

*Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary*

Date: January 24, 2008

Time: 7 P.M.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson
Steve Petersen, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner
Mike Ward, Commissioner

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
Michael Hren, Zoning Coordinator
Jim Wallace, Deputy Village Manager

Call to Order

Mr. O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM

Roll call noted the following: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, present; Mimi Troy, absent; Steve Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, absent; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, present. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

Old Business

ARC 07-25: Walgreens, 189 W. Northwest Highway (Non-Historic) Final Meeting
Petitioners: Meg George; Bell, Boyd, and Lloyd; 70 W. Madison St; Chicago, IL
Tom Hatzhold; Arcline Associates; 3025 Highland Ave; Downers Grove, IL
Eugene Faigus; The Faigus Group; 56 Skokie Valley Rd.; Highland Park, IL

Ms. George detailed the history of the project and introduced Mr. Faigus and Mr. Hatzhold.

Mr. Hatzhold spoke. He discussed the champagne color for the doors and windows, which would cost a total of \$5,000 to utilize.

The ARC reviewed the comments/suggestions made at the preliminary hearing.

Mr. Lytle asked what the feature is on either side of the pilaster.

Mr. Hatzhold confirmed that they are downspouts.

The ARC discussed alternatives for color and location.

Mr. Petersen suggested that painting the downspouts to match the brick was acceptable. He also suggested having them return to the wall, bringing them back to the face of the pilaster. The ARC agreed.

The petitioner shall extend the fascia to 1x12, bring the soffit back, and move the detailed dentil work to the point where the soffit meets the sub-fascia.

The fascia shall extend four (4) inches below the bottom edge of the gutter.

The width of the lintel was discussed at length. The width of the lintel shall be the same as the width of the columns' neck dimension.

The petitioner shall revise the soffit behind gutter to a 1x12 stock, bring the soffit to the backside of the fascia, return the soffit to the masonry wall, apply a 5/4x12 stock to the top of the masonry, with a dentil molding applied to the top of that 5/4x12 stock adjacent to the bottom of the soffit.

Mr. Hatzhold pointed out that detail 5 on Page A2.1B is from the Fypon catalog, molding MD510-12 the B column 5 and ½ crown fascia.

The sub-fascia for detail 5 on page A2.1B of the submission shall use the same dentil molding as detail 2 on the same page. Detail EV 404 shall be used for the detail molding where the soffit meets the wall.

The ARC recommends cementitious siding with a ½ inch to a ¾ inch butt.

The ARC recommends considering a wider casing dimension for the windows in the gable ends.

The ARC recommends the use of a column historically representative of the Doric style.

For the wall and awning detail, Sheet A2.1B, a cast stone sill shall replace the 3 bricks above the windows.

The ARC determined that the sign on the drive-thru is acceptable as proposed.

The ARC determined that the two panel door is acceptable (item 4).

The ARC determined that the brick size presented is acceptable (item 5).

The ARC determined that the petitioners' responses to items 6 through 8 are acceptable.

The ARC determined that the petitioners' responses to items 10 through 13 are acceptable.

Ms. Zurek asked for clarification of the glazing color for the windows.

Mr. Hatzhold clarified.

Mr. Hatzhold discussed the landscaping options.

The ARC reviewed the landscaping plan.

The ARC accepted staff's recommendations.

Mr. Lytle asked if the photometrics show the spillover of the interior lights.

Mr. Hatzhold clarified.

The color of the tactile warning was discussed. The color was left to the discretion of the petitioner.

Mr. O'Donnell opened the floor for public comment. None was voiced.

Mr. O'Donnell closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Ward moved to approve ARC 07-25 subject to the conditions and recommendations noted below:

- The downspouts shall return to the wall. The downspouts shall be brought back to the face of the pilaster.
- The fascia shall be extended to 1x12, the soffit shall be brought back, and the detailed dentil work shall be moved to the point where the soffit meets the sub-fascia.
- The fascia shall be extended four (4) inches below the bottom edge of the gutter.
- The width of the lintel shall be the same as the width of the columns' neck dimension.

- The soffit behind the gutter shall be 1x12. The soffit shall be brought to the backside of the fascia. The soffit shall be returned to the masonry wall. A 5/4 x 12 stock shall be applied to the top of the masonry, with a dentil molding applied to the top of the 5/4 x 12 stock adjacent to the bottom of the soffit.
- The sub-fascia for detail 5 on page A2.1B of the submission shall have the same dentil molding as detail 2 on the same page. Detail EV 404 shall be used for the detail molding where the soffit meets the wall.
- For the wall and awning detail, Sheet A2.1B, a cast stone sill shall replace the 3 bricks above the windows.
- The building trim, gutters, dentils and columns shall be off-white in color.
- All landscaping plans shall be subject to Village Manager approval.
- Cut sheets for the light poles and bollards shall be brought back for review and ARC approval.
- The ARC recommends considering the drainage of the planters.
- The ARC recommends cementitious siding with a ½ inch to a ¾ inch butt.
- The ARC recommends considering a wider casing dimension for the windows in the gable ends.
- The ARC recommends the use of a column historically representative of the Doric style.

Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. *Roll call vote: Mr. Petersen – yes; Mr. Ward – yes; Mr. Lytle – yes; Mr. Coath – yes; Mr. O'Donnell – yes. Motion carried 5-0.*

The ARC took a short recess.

New Business

ARC 08-01: Herrmann Chimney, 145 W. Lake (Historic) Public Hearing
Petitioner: Tim Herrmann, 518 North Avenue, Barrington, IL, 60010

Mr. O'Donnell swore in Mr. Herrmann.

Mr. Herrmann introduced the project.

Mr. Ward asked if this is the only chimney that the house has.

Mr. Herrmann stated that there is a stack in the back of the house that is not visible from the street.

Mr. Lytle asked for clarification on the dimensions of the soldier course.

Mr. Herrmann explained that this was taken from a prior proposal, and he is unaware of the specifics.

Mr. Lytle suggested that the ARC should determine the offset.

Mr. Coath asked about materials.

Mr. Herrmann showed samples of the brick.

Mr. Coath asked about the materials of the cap.

Mr. Herrmann stated that it is a cast limestone cap.

Mr. Coath stated that the cap should be a minimum of four inches.

Mr. Petersen stated that there should be an inch projection on the cap.

The ARC discussed the size of the offset for the corbelled portions.

The ARC discussed the size and height of the shoulders.

The ARC discussed the top of the chimney

Mr. Petersen moved to approve ARC 08-01 with the following conditions:

1. The cap and shoulders shall each have a minimum thickness of four (4) inches.
2. The cap shall have a minimum projection of one (1) inch on all four sides.
3. The corbelled portions shall have a minimum of a one-half (1/2) inch offset. The ARC recommends the use of a one (1) inch offset, utilizing solid bricks.
4. The top of the chimney shall utilize a standard clay tile with dimensions as determined to be appropriate by the mason.

Mr. Ward seconded the motion. *Roll call vote: Mr. Petersen- yes; Mr. Ward- yes; Mr. Lytle- yes; Mr. Coath- yes; Mr. O'Donnell- yes. Motion Carried 5-0.*

Other Business

ARC Discussion: Building Height

Mr. Hren and Mr. Wallace introduced the topics that staff wanted the ARC's opinion of.

Mr. Petersen stated that the slopes and details are important to consider when looking at the raising of roof height.

Mr. Petersen noted that there is a concern regarding massing if the height is increased.

Mr. Coath suggested that the ARC review petitions for a higher height limitation to ensure that they have historic proportions.

Mr. Wallace explained staff's ideas regarding the ARC reviewing such petitions.

Mr. Wallace asked the ARC if there needs to be a requirement for all those who would utilize a greater maximum height to engage in preservation.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if there is an additional review, would staff feel the ARC's workload would be too extensive.

Mr. Wallace said that it might be a concern. He also noted that staff is still considering splitting the ARC into two bodies: a historic and a commercial board.

Mr. Petersen said that it might be difficult to staff two boards.

Mr. Wallace said that staff is now set up in such a way that separate boards would in fact be easier to deal with.

Mr. Petersen clarified that it might be difficult to get commissioners for two boards.

Mr. Wallace agreed.

Mr. Coath wondered how many people would sign up for this historic exemption.

Mr. Petersen and Mr. Wallace said that it would attract many developers from the north side of town.

Mr. Ward said that saving even one historic house would be a gain for the Village.

Mr. Coath noted that new houses up to historic standards could also be attracted.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that Lake Forest's height policy is extremely confusing.

Mr. Wallace agreed.

The ARC noted concern that loopholes be closed to avoid abuse of this policy.

Mr. Petersen noted that this should hold petitioners to the same standards as the Historic District. He added that the ARC must be willing to completely refuse petitions if it feels that they are not up to the standards necessary.

Mr. Ward suggested that using the Lake Forest rules as a guideline could be useful.

Ms. Zurek said that staff would likely use the Historic District guidelines as a guideline.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the Historic District rules speak to roof pitches and massing.

Ms. Zurek confirmed that they do.

Mr. Ward noted that there is a large risk of getting bad houses with this height limitation change.

Mr. Coath said that the risk can be avoided by tying the approval to historic massing.

Mr. Ward stated that such a policy would be subjective. He added that Lake Forest's policy is not subjective at all.

Mr. O'Donnell said that a concern is cost. Due to the expense of architects, it could be extremely costly for a petitioner if the ARC rejects their design completely.

Mr. Coath said that there should be design guidelines to point them in the proper direction.

Mr. Wallace asked if historic houses are built on certain modules: 24, 28 or 32 feet wide.

Mr. Coath suggested that a survey of the houses in town could provide an answer to that question.

The ARC is in agreement with the spirit of staff's ideas, but has concerns regarding the practical application thereof.

Resources for design guidelines were discussed.

Mr. Coath suggested that this should apply to the Historic District as well.

Mr. Wallace noted that staff wanted to set this up as a Zoning Ordinance change rather than a series of variations.

Mr. Hren asked if the roof line of an addition should be subservient to the original outside the district.

Mr. Petersen said it is dependent on situation and the style of the house.

Mr. Petersen noted that to get this variation, two courses could be taken: tearing it down and building to historic specifications or preserving the historic house. Mr. Petersen noted that the first thing a developer would be inclined to do is tear down the house to get bigger structures. This could actually cause historic buildings to be torn down rather than preserved.

Mr. Wallace suggested that if the building is demolished the property could be made ineligible for the height variation.

Ms. Zurek noted that the house could be demolished, the property sold to someone else, and the restriction would be bypassed.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested making the ineligibility run with the property.

Mr. Ward suggested that this is infeasible. Putting restrictions outside the Historic District changes the whole landscape.

Mr. Wallace said that to prevent this, the variation could not be allowed for new construction.

Mr. Petersen explained that the reason this applies to older homes is because a lot of them do not meet the height restriction. When a new house is built, the height increase can be used to encourage buildings mimicking a historic style.

Mr. Ward said that builders will always tear a house down given the choice between addition and teardown/new.

Mr. Wallace suggested that all demolition permits could be flagged.

Mr. Ward said that if you do that, you essentially move all houses into the historic district.

Mr. Hren asked if not permitting new construction to have the height variation would solve this issue.

Mr. Petersen feels the new construction can get the height variation provided that staff or ARC have determined that if there was

demolition involved, the structure demolished was a non-historical structure.

Mr. Ward said that there are too many unintended consequences created if that route is taken. The Village should zero in on one aspect or the other. He added that the only way to encourage preservation through this method is to only allow the variation in the case of a preserved historic home.

Mr. Wallace said that demolition permits could include a provision that if ARC review is not involved, the property in question is no longer eligible for a greater height maximum.

Mr. Ward argued that the Village is then altering property values.

Mr. Ward pointed out that there is a Historic District. Property owners in the district are aware of the restrictions. But adding restrictions outside the district is dangerous.

Mr. Coath noted that this might not be a boon to developers, and they might not even utilize this height limitation change.

Mr. Wallace pointed out that developers do work in the Historic District.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed, and cited examples of developers who prefer to work under the district's limitations.

Mr. Hren asked if the goal should be preservation or the creation of attractive new construction.

Mr. Ward feels that, since there is already a historic district, new construction is more important.

Mr. Petersen asked if the homes should be put into a district.

Mr. Wallace said that there would be significant resistance to the creation of a new district.

Mr. Ward suggested using the height variance as a way to make new homes better, with a second incentive, 'X', for preservation outside the historic district.

Mr. Petersen suggested that there is no 'X' to give that will provide incentive for such a process.

Mr. Coath suggested reducing the buildable area.

Mr. O'Donnell said that then developers will still tear down houses and then put up normal housing within the Zoning limitations rather than preserve.

Mr. Petersen suggested that the assumption that historically styled houses will all have small footprints is inaccurate. He would prefer to allow styles, such as a Victorian home, that would have large footprints so long as they are good examples of the style.

Mr. Wallace said that it may be that in order to preserve the houses, a new district should be created.

The ARC believes that houses in the Historic District could be permitted for this height limitation change.

The ARC suggests that staff research other incentives to encourage preservation outside the district.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested that controlling new construction is more important than preserving homes outside the historic district.

The ARC would prefer the Zoning Ordinance change rather than a variation if this process is pursued.

Mr. Coath feels that raising the overall height is dangerous.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested that it is too low, but better design controls are necessary in order to raise the overall height.

The ARC agreed with Mr. O'Donnell's comment.

Staff will review this matter and return to the ARC with revised questions for their input at a later date.

Approval of Minutes

None.

Planner's Report

Mr. Hren updated the ARC regarding upcoming projects.

Adjournment

Mr. Petersen moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Robert Hren
Zoning Coordinator

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission