Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date:	May 8, 2003
Time:	7:30 p.m.
Location:	Village Board Room 200 South Hough Street Barrington, Illinois
In Attendance:	John Julian III, Chair, Architectural Review Commission Joseph Coath, Vice Chair, Architectural Review Commission Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission Lisa McCauley. Architectural Review Commission Shea Lubecke. Architectural Review Commission
Staff Members:	Keith Sbiral, Planner Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

Call to Order
Chair Julian called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Shea Lubecke, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer present; John Patsey, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

MR. Julian indicated a change in the agenda. The Planner's Report will be first.

Planner's Report
Mr. Sbiral discussed changes to Leo Stratton's approved COA.

Mr. Sbiral asked if Mr. Stratton needed to come back to the ARC for approval of a windows differing from the ones indicated on the original plans.

Ms. McCauley entered.

Mr. Julian indicated that he had seen the windows.

Mr. Sbiral drew an explanation of the window.

Mr. Julian asked if the ARC gave a recommendation for a specific model of windows.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC only gave a recommendation for Marvin double-hung wood windows, but did not make them a requirement.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that Mr. Stratton wants to change the other windows on the SW of the house.

Ms. Lubecke indicated that Mr. Stratton should come to the ARC.

Mr. Coath agreed.

Mr. Peterson pointed out that there would now be three different types of windows on the house, which might make it look worse than it already does.

Mr. Sbiral said that Mrs. Marilyn LeSeur was looking to replace the siding on her home. Mr. Sbiral indicated that Mrs. LeSeur could replace wood siding with cementatious material.

Ms. Lubecke said Mrs. LeSeur should come to ARC.

Mr. Julian agreed.

Old Business
ARC 03-03 McGugan Residence – 121 West Lake Street (Public Hearing - Historic)
Petitioners: Lynn W. McGugan, owner, and John Keating, architect.

Mr. Julian re-opened case.

Mr. Julian swore in Ms. McGugan.

Ms. McGugan presented her case. Ms. McGugan indicated that the petitioners had taken the plans back to their architect. Ms. McGugan indicated the changes that had be made. Ms. McGugan indicated that they had lowered the roof and made the bay windows smaller, as requested by the ARC at the 4-24-03 meeting. Ms. McGugan indicated that the other changes to the porch on the east elevation. The south elevation had not changed much except the porch. Ms. McGugan indicated that they were really interested in maintaining the integrity of the home.

Mr. Julian asked if that was all the petitioner wanted to highlight.

Ms. McGugan answered yes.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

Mr. Sbiral gave the staff report. Mr. Sbiral indicated that the petition complied with all standards for Historic District except for standard #9.

Recommendation: Staff believes standards 6,7,8,11 are not applicable to this petition. Staff believes the petition substantially complies with six (6) of the seven (7) applicable standards (1,2,3,4,5,10) listed in Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance. Each petition subject to Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance must meet all applicable standards. Staff, therefore, believes the ARC should further consider Standard 9 and provide the petitioner with specific recommendations relative to compliance with this standard. Further the ARC should consider the specific materials proposed for the project and note approved materials for the official record. If the ARC finds substantial compliance with all standards listed in Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance Staff recommends approval of ARC 03-03. If, however, the ARC believes further consideration and investigation must be given to Standard 9 or any other standard, Staff recommends the continuation of the Public Hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the ARC.

Mr. Julian asked for commissioner comment.

Ms. Plummer had no comments regarding the petition.

Mr. Coath desired further delineation between rear gable and the rest of the house. Mr. Coath wondered if it was possible to drop the cornice line on the rear gable and drop it into the master bedroom six to eight inches. Mr. Coath felt this would help the massing of the structure because it would lower the pitch of the roof.

Mr. John Keating, architect, indicated that the petitioner had decreased the width of the addition.

Mr. Coath asked if mass had been removed of the south end of the gable.

Mr. Keating indicated that he had decreased the width throughout the addition.

Mr. Coath asked about the intention of the double doors. Mr. Coath wondered if the intent of the double doors was to gain a view.

Ms. McGugan said yes.

Mr. Coath asked about the gutter on the addition. Mr. Coath indicated that a round gutter should be added to the addition as it was more appropriate for the house and that it should not match the existing aluminum gutter.

Ms. McCauley asked about the roofline on the new covered porch. Ms. McCauley wondered about the angles.

Mr. Keating stated that the angle was 45 degrees. Mr. Keating thought it added character to the roofline and the home.

Mr. Julian asked if there were any photos of the existing house. Mr. Julian asked if the petitioners had opened up the porch.

Ms. McGugan said that they had. The porch was enclosed in the 1930s and Mr. McGugan opened it up recently.

Ms. Lubecke was still worried about the overall mass. Ms. Lubecke was concerned with the windows added to the west elevation. The three windows should be more unique especially the middle window. It should be a larger window like what was seen in old farmhouses of this style. Ms. Lubecke thought the window should be more distinctive. The other two windows should either go away or be very small.

Ms. Lubecke indicated that a single door is more appropriate than a double-door on the side of the door. Ms. Lubecke indicated that there are days that the petitioner would not want people coming to the door and having such a good view of the inside of the house, especially since that person would be looking into the kitchen/breakfast area.

Ms. Lubecke said mass was still the major issue. Ms. Lubecke said that the yard was one reason that Barrington was appealing to people and the structures should not seek to cover the entire lot.

Mr. Peterson said that the porch on the east side of the home looks like a grand entrance, but he was not as bothered by the double doors. Instead, the stairs to the porch should be scaled down by adding a railing. Mr. Peterson thought that entrance may be discouraged by doing this. Mr. Peterson was also concerned with massing. Mr. Peterson said that the house looks much simpler than the porch that was indicated on the plans presented by the petitioner. Mr. Peterson agreed with Ms. Lubecke that the windows on the west elevation should be changed.

Mr. Julian stated that the ARC did not care about the inside, but he wondered about how the attic worked with the master bedroom.

Mr. Keating stated that he could drop the cornice line, but he wanted to maintain a seven foot height for windows and the unique attic space.

Mr. Peterson stated that the piece on the east should be dropped, not the whole line. Mr. Peterson was still bothered by the mass and the bay windows. Mr. Peterson pointed out the troublesome point on the plans (the center bay in the breakfast room). The wall should be flat.

Ms. Lubecke was bothered by the east elevation. There is not enough differentiation between new and old. Ms. Lubecke stated that the home should "disintegrate" as one moves towards the rear. The front and rear should not be as symmetrical and formal. There was too much duplication. Eliminating the duplication should reduce the mass.

Mr. Sbiral went through the conditions that the ARC had developed.

Mr. Julian asked if the petitioners would be opposed to coming back.

Ms. McGugan said that would be okay. The petitioners did not want to mess up the house and were willing to work with the ARC to protect the structure's integrity.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that this case would be first on the May 22 agenda.

Mr. Peterson encouraged the petitioner to bring options for the ARC to look at.

Mr. Sbiral went over the conditions.

Mr. Julian continued ARC 03-03 to May 22, 2003 at 7:30 p.m.

MOTION: Ms. Plummer made a motion to continue ARC 03-03 to the May 22, 2003 ARC meeting at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion. Roll call vote Chairperson Julian, recused; Mr. Coath, yes; Ms. Lubecke, yes; Ms. McCauley, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Plummer, yes. Motion carries 5-0.

Mr. Julian indicated that plans should be submitted as soon as possible.

New Business
ARC 03-09 Barrington Park District – Beese Park Shelter Alteration 701 Cornell Avenue (Public Hearing, Non-Historic)
Petitioners: Barrington Park District, Mr. David Thoma, architect.

Mr. Julian recused himself and left the meeting.

Mr. Coath opened the public hearing.

Mr. Thoma indicated that this petition was for the second shelter in Beese Park. Mr. Thoma indicated that the Park District needed to improve the services to this building. Mr. Thoma indicated the changes to the interior of the buildings. Many changes were made to the bathrooms and concession stand.

Mr. Thoma presented an elevation not given to the ARC in their packets. The elevation indicated that the overhead doors made of wood and glass and would be slightly different from normal overhead garage doors.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the addition would have a HVAC unit that would be concealed.

Ms. Lubecke asked about the finish and the roof material.

Mr. Thoma indicated that it would match existing.

Ms. Lubecke asked if the doors were glass.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the entire front was glass.

Mr. Sbiral asked if the HVAC was visible.

Mr. Thoma responded that it was not.

Mr. Sbiral gave the staff report. Mr. Sbiral indicated that staff recommends approval of the petition.

Ms. Lubecke asked about trash receptacles.

Mr. Thoma indicated that they were all inside.

Mr. Peterson had concern with the glass in the overhead doors. Mr. Peterson felt that the overhead door tracks would make the inside space not inviting. The existing siding also needed to be changed. Mr. Peterson felt that more effort should be made to make the building more attractive.

Ms. McCauley stated that enclosing this building would eliminate shade spots.

Ms. Plummer stated that the garage doors should be reconsidered. Safety might be an issue and the doors might not be inviting. Ms. Plummer stated that vandalism would be a problem with the glass doors.

Mr. Coath agreed that the overhead doors should be reconsidered. Mr. Coath suggested French Doors. Mr. Coath did not mind the building; he felt that the design was close to the original design. Mr. Coath felt that the overhead doors were an interesting concept, but should be reconsidered.

Mr. Thoma stated that there were budget constraints. Mr. Thoma also stated that the Park District needed the ability to have an entirely open building; a partial opening was not appropriate for their use. The objective of the building and the overhead doors was to keep a very open building. Vandalism was considered, but the Park District had decided live with that fact.

Mr. Thoma said that the Park District had looked at other options for opening the building, but nothing seemed appropriate for the design of the building or the Park District's budget.

Mr. Peterson said with the overhead doors, the inside of the building would feel like a garage with overhead doors being open (from the inside of the building).

Ms. McCauley asked about French Doors.

Mr. Thoma said they did not work because it did not allow the building to be entirely open.

Mr. Coath stated that there were ways to use French Doors and make the building entirely open.

Ms. Lubecke stated that the shelter should provide protection from the elements.

Mr. Thoma stated that the Park District wanted the building to be entirely open and they were constrained by costs.

Ms. Plummer asked about the client. Ms. Plummer said the Village of Barrington was the Barrington Park District and a representation of the community. Ms. Plummer stated that the representative of the Park District should be at the meeting. Ms. Plummer stated that the person/representative for the Park District needed to be at the meeting since they were simply a representative of the community and not a resident.

Mr. Thoma stated that Ms. Terry Jennings was unable to attend the meeting tonight. Mr. Thoma stated that the petitioner wanted to maintain the functionality of the building while making improvements.

Ms. Plummer stated that the commission should wait for a Park District representative to come to the meeting.

Mr. Coath stated that there were clear disagreements regarding the doors and that the petitioner should come back. The ARC was not in a position to give approval for this petition. Mr. Coath presented the options to the petitioner.

Mr. Thoma asked about getting a denial for the ARC.

Mr. Sbiral stated that if the petition was denied the petition would go to the BOT.

Mr. Thoma asked if ARC could hear the case again if there was a denial.

Mr. Sbiral advised the petitioner that it would be better to come back to the next meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Peterson made a motion to continue ARC 03-09 to the May 22, 2003 ARC meeting at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Chairperson Julian, recused; Mr. Coath, yes; Ms. Lubecke, yes; Ms. McCauley, yes; Mr. Peterson, yes; Ms. Plummer, yes. Motion carries 5-0.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that the petitioner should resubmit to staff in one week.

Adjournment:
Ms. Plummer made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all yes. Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordination

_____
John Julian, Chair,
Architectural Review Commission