

## CITIZENS FOR GLEN ELLYN PRESERVATION

### QUESTIONS FOR 2008 VILLAGE BOARD CANDIDATES

1. What policies or programs would you adopt as Trustee/President to enhance the relationship between the preservation of historic resources and economic development?

**Jay Strayer candidate for Village President:** As a long time resident, I have always been in favor of policies and programs that preserve Glen Ellyn's historic character. While living in my previous home, built in 1911, I restored the interior to its original condition. This included restoration of all the oak floors, wood and millwork to its original condition. When a local builder wanted to purchase the home, I chose not to sell it to him. He stated he might tear down the home, subdivide the lot and build two homes. This would have resulted in the loss of three oak trees that were approximately 90 years old.\*

**Mark Pfefferman, candidate for Village President:** Hello and please note: Our Glen Ellyn Village Board acts collectively, as a unit. As a result, this and all other questions would have to be answered as such. What follows are my personal views.

I favor creating a vision for Glen Ellyn. When developing such, questions such as "What do we value as a community?" will be debated and answered with the help of the public and staff. I am confident that historic architecture, character, and diversity of housing and commercial real estate stock will be among the answers.

**Phillip Hartweg, candidate for Village Trustee:** I would encourage the EDC Board to communicate with your organization as well as the Village Administration on a routine and as needed basis to further enhance the public image that Glen Ellyn is proud of its history. This should or could be a theme for its recruitment of new businesses and new residents. There should be more cooperative programs in the community to help all and especially school age children relate to the local history.

**Chris Wilson, candidate for Village Trustee:** Historic Preservation can play an important part in the economic development of our downtown. As a trustee, I would encourage the village and/or the Historic Preservation Commission to pursue several of the recommendations from Town Builder Studios in Chapter 5 of their downtown plan.

- ∞ Complete a National Register nomination for the downtown historic commercial district. National Register designation would qualify property owners to apply for federal tax credits if they restored or renovated their buildings.
- ∞ Landmark the downtown commercial district (a local designation through the Glen Ellyn Historic Commission)
- ∞ Educate building owners on federal and local economic incentives available to property owners who wish to restore or renovate their properties.
- ∞ Encourage uniquely-designed infill having similar setbacks and massing to the existing historic buildings.

**Joseph Salamunovich, candidate for Village Trustee:** I believe that historic structures are a very important part of what makes Glen Ellyn what it is, helping to define our character as a community. However, I also believe that economic development is vital to Glen Ellyn. If preservation is fostered at the expense of economic development, then the means and the purpose of preservation will be lost as Glen Ellyn falls into decline, which will erode its character more than the loss of historic structures.

Historic structures should be maintained whenever reasonably possible. The question is whether the historic structure can provide the required functionality on an economically viable basis. We should remember that many of the historic structures that we would seek to preserve now were themselves erected to replace earlier historic structures that had ceased to be functional. That is what has permitted Glen Ellyn to grow and prosper in the past.

**Carl Henninger, candidate for Village Trustee:** This question is unclear.

**Peter Cooper, candidate for Village Trustee:** As I have discussed with members of the community, I did not develop a platform – or, more precisely, an “agenda” – before deciding to run for Village trustee. Included in the decision not to adopt an agenda was a determination not to advocate for specific policies or ordinances in connection with this campaign. Likewise, I do not have a list of commitments or projects that I think the Village must undertake or avoid. Rather, I am committed to openly and publicly debating and balancing competing interests within the Village. While I am committed to maintaining Glen Ellyn’s aesthetics, its sense of community, and its socioeconomic character and diversity, I also respect peoples’ property interests, including the right to improve and modify their own property.

2. How do Glen Ellyn's historical residential buildings and neighborhoods fit into your vision and what policies and programs would you adopt to enhance the preservation and improvement of such neighborhoods?

**Jay Strayer:** I favor restoration rather than replacement of historic properties. While the choice ultimately resides with the property owner, I am in favor of giving historical properties landmark status.

**Mark Pfefferman:** The diversity of residential housing stock – style, age, type, size and lot size are one of the qualities that make Glen Ellyn unique. As a trustee, I was a strong supporter of Glen Ellyn becoming a Certified Local Government. I support placquing and designated historical districts like north Main Street.

Ideally, the village board may want to offer incentives, in addition to the annual awards it does now, for historic renovations and new development that blends into and enhances our streetscapes. (This would take meticulous attention to detail and definition of qualifications.)

**Phillip Hartweg:** I live on the fringes of the Main Street Historical area and see that it can be a positive for those home owners who wish to become involved. Further enhancement could be done. Not everyone wishes to be involved but perhaps you (CGEP) and the Historical Society could work together to improve the interest and desirability of the program.

**Chris Wilson:** I believe that the historic homes contribute significantly to the character and charm of our village. I would encourage the village to complete the Historic Resource Survey for all of Glen Ellyn. In addition, I would encourage the Historic Preservation Commission, in conjunction with Citizens for Glen Ellyn Preservation, to conduct a seminar celebrating the results of the survey. This seminar should educate interested residents about the process and the benefits of having their homes land marked. Information on tax incentives available to homeowners who restore their homes should also be presented

**Joseph Salamunovich:** I'm very much in favor of preserving our historic residential buildings and neighborhoods although I'm not in favor of protecting something just because it's old. Old does not always equate to historic. Regarding improvement of those neighborhoods, I'm in favor of encouraging the development of housing that compliments the surrounding historic residences so that we can avoid the "McMansions" that are so often a blight to a community.

**Carl Henniger:** This question is unclear.

**Peter Cooper:** My wife and I moved to Glen Ellyn in 1993, in large part because of Glen Ellyn's attractive older homes and neighborhoods. Nevertheless, I am against imposing more restrictions on homeowners concerning the use and preservation of their properties. I believe that most people who purchase older homes do so because, like my wife and me, they prefer the character and beauty of a mature property. My experience is that most owners of older properties work hard to maintain them. When they choose to modify or renovate their homes, they seek to preserve the houses' architectural integrity and character even while they modernize them. I think the Village's policies and allocation of resources to encourage preservation are sufficient.

3. Do you feel that historic designations (of individual structures, artifacts, and districts) are a valuable procedure and, if so, what actions would you take to enhance the use of such designations in Glen Ellyn?

**Jay Strayer:** Absolutely! If property owners are in favor, Village government should not be opposed to such a program. As Village President I will actively promote the historic designation of structures, artifacts and districts.

**Mark Pfefferman:** Yes. We have many programs in place to accomplish this. As with many areas in the village, enhancing communication and making the information readily available to residents is integral to increased usage. I hope to raise our village's communication efforts up several notches.

**Phillip Hartweg:** I feel that historical designations are a valuable concept to the community. However, this is not always an interest to all. Cooperative efforts of the service organizations and historical groups in the community should first be brought about and perhaps new programs and concepts can be encouraged in cooperation with the village.

**Chris Wilson:** I feel that historic designations are very important to preserving the character of Glen Ellyn. The completion of the Historic Resource Survey, which was started in 2002, would help in the identification of architecturally significant, historic homes, as well as nearby homes which contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood. Residents need to be educated on the benefits of land marking these structures.

The horse trough is an example of an artifact that the Historic Preservation Commission presented to the Village Board for land marking. The Board recommended waiting on this action until the downtown plan was

adopted. Rather than delay, I would recommend supporting the land marking of the object, not it's site.

One idea for promoting our historic resources would be through the creation of a map of our significant homes and commercial buildings, with brief histories and notable characteristics of the styles. By bringing together the knowledge and talent from our many community groups, events such as docent-led walking or trolley tours could be combined with lunch in our downtown restaurants and other special events.

**Joseph Salamunovich:** Historic designation is a valuable procedure. At this time I'm unaware of anything that needs to be done to enhance the use of such designations but I'd certainly be willing to listen to suggestions.

**Carl Henniger:** I do not know enough about this to offer an opinion at this time.

**Peter Cooper:** Every community benefits from a sense of history. I formerly lived in Brooklyn, whose streets and buildings bear historical markers of the Battle of Long Island fought in 1776. These testaments to the bravery of America's patriots were nestled in one of the country's most urban environments. The Village's ordinance and policies with respect to the Historic Preservation Commission, and the solicitation of property owner participation and consent with respect to landmark designation is appropriate and sufficient.

#### 4. Ideally, what role do you think the Village Historic Commission should have beyond its required regulatory functions?

**Jay Strayer:** I believe the current role of the Historic Preservation Commission should not be diminished in any manner.

**Mark Pfefferman:** The survey of residential housing stock that the Historical Preservation Commission is conducting is a valuable tool for our village. It should be readily available to the public. I would also like to see the HPC join the Architectural Review Commission's review when historic commercial structures are involved.

**Phillip Hartweg:** Any commission should fully try to fulfill it's mission. At his moment I do not have any specific information on the goals and aspiration of this commission (and I do not have access to such information to properly answer this question here today).

**Chris Wilson:** I believe that the Historic Preservation Commission should become more proactive in land marking our important public historic structures such as Glenbard West, the WPA-built Lake Ellyn boat house, the Main Street Rec Center and our downtown historic commercial district.

Additionally, the commission should provide education seminars to the public on tax incentives available to residents who land mark their homes. They should also publish the Historic Preservation Guidelines (available on the village website) which they wrote to educate residents about the different architectural styles common to the village.

**Joseph Salamunovich:** At this time I don't see the need to expand the Village Historic Commission's function beyond what it is today but I would be open to hearing the case for expanding it.

**Carl Henniger:** In the Board / Commission / Staff structure employed by Glen Ellyn, it is key that the Village Board leverages the expertise of it's Commissions. The decision of what work should be undertaken by commissions should come from both directions ... the board should direct the Commissions to work on issues important to it and the Commissions should approach the Board to gain approval to pursue items of importance to them.

Should I be elected, I will be interested to learn what the Historic Commission believes it should be doing to further enhance their mission.

**Peter Cooper:** It is not clear what you are asking. With respect to the Historic *Preservation* Commission, please see my answer to question 3, above. With respect to the Glen Ellyn Historical Society, I believe the Village and the community benefits from the Society's preservation and publicizing of Glen Ellyn's historic past. Although the weakening economy and declining real estate values will present challenges to Glen Ellyn in further subsidizing the work of the Historical Society, I hope that GEHS will be able to complete its work in creating a Glen Ellyn Historical Park centered around Stacy's Tavern.

5. In light of the wooded character of the Village, do you support the proposed amendments to the Tree Preservation Ordinance (developed by the Village Environmental Commission in 2007) that would protect specific varieties of healthy trees in the setback portion of private properties? Please explain.

**Jay Strayer:** I believe certain trees are more valuable than others and if possible should be designated as protected trees in the setback portion of private properties. Type, size and condition needs to be considered. If the owner wants to remove a protected tree, then consideration needs to be given to an appropriate replacement tree. A policy that seeks to protect trees on private

property must be balanced with the rights of the property owner. I believe more investigation needs to be conducted to determine if the current voluntary ordinance is working. The protection of trees during construction must be given a higher priority. I am in favor of inspection of the health of trees several years after completion of construction to determine the damage from construction. Weather conditions and the effects of a drought on the health of the trees must also be considered.

As far as the proposed Ordinance, it is not appropriate at this time for me to express support for or against such an ordinance. However, Glen Ellyn is a community that takes pride in its beautiful trees, gardens and parks. These wonderful attributes need to be preserved. I fully support the goals for tree preservation issued by the Glen Ellyn Environmental Commission on September 20, 2006.

**Mark Pfefferman:** Quite frankly, the proposed amendments seem to have vanished from public view, so I am a bit uncertain as to what the latest version contains.

Our community has decided, collectively, that green space (setbacks) are appropriate for residential development and, for example, swimming pools, RVs, and six-foot high fences are inappropriate in our front yards. Our zoning code reflects this. The community also values trees. Therefore, the tree-preservation-in-set-back ordinance does not seem to be a burden on individual property rights, as long as the appropriate alternatives remain in place as presented in the last version I reviewed. Our code allows for certain structures within setbacks such as gazebos, garages, and sheds. The tree ordinance would have to address and accommodate these. I am supportive.

**Phillip Hartweg:** I have been able to access the village website and review the Proposed Tree Ordinance. As I see it it appears to be a "voluntary ordinance" and this amendment has been in discussion at various levels since 9-20-06. I think it has missed involvement of some groups and doesn't always show some reasonable and common sense approaches. The Village character needs to be preserved but so does the rights of individual property owners. We need a balance and relevant education of the issues. It might be good to keep in mind that this has not always been a well forested area.

**Chris Wilson:** At the request of the Village Board, the Environmental Commission worked for a year to come up with amendments to the current ordinance that offer protection of desirable trees, which is in the interest of the community at large, balanced with the rights of homeowners to make decisions about their own properties. The resulting amendments, which apply to the unbuildable part of the lot, would allow residents to take down trees anywhere on their properties for most of the typical reasons, such as disease, crowding or an undesirable variety, but would slow the practice of clear-cutting at the start of new construction.

Personally, I believe it is in the best interest of our village and our environment to preserve our mature and heritage trees whenever possible. Trees are a quality of life issue in that they provide so many important benefits to us. In light of the village-wide outpouring of concern regarding the loss of native trees in historic Babcock Grove in Ackerman Woods, and also the survey conducted by CGEP of a designated area in northeast Glen Ellyn where 79% of the residents signed a petition in support of the amendments, I believe that there is a growing mandate for increased tree protection.

**Joseph Salamunovich:** Trees are among Glen Ellyn's greatest resources so I generally support any measure intended to preserve healthy trees in our community. However, I'm also sensitive to the inherent right of individual property owners to be able to use their private property as they see fit.

I'm in favor of the proposed changes to the TPO. They appear to balance the competing interests of the community and the private property owner in a reasonable manner. From a preservation standpoint, it is definitely an improvement over the current voluntary TPO. At the same time, it recognizes the property owner's need to make necessary changes and provides a means to resolve disputes.

**Carl Henniger:** I am in complete agreement with the Environmental Commission that the Village's trees are a very important asset. And I support efforts to protect them. My only concern is that we not enact legislation that would end up landing the Village in court fighting legal challenges to it.

**Peter Cooper:** In the 1980s, my in-laws lived in a beautiful, old New England town, full of white clapboard houses with black shutters. The town's appearance did not develop by accident. A homeowner required the approval of the village before she could paint her house; even then, she could only choose from a limited palette of white paints.

I am reluctant to have Glen Ellyn become a community in which every aesthetic decision requires Village approval, and I do not wish to impose substantial, additional burdens on property owners concerning the maintenance or preservation of trees. Nevertheless, I believe it is proper to expect builders to better protect existing trees on properties they are redeveloping, and that the existing tree ordinance may require revision to accomplish that goal.

6. Will you support restoration and rehabilitation over reconstruction and redevelopment of the historic buildings in Glen Ellyn's downtown? (For example, if the historic building on Forest Avenue that contains Gearhead Auto Repair, Mykha's restaurant and Florist on Forest were recommended for restoration, how would you react?)

**Jay Strayer:** It all depends on the character of the reconstruction. I would not be overly concerned if an auto repair facility were redeveloped. I would be more concerned about the buildings on Crescent, which have a more distinctive character. Again, the interest of the owners must be considered. For twenty years I was the owner of a vintage property on Duane Street. I restored portions of the building but did not make any significant changes in its distinct character. I sold the building in 2000. The new owner has made additional improvements in the property in keeping with the building's unique appearance.

**Mark Pfefferman:** I support restoration and rehabilitation whenever possible and appropriate. The Bike Shop and Honey are great examples of interior renovation and repurposing. And who cannot admire Tracey Kreiling's gift to Glen Ellyn with her renovation and restoration of the Bells and Whistle's space? First, we need to determine which buildings are historic. Perhaps we could start with the Historical Preservation Commission compiling a list of the top 50 historic structures in Glen Ellyn. Once that is determined, each structure would need to be analyzed to determine its useful life and if it is indeed worth saving, either in entirety or façade.

I favor a commercial property maintenance ordinance so that our older buildings do not fall to ruin due to gross neglect or disrepair. This is evidenced in some structures downtown and the motels on Roosevelt Road.

**Phillip Hartweg:** There is a need for revitalization of downtown Glen Ellyn. There is a need for increased sales tax revenue. There is a need for more flexible properties. There is a need for some redevelopment. I am not sure the plans I have seen address all needs. I would hope for a long term, logical plan that uses our current strengths to the fullest while improving our weaknesses. At this moment, specific areas will have to be targeted in some sort of priority - those areas are still under review. Some structures can be maintained while others will have to be altered or even removed.

**Chris Wilson:** Wherever possible, I do support the restoration of historic buildings in downtown Glen Ellyn. I was very encouraged by Town Builder Studios' recommendation in the coming Strategic Plan to renovate most of the historic buildings in downtown Glen Ellyn. I fully support saving the Gearhead building, which is a wonderful example of the Tudor Revival style that is throughout the downtown. Although it is designated to be replaced by a parking

garage in the newly proposed concept plans, I do believe that some creative rethinking of the plan could save the building and still give us plenty of parking.

**Joseph Salamunovich:** As I said earlier, we need to balance preservation and functionality. If a downtown commercial building can be renovated or modified to serve its intended function on a cost-effective basis, then I would support that rather than replacing the building with a new one. However, in some cases it may not be possible to modify an old building to perform a modern function or the cost of that modification might be prohibitive. In either of those cases, I would support replacing the building with a new one that is fully functional and cost-effective, but I would want the new building to be in keeping with its surroundings.

**Carl Henniger:** This question is unclear.

**Peter Cooper:** This question cannot be answered in the abstract; it must be reviewed in the context of a specific proposal. While there is real value to preserving historic and architecturally significant buildings, not every old structure is “historic.” Glen Ellyn’s financial and social vitality flows directly from a vibrant downtown, and the Village must focus on revitalizing our commercial districts. The proposed Downtown Strategic Plan is a central part of that process. As a trustee, I would pledge, in connection with the implementation of the Strategic Plan, to listen intently to all sides of the issues, to consider information and evidence presented to the Board and me, and then to use my best judgment in rendering decisions in the best interests of the community.

7. Do you feel that the current lot coverage ratio for residential properties is sufficient or do you think it should be modified? Please explain.

**Jay Strayer:** A 20% lot coverage ratio is sufficient. The reduction of the LCR from 25% to 20% was a long and complex process. In most cases, the combination of a 20% lot coverage ratio and the Zoning Code height restrictions have been adequate to reduce the bulk of new construction on smaller lots; however, there certainly are new homes that do not fit the character of the neighborhood. Overall, most teardowns and reconstructions (in my opinion approximately 80%) have been done well.

**Mark Pfefferman:** I believe the current LCR works well. The residents, board and staff should review it every five years to determine if any modifications are necessary. For example, the current eave-to-roof-height ratio restrictions may not allow new development to reflect classic architectural styles such as Victorian or

Queen Anne. We may want to revisit this. Proper storm water drainage remains a concern.

**Phillip Hartweg:** It is always good to have "sufficient" lot coverage ratio. This ratio can be stretched to the legal maximum with poor results. In other cases the house size versus lot size may be out of balance because of design and appear inappropriate. In most cases the current ratio is workable and may suit the eye and needs of everyone. Again, balance and logic should prevail

**Chris Wilson:** I do not see a need to modify the current lot coverage ratio. I feel that variances for additional coverage should be given on an individual basis due to extenuating circumstances, such as irregular lots, necessary additions to make historic homes on small lots livable, etc. Variances need to take into account the implications to the neighbors' properties as a result of the variance.

**Joseph Salamunovich:** I understand the current policy is to require a maximum 20% coverage, subject to a variance in appropriate circumstances. That seems to be a reasonable approach but I would remain open to competing arguments for increasing or decreasing it (just as I'd be open to reconsidering any village ordinance under the right conditions).

**Carl Henniger:** I believe that since the adoption of the current lot coverage ratio, the quality of the new/replacement construction and remodeling that has occurred has been much better than in the years preceding its adoption.

I'd want more information to determine whether or not the ratio should be changed. I'd need to know what the impact of any changes would have been on the projects that were approved over the past couple of years to fully understand what the impact of any changes would be.

**Peter Cooper:** I would need to study this in greater detail, and hear from interested persons, before forming an opinion. I believe that the current ratios do provide a reasonable starting point, though I believe some houses can be too large even on enormous lots, and that many structures on smaller lots may be appropriate, even if they exceed the current ratio. This is a question that should be reviewed in the context of the particular proposed structure.