

***Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Minutes Summary***

Date: March 13, 2008

Time: 7:00 PM

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

In Attendance: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson  
Joseph Coath, Commissioner  
Steve Petersen, Commissioner  
Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner  
Mike Ward, Commissioner  
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Evans, Assistant Director of Economic & Community Development  
Michael Hren, Zoning Coordinator  
Rosalie Lauerman, Recording Secretary

**Call to Order**

Mr. O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM

Roll call noted the following: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, present; Mimi Troy, present; Steve Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, absent; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, present. Ms. Plummer arrived at 7:07 PM.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

**Chairperson's Remarks**

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

**Old Business**

**New Business**

**ARC 08-06 Greencastle of Barrington, 445 E. Main Street (Non-Historic) Certificate of Approval for Replacement Windows**

**Petitioner: John Williams, Lifelink, 3331 South York Road, Bensenville, IL  
Ken Kosakowski, Construction Management Corporation of Illinois, 751 N. Bolingbrook Drive, Bolingbrook, IL**

Mr. Williams presented the application. He explained that they propose to replace all windows in the Greencastle of Barrington structure that was constructed in 1981. The original windows are single hung but because of the width of the window and the double glazing, they are very heavy and difficult to operate. The proposed replacement windows have been tested with the elderly. They are aluminum sliding windows that are well insulated and easy to operate. They slide with one finger and have full top-to-bottom locks. The applicant stated that the cost of single hung windows, as required by ordinance, is beyond the applicant's budget. The narrower, 6-inch wide windows will be replaced with single hung windows; a budget-driven decision.

Mr. Williams submitted a sample of the proposed replacement window. He added that one new window has been installed in the building for evaluation.

Mr. Evans advised that staff has no objection to the proposed windows; they are common in the area.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the commissioners for their questions and comments.

In reply to Mr. Lytle's question, Mr. Williams said that the window color will match the existing bronze windows.

Mr. Ward said he had no problem with the proposal.

Referring to the applicant's sketch, Mr. Coath questioned window installation and location of the mullion. Mr. Kosakowski explained that the location of the mullion is the same as the existing windows.

Replying to a question from Ms. Troy, Mr. Williams answered that the mullion cannot be located in the center of the window because of the design of the interior dwelling units. It is positioned at the location of the separation wall between two units.

Mr. Coath asked the name of the manufacturer and the mechanism that makes the windows easy to operate. Mr. Kosakowski said that the proposed replacement windows are manufactured by Crystal Windows and Doors of Flushing, NY. They are easy to operate because the track is stainless steel with sealed ball bearing rollers and a weep hole for flushing out debris.

Ms. Troy asked if the replacement windows represented any ingress or egress issues. Mr. Williams replied that the proposed window's opening is actually larger than the existing.

Mr. Evans advised that the Engineering and Building Department did not have a problem with ingress and egress. He added that the subject is not in the Historic District.

Mr. Petersen moved to recommend granting a certificate of approval; Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes; motion passed.

**ARC 08-05: Finn Addition, 141 West Lincoln Street (Historic) Preliminary Meeting**  
**Petitioner: Patrick A. Finn, 1244 West Northwest Highway, Palatine, IL**  
**Keith Ginnodo, Kingsley + Ginnodo Architects, 314 North Pine Avenue, Arlington Heights, IL**

Mr. Finn, owner of the property, introduced the application saying that he plans to remove the rear addition that was built about 20 years ago. The original house is an old farmhouse. He plans to replace the rear addition with a new two-story addition. He also plans to demolish the existing garage and replace it with a new two-car garage. The original garage was constructed on a wood foundation that is now rotted; it appears to have been constructed as a temporary structure. He added that the neighbors complain about the garage as an eyesore. He submitted supplemental photos of the garage.

Ms. Troy pointed out that the garage, a contributing structure, is a petite scale with some charm and uniqueness. She said she would hate to lose a historic structure if it can be relocated and used, perhaps as a gardening shed.

Mr. O'Donnell said that tearing down the garage is a serious issue because it is a contributing structure in the Historic District. The village draws the line at 1940, the year the garage was built.

Mr. Hren advised the Commissioners that they might need to make a ruling to find the garage a non-contributing structure.

Mr. O'Donnell asked and Mr. Hren agreed to clarify the 1940 guideline.

Mr. Finn said that the wooden foundation is pulverized; there is no concrete in the foundation. The garage may fall apart if an attempt is made to move it.

A consensus of the board agreed that the garage should be inspected at the site and report back to Mr. Hren.

Mr. Hren advised that if, as a result of inspection, the Commissioners conclude that the garage can be restored, the applicant will need to return for another preliminary meeting. If it cannot be saved, the applicant can move to the next step in the approval process.

Mr. Finn asked why permission was granted to demolish the house across the street.

Mr. O'Donnell explained that the structure was a non-contributing structure while this structure is contributing.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the applicant to explain the proposed changes to the existing windows. He added that the village requires wood windows.

Mr. Finn said that he plans to replace all windows with matching windows. He said he prefers wood windows.

Mr. O'Donnell said that if the windows are original to the contributing house, the applicant needs to try to save those original windows. Applicant replied that the windows are in very poor condition.

Ms. Plummer stated that the petitioner is changing the location of windows which is a problem. In the historic district it is important to maintain the original facade of the house as much as possible. Based on the north elevation sketches, it appears that one window on the second floor is being eliminated. Also on the first level to the right a door is being removed and a window inserted. The existing windows would need to be looked at to make sure they cannot be repaired. Ms. Plummer advised that the guidelines regarding moving windows are very confining.

Mr. Ginnodo, the project architect, said that the first floor window is replacing the existing secondary entry front door to the right. The second floor window has been shifted about a foot to the left.

Mr. Finn added that the existing structure is a legal two-flat. He wishes restore it back to a single family home to improve the property and sell it as a single family dwelling. He believes that the door on the right is not original to the house.

Mr. Petersen asked if the inside will be gutted and if so, the applicant might then determine what is and is not original to the house. Mr. Finn replied that the interior will be gutted. Mr. Petersen explained that the applicant may justify his proposal to modify the window based on a plan to convert a two-flat to a single family dwelling and to restore the house to its original facade.

Mr. Hren agreed that replacement could be acceptable if it is a restoration to the original.

Mr. Coath asked if the change to the second story window is also a restoration of the original design. Mr. Ginnodo responded that the Historical Society did not have a photo of the original house. Mr. Coath suggested that the applicant should check the existing windows to determine if they are replacements or original. If they are beyond repair, they should be replaced but if they are salvageable they should be saved.

Mr. Finn stated that some of the existing windows in the addition may be replacements. He is in agreement with saving those original windows that can be salvaged.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for opinions regarding the existing concrete steps and the sweeping covers over the doors, as well as the proposed roof and porch alterations.

Mr. Coath said that he is fine with the proposed porch but has concerns about the roof plan, particularly the long low pitch and the mass of the roof on the proposed rear addition.

Mr. Ginnodo replied that the roof is tucked behind the gable and will not be seen from the street side of the house.

Ms. Troy's suggested that an alternative might be a shed roof off of the existing gable. Mr. Ginnodo believed that the proposed simple roof design would call less attention to the roof.

Mr. Ward said that retaining the original materials on the windows and removing the right front door will be a huge improvement for the street, as will the proposed front porch. He suggested that the windows could be inventoried during a Commissioners' walk through. The location of the original windows should be explored.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed and added that the petitioner should use the original location. If the petitioner prefers to place windows in locations that are not the original locations, the petitioner must convince the board.

Mr. Ginnodo said that in that case, the petitioner will be starting from scratch with the stair window. The stairway has been redesigned and the new location is the only logical place for the window.

Ms. Plummer observed that the Commission has denied other applicants' requests to move windows and she has a problem with allowing this applicant to shift window locations.

Mr. Petersen said that he would be ok with the location of all the windows if the petitioner is restoring original windows and reusing original materials.

Mr. Lytle asked if the aluminum siding will be replaced. Mr. Finn said it will be removed. Mr. Lytle suggested that, if the original siding underneath can be preserved, it should be. If it cannot be preserved, it should be replaced with new siding to match the original siding. The original siding should be looked at during the site inspection. Petitioner concurred.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for questions and opinions regarding the front porch addition.

Ms. Troy suggested that the porch railing needs more detail and added that it looks high.

Applicant agreed to confirm the code requirements for porch railing height.

Mr. Coath recommended a traditional front porch floor of ¾ inch tongue and groove flooring. Commissioners agreed to make it a requirement.

Mr. Hren asked the Commissioners to consider whether the existing 1930 addition has acquired historic significance in its own right and therefore would need to be preserved.

Mr. Ginnodo explained that there is a crawl space under the addition but it is not connected to the house and submitted photos of the foundation of the addition.

Mr. Finn said that the foundation of the addition is in poor condition. There is nothing of historic significance about the addition; it might have started as a porch. He said he is trying to respect the original structure and construct something that enhances the house and the community. The new foundation will be concrete and stone to match the existing structure.

Commission members agreed to include inspection of the addition as part of the site survey and walk through. A consensus of the commission agreed that the addition has no historic significance in its own right and can be removed.

Ms. Plummer questioned the size of the proposed addition and whether it will overwhelm the existing house. A consensus of the board agreed that it would not overwhelm the house.

Regarding the existing chimney, Mr. Coath recommending bringing the brick all the way down through the foundation and applicant agreed.

Ms. Troy recommended keeping the original chimney coming up through the house, it is historically authentic.

Ms. Plummer noted that a small upper window by the chimney is being eliminated. Mr. Ginnodo said that it will be covered with louvers. Ms. Plummer suggested it be looked at during the site survey.

Mr. Ward agreed that it would be desirable to keep the chimney with its original materials. He recommended that the Commission consider keeping the chimney as it adds character to the house. The brick of the chimney could be exposed inside the house and add an architectural element to the interior. It should be examined to determine if it is structurally sound.

Mr. Ginnodo said that the chimney interferes with a first floor closet and the proposed layout. Currently the chimney is wrapped in plaster.

Mr. Petersen said that it should be a strong requirement that the exterior of the chimney, above the roofline, be retained.

In response to Mr. Hren's prompt, the members agreed that the existing shutters and wooden canopies over the doors can be removed.

Regarding Mr. Hren's question about the existence of lentils above the second floor windows, Mr. Finn replied that there are none. Mr. Ginnodo submitted a sketch of proposed lentils. The consensus was that the proposed lentils under the upper eaves should be approved.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for opinions regarding the contributing existing garage and the proposed new garage.

Mr. Petersen said that he supports construction of a new garage. He requested that the applicant supply a cut sheet of the main door.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that he prefers that the exterior of the new garage be wood or wood veneer. He also noted that the proposed garage plan does not show any windows.

Mr. Finn said he is concerned that garage windows may be a security risk. He submitted plans for the garage door and noted that it is steel not wood.

Mr. Ginnodo said that the straps and handles shown on the plans will not be installed. He added that there are windows in the garage door.

Mr. Ward recommended that windows be constructed on the east and north elevations of the garage. Mr. Finn agreed.

Mr. Hren advised that a new garage would be non-contributing. He noted that the guidelines say materials should be visually compatible with the primary structure.

Mr. Ginnodo said that the garage will have details from the house but plainer.

In response to a question from Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Finn replied that roofs on the house as well as a new garage will be asphalt shingle with lead flashing on the plumbing shields.

Mr. O'Donnell recommended half-round galvanized or aluminum gutters for the house and the garage, if needed. Mr. Finn agreed.

The consensus of the Commission was that the concept of the trellis is acceptable.

Mr. Coath and Ms. Troy were asked and agreed to conduct a site survey and walk through on behalf of the Commission. They will be inspecting existing windows, siding, addition, chimney, garage and the interior of the house. The site survey will be March 18, 2008 at 9:00 AM.

Commission requested and applicant agreed to provide cut sheets for the entry doors and the garage door.

Mr. Hren advised that all staff issues have been addressed.

Petitioners thanked the Commissioners for their comments.

#### **Other Business**

Mr. O'Donnell opened the meeting to public comments.

Mr. Petersen recused himself from the board and left the meeting room.

Ms. Petersen, an architect representing a resident, asked for an informal hearing and general comments regarding a proposed rear addition to a residence at 239 Lincoln, a contributing structure in the Historic District. She presented a conceptual plan. Commissioners suggested redesigning the front windows to make it look more like the porch that may have been there originally. Commissioners in general thought the location and massing of the addition were acceptable.

Mr. Petersen returned to the board.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Troy recommended amending the minutes of February 28, 2008 on page 3, beginning of paragraph 5 to include "Mrs. Troy asked the applicant why they are taking down the original structure prior to needing to remove it."

Mr. Lytle moved to approve the minutes of February 28, 2008 as amended; Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion passed.

#### **Planners Report**

Mr. Hren reported that a preliminary meeting for Chase Bank, 136 West Northwest Highway, is on the March 27, 2008 agenda as well as an alteration to the Macdonald residence, 208 West Lake Street, a contributing house in the Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Mr. Hren asked for an informal opinion regarding a proposal to change a 1 ½ story craftsman residence into 2 ½ stories; the addition would be at the roofline. The home is a contributing structure in the Historic District. He informed the owners that commission guidelines advise that this is generally not permitted.

The Commissioners agreed that in this case the only recourse the property owner has is to tear down the non-contributing garage and move the contributing structure to create space for the addition. They agreed that expanding at the roofline probably would not be approved.

**Adjournment**

*Mr. Petersen moved that the meeting be adjourned; Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes; motion passed.*

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rosalie Lauerman  
Recording Secretary

---

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission

Approval Date: March 27, 2008