. *Roof shapes:* The design of the roof should be compatible with that of adjoining buildings and structures.
    f. *Appurtenances:* Use of appurtenances should be sensitive to the individual building or structure, its occupants and their needs.
    g. *Scale of building or structure:* The scale of the building or structure should be compatible with that of surrounding buildings or structures.
    h. *Directional expression of front elevation:* Street façades should blend in with other buildings and structures with regard to directional expression when adjacent buildings or structures have a dominant horizontal or vertical expression.
10. Demolition. In granting a Certificate of Appropriateness to undertake demolition, the Commission shall find that at least one of the following conditions exists:
    a. The demolition would be limited to a non-significant portion of a building or a non-significant accessory structure, and 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 district; or
    c. The Building Official of the City of Urbana certifies that the demolition is required for public safety because of an unsafe or dangerous situation.

Please contact the Planning Division if you need assistance: Planning@UrbanaIL.gov or (217) 384-2440.

ATTACHMENTS

Please include any required attachments or attachments relevant to your request.

Attach Files Here

CERTIFICATION BY THE APPLICANT*

☐ I certify all the information provided in this application and any attachment(s) are true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I am either the property owner or authorized to make this application on the owner's behalf.

☐ I acknowledge that by submitting this application, I am granting permission for City staff to post a temporary yard sign announcing the public hearing to be held for my request on the property. I further acknowledge that my electronic or digital signature on this application has the full legal effect as that of my written signature.

Applicant's Signature*

Date*

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED APPLICATION TO:

By emailing a pdf copy to Planning@UrbanaIL.gov

Or by mailing a paper copy to:
City of Urbana
Community Development Department Services
Planning Division
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

City of Urbana
400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801
www.urbanail.gov

Study Session:
Historic Preservation Plan and Downtown Design District Conversation

Meeting: Historic Preservation Commission, November 4, 2026
Location: Council Chambers

This study session is intended for continued Commission discussion of the Historic Preservation Plan and how it may relate to the recently proposed Downtown Design District.

City of Urbana
400 S. Vine Street, Urbana, IL 61801
www.urbanail.gov

Study Session:
Section 106 Sequence #26422 (Florida Avenue Project)

Meeting: Historic Preservation Commission, November 4, 2026
Location: Council Chambers

This study session is intended for Commission discussion of the correspondence received on October 20, 2026 from Mo Chase, Architectural Historian at the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), as it relates to the Commission's role as a consulting party in the Section 106 review process of the Florida Avenue Project.