



City of Aurora

44 East Downer Place
Aurora, Illinois 60505
www.aurora-il.org

Legistar History Report

File Number: 15-01071

File ID: 15-01071	Type: Resolution	Status: Draft
Version: 2	General Ledger #:	In Control: Planning & Development Committee
File Name: HP Grant / 169 S. Lincoln Avenue / Mary Anne Cummings		File Created: 11/25/2015
		Final Action:

Title: A Resolution Authorizing the Execution of a Historic Preservation Grant Agreement with Mary Anne Cummings for the property at 169 S. Lincoln Avenue (Mary Anne Cummings - L15-01071/ AU27/1-15.289-HP/GR - JH - Ward 2)

Notes:

Agenda Date: 12/10/2015

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Grant Committee Memo.pdf, PRS 169_S Lincoln.pdf, Application Packet_169 S Lincoln.pdf

Enactment Number:

Planning Case #: AU27/1-15.289-HP/GR

Hearing Date:

Drafter: JHall@aurora-il.org

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Historic Preservation Commission	12/02/2015	Forwarded	Planning & Development Committee	12/10/2015		Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Mr. Truax, seconded by Mr. Vaughan, that this agenda item be Forwarded to the Planning & Development Committee, on the agenda for 12/10/2015. The motion carried by voice vote.					
	Notes:	<p><i>Ms. Hall said the property owner is also another one that currently has started work on the project. She hasn't gotten very far with it, especially with winter coming, but she has gotten her COA issued. The work basically is covering front porch repairs. Let me bring up the pictures.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Schweizer said while we're finding that, I know that maintenance on something like a porch is very expensive, but is the grant really for restoration or is it for maintenance? If it is deferred maintenance that's kind of a property owner Catch 22. I'm looking at you Rob because you probably have more answers on this.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Vaughan said it is an interesting question. We looked at, as a Grant Committee, we looked through a lot of applications and some of us were divided, to be honest, on whether a project was considered to be deferred maintenance or worthy of restoring historic integrity. The majority of the applicants that were looking for assistance were basically deferred maintenance. A lot of the ones that</i></p>					

we are looking at here, 113 S. 4th, are similar. A lot of them are maintenance related and this one, I believe, would be in the same situation as...

Mr. Truax said the 113 S. 4th, why do you consider that deferred maintenance? They took off inappropriate siding.

Mr. Vaughan said it was replacement of the boards and painting.

Mr. Truax said but it was covered.

Mr. Vaughan said that is true.

Mr. Truax said it changed from really poorly maintained to one that looks pretty good now. I think that one really is restoring the historic character of the property.

Mr. Vaughan said I do completely agree with you on that one. In my opinion that was a very deserving project. The Lincoln project, the same could be said for replacement to the balusters, and the new railing that has been put up. It is a fine line. This was, to be honest, a maybe in the list of funding, which is why we wanted to bring it to the Commission. I wanted to have the opportunity to chime in on this one because it was sort of on the fence. There was some deferred maintenance, but there was also some replacement. It was in pretty bad shape and I think, personally I have a great appreciation for the length that they went through to restore the railings that are up there now. The scope of the project is massive. It is really a huge undertaking and it is a very prominent house on Lincoln. It is pretty much the first one you see as you are heading south down Lincoln. Because of the placement of the house and the scope of the work, we wanted to bring it before the Commission for discussion.

Ms. Hall said in the picture you can see this is where they started some of the work.

Mr. Truax said I guess the other question is, do we know how long the owners have owned the property?

Ms. Phifer said the first page of the application should have the date of purchase.

Mr. Vaughan said 1995, December of 1995. It's been a long time.

Mr. Truax said it looks like they are doing a great job.

Mr. Vaughan said again, the quality of the work and the extent that they are going through, I did feel that it was worthy of discussion.

Ms. Hall said I know that when I spoke with the owner they've done some work on the rest of the house. They've done some work on the Carriage House behind to help restore that portion of the house. I don't think I took any pictures of that. This picture shows the deterioration of the siding. Just to move onto the conversation of the cost, since she has already started the process, she is going with Centra as the cost estimate that she is going to go with, which is \$20,272.79. The staff, again, when determining what we recommend, we went with a 50% recommendation for this project as well. You can see that would be rounded to about \$10,200. Is there any conversations about the percentage recommendations or the project in general?

Mr. Truax said I really liked your 40%, which would drop it down to about \$8,000.

Mr. Miller said that may be fair. I can support that.

Mr. Truax said I move we recommend that 169 S. Lincoln get a grant of \$8,000. Mr. Vaughan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Phifer said I just want to make one clarification. We are marking for the motions about the \$7,000, the \$8,000, but when we do the grant agreement it is based upon a percentage because it is based on actual costs, so there is a cap, but at the same time all the costs, they are not guaranteed that amount. It is all based on a certain percentage of the overall project costs that are actually incurred. I just wanted to make that clarification.

Mr. Truax said should we then back off these motions and put them at 40%?

Ms. Phifer said actually giving me both and then we'll figure out how the numbers play out and we'll make sure that that works. That's fine.
