



# City of Aurora

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

## Legistar History Report

**File Number: 15-01070**

**File ID:** 15-01070

**Type:** Resolution

**Status:** Agenda Ready

**Version:** 2

**General Ledger #:**

**In Control:** Planning & Development Committee

**File Created:** 11/25/2015

**File Name:** HP Grant / 113 S. 4th Street / Sam Melton

**Final Action:**

**Title:** A Resolution Authorizing the Execution of a Historic Preservation Grant Agreement with Sam and Larissa Melton for the property at 113 S. 4th Street (Sam and Larissa Melton - L15-01070 / AU27/1-15.288-HP/GR- JH - Ward 2)

**Notes:**

**Agenda Date:** 12/10/2015

**Agenda Number:**

**Sponsors:**

**Enactment Date:**

**Attachments:** Grant Committee Memo.pdf, PRS 113 S 4th St .pdf, Application Packet\_113 S. 4th St.pdf

**Enactment Number:**

**Planning Case #:** AU27/1-15.288-HP/GR

**Hearing Date:**

**Drafter:** jhall@aurora-il.org

**Effective Date:**

### History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
----------	--------------	-------	---------	----------	-----------	--------------	---------

1	Historic Preservation Commission	12/02/2015	Forwarded to P&D Committee	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:** Ms. Hall said this project is restoring the wood siding that was underneath some synthetic siding. The applicant is currently in the process of doing the project. He has already removed all of the synthetic siding and is restoring the siding underneath. Most of it is restoration. There were a few replacements. The first picture you see on the left is what it looked like before he did any of the work. This is during taking off the siding and before restoration of the siding. You can see the poor condition the siding was in. These are the pictures of what it looks like currently. He is still not complete with the project. He's done the restoration of the siding, and began some of the painting. He is also installing some crown moldings around the windows, which adhere to the design guidelines. There are several little details of the Queen Anne style, the shell siding. The crown molding is also the Queen Anne style.

Mr. Vaughan said I see we have a few new people in the audience. Is there a representative from this property or any of the others? Would you like to speak and say anything regarding the house?

*I'm Sam Melton. We are the property owners. We've been owning the house for about 9 years now and we've been hoping to reside it for a while now. We finally, this fall, decided to push forward with the project. The original siding was ceramic tile and was cracking all over the place and had all sorts of issues with it. About 2 months ago we removed the siding that was there and we had a restorationist come out and talk to us about how to restore it to the original Queen Anne. It's been a very interesting project because you pull off the siding and you start to find a lot of the detail work underneath and we are trying to recover as much of that as possible, so that's why we are hoping to get the grant to bring back some of that original flavor of the home.*

*Mr. Miller said were some of the window pits missing, or did you find evidence of that?*

*Mr. Melton said we found on the front of the house you see a place where they would have like a mansard roof over that portion of it. We found a little where there was crown molding on top of the lug windows. It also looks like the main bay window on the front was actually pushed out from the house and they had another mansard roof over the top of that one and when they put the ceramic tiles on to it, they flattened the whole thing out to try to make it easier to apply the siding, so they removed most of that except for the portico and those pieces. Those are the kinds of details that we are hoping to restore.*

*Ms. Hall said the estimated cost that was submitted with the one he chose was the cost estimate from Historic Painting & Restoration, so \$18,605 was the cost estimate. You can that see staff started laying out what the grant would cover. If you did a 50% match, it would be \$9,400 rounded.*

*Ms. Phifer said if the Commission has any comments or thoughts with regard to the amount, this is something that in the past we have had a fluctuating scale depending on what the Commission felt was something to recommend, whether that be a match of 50% or there be a lower percentage. That is something that has been up for the discussion. You'll notice that, and these are recommendations from staff, at the time of the Grant Committee, we really just kind of talked in broader brush pictures. We wanted to come back and take a look at what kind of dollars we were talking about. So what staff is recommending in this spreadsheet is that for all of the grants that are being considered tonight is to keep to that matching, that 50%, but again, that is something we can discuss a little further. Any discussion on the percentage or on the project itself would be great.*

*Mr. Schweizer said my only comment on the percentages is that we're balancing this year and next year with the same amount of money, so if we go with the 50%, we're not going to have that amount available for 2016. Just keep that in mind as you run these numbers in your head.*

*Mr. Vaughan said I do agree with Jim. I think based on the fact that had 14 or 15 applicants, many of which we've asked to revise their applications for 2016, I'd like to make sure that we do have funds available for those projects that may be coming up. I don't know what sort of responses you've had from those homeowners, if you've had any. I would actually recommend 25% reimbursement for this project.*

*Mr. Castrejon said what do you foresee for allocation of funding for next year?*

*Ms. Phifer said we currently, and the budget is before the City Council next Tuesday, and currently that budget does not have any additional funding for 2016 for any of the Historic Preservation Grant programs. We do still have some money available to us that we can use from other grant agreements that we do not foresee having all the grant money used, so we will have some leftover money for 2016. We are right now looking that we are going to have \$48,000 that would, as Rob indicated, would cover the 2015 and 2016 grant cycles. That's what the budget shows right now. It is hard to say what the year will show. We can always add money to that if the City Council finds that all funding at the state gets itself figured out and maybe some of the budget isn't as tight. I do think it is a very positive thing that we did have in a short application window, we did have 15 applicants and I think that shows that there is a need and a want for the program. I also think showing in some ways that we have \$35,000 worth of grants that we could easily absorb into the neighborhood, it is showing that this money will get used. In some ways I completely understand wanting to make sure that if we don't have any more money in 2016 that we want to make sure we can continue the program because I think it is very important to continue to have the program, so I would hate to see us not have grants available for 2016, but at the same time showing that there is a need and a demand for that money so that we can show that it is a program that is popular and it does have an impact. There is a real ability with these projects, which is why I think the committee felt so strongly about them that they really will make an impact in the neighborhoods. It is kind of a Catch 22. In some ways, the way that you show that the program is valuable is by spending that money and showing some good projects, but at the same time*

*we want to make sure that we still have the ability to have the projects in 2016. We did get some positive reaction, in answer to your question, to those ones that we talked about doing some things in 2016, so we definitely think we are going to have some really good projects that we can bring forward in 2016 as well.*

*Mr. Miller said so if we have the \$48,000 and we vote to approve the \$35,600 it shows here we are left with less than \$13,000.*

*Ms. Phifer said and as I say, there are some agreements that are out there that there are funds that will, we think, come in under budget, so we think we can reallocate those funds, so we may have another \$10,000 to add to that for 2016. That is not a guarantee, but it does look like we may have a little bit of additional money, so that would leave \$23,000 for 2016.*

*Mr. Schweizer said I think 50% would be a perfect world; 25% is too mean. I think more around the 40% might be more applicable to something like this.*

*Ms. Phifer said so then we would just be looking for a recommendation from the Preservation Commission on this grant application.*

*Mr. Schweizer said are we supposed to come up with a number right now?*

*Ms. Phifer said we would like you to make a recommendation on a number. At the end of the day, it is the City Council that makes the final decision, so this will go to the Planning and Development Committee. They will take your recommendation and staff's recommendation and do a count and then make a final determination to be presented to City Council for final decision.*

*Mr. Schweizer said I recommend 40%.*

*Mr. Miller said that would leave us another \$35,600 for next year.*

*Mr. Truax said we are going to be playing with a lot of these numbers, I think, so worrying about what the final number is down here isn't important yet. I think around \$7,000 would be the right number, which still gives us a couple thousand left over.*

*Mr. Vaughan said I'll compromise and agree with Don.*

*Mr. Truax said I move that we recommend approval of 113 S. 4th Street with a recommendation of \$7,000. Mr. Vaughan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.*

---