

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

Date: April 10, 2008

Time: 7:00 PM

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

In Attendance: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson  
Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson  
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner  
Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: 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: Steve Petersen, absent; Karen Plummer, present; Mimi Troy, present; Mike Ward, absent; Patrick Lytle, present; Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson, present; Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson; present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

**Chairperson's Remarks**

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

**Old Business**

**ARC 07-03            Wiersma Residence, 206 East Hillside Avenue (Historic) Final Details**  
**Petitioner:           Travis Wiersma, 206 East Hillside Avenue, Barrington, IL**

The petitioner was not present. Mr. Hren said that the petitioner has known about the meeting for three weeks and he left the petitioner a voice mail reminder today.

Mr. O'Donnell summarized the application saying that the Village sent a Notice of Violation to Mr. Wiersma on February 4, 2008 advising him that the Engineering and Building Department determined that there are several violations of the terms and conditions of the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for construction at 206 East Hillside Avenue. Mr. Wiersma responded with reasons for deviating from the COA in a letter to the ARC dated February 28, 2008.

Mr. O'Donnell expressed concern about the apparent disregard for following the approved plans.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested that they consider one violation at a time and after deliberation of each, poll the Commissioners for a decision on each issue.

1. First floor and upper deck flooring is constructed of composite material, approved plan specified wood.

Ms. Troy asked if composite was permitted on other decks.

Mr. Hren replied that the Commission can accept a composite material if it finds that it is visually compatible.

Ms. Troy said that she is ok with a composite material on the horizontal surface of a non-contributing new structure.

Mr. Coath said he does not like to see railings other than wood in a historic neighborhood. He noted this is not a historic house, it is new construction.

Mr. Hren said that wood railings were not stated on the plans, only the wood deck floors were specified.

Ms. Plummer stated that in the future deck and railing material should be called out.

Mr. O'Donnell said that he is ok with the composite deck; the burden of replacing it would be greater than the visual damage.

Mr. Lytle added that the deck is on the back of the house.

Ms. Plummer said that composite material will weather differently.

Mr. O'Donnell called for a roll call on the acceptability of the deck floor material in this case; the deck railings will be addressed separately.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, no; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 4 to 1. The composite deck flooring is acceptable in this case.*

2. Deck railing posts do not have recesses as shown on the approved plans. Deck railings are composite rather than wood. The type of railing material was not specified on the approved plan.

Ms. Troy said she does not like non-wood railings.

Ms. Plummer said that, since wood railings are not called out on the plans and not specifically stated in the ordinance, the commission has no authority to change the railings.

Mr. Hren advised that the commission could find that the railings are not visually compatible.

Mr. Coath said that he could find the railings acceptable in this one case because they already exist and it would be counterproductive to be overly severe on smaller items. This is new construction and the railings are on the rear of the house.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for a roll call on the acceptability of the deck railing material and the deck posts without recesses.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, no; Ms. Troy, no; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 3 to 2. The composite deck railings and the plain posts are acceptable in this case.*

3. First floor deck is not constructed according to the approved plans; plans show a smaller deck.

In response to the commission's question, Mr. Hren said the applicant's explanation for the larger deck was that in the middle of construction he decided a larger deck would look better.

Ms. Plummer said that if approved plans are changed the petitioner is required to come back to the board. If plans say they have to do something and they don't, they have to change it. In a similar situation a resident was required to remove unapproved skylights that are visible from the street. The absent petitioner says in his letter "I am more than happy to . . . pay any additional fees that are due to building a larger deck." The petitioner is a builder in this community.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the Village inspectors noticed the larger deck at the footing inspection.

Mr. Hren replied that the inspector found the construction structurally sound and was not concerned with zoning violations. The deck size is a zoning violation. The deck complies with setbacks.

Ms. Troy said that if the applicant had presented this size deck originally, the commission probably would have approved it.

Ms. Plummer said that these decisions will set a precedent. If the board didn't approve it, it must be removed.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for a roll call to poll the board on the acceptability of the size of the first floor deck.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, no; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 4 to 1. The size of the first floor deck is acceptable in this case.*

The commission agreed that it would be helpful to have a copy of the approved plans.

At 7:34 Mr. O'Donnell announced a brief adjournment so that Mr. Hren could bring in the approved plans.

Mr. Hren returned with the approved plans at 7:36 and the meeting resumed.

4. Cut sheets for the columns were requested. They have been received.

In response to Mr. Coath's question Mr. Hren confirmed that the columns are wood.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for a roll call on the acceptability of the columns as built.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 5 – 0.  
The cut sheets are acceptable.*

5. A service garage door is shown on the plans but was not constructed. Three windows were constructed that are not shown on the approved plans.

Ms. Troy said she prefers what's been built over the proposed. The two windows are much friendlier. Had this been part of the original plan, the commission probably would have approved it.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for a roll call vote on the acceptability of the unapproved changes to the garage.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 5 – 0.  
The garage windows are acceptable in this case.*

6. The chimney is not built according to the approved plans. The plans show a lower section topped by a shoulder. The constructed chimney has a flat vertical face along its entire length.

Ms. Troy said that she would not have approved the constructed chimney. She added that a contractor should know the width of the chimney in advance of construction.

Mr. O'Donnell said he is not in favor of this chimney and added that this is what he hopes to avoid in the Historic District.

Mr. Coath questioned why two fireplaces required that the chimney be built this way.

Mr. O'Donnell said he thought the original plans had a full chimney and the commission required that it be cut back to shoulders.

Ms. Plummer said she does not find the chimney acceptable.

Mr. O'Donnell called for a roll call poll on the question of the acceptability of the chimney as built.

*Roll Call: Ms. Plummer, no; Ms. Troy, no; Mr. Lytle, no; Mr. Coath, no; Mr. O'Donnell, no. The vote was 0 – 5.  
The chimney, as constructed, is unacceptable.*

Mr. Hren asked the Commissioners for their recommendations to remedy the situation.

Mr. O'Donnell said the petitioner should look at the possibility of putting 1 or 2 shoulders on the chimney.

Mr. Lytle asked if the commission approved the K style gutters on this house.

Mr. Coath said that the petitioner failed to construct the gutter returns back toward the pediment, which was a condition of approval.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for a voice vote on the question of requiring construction of the gutter returns back toward the pediment. The result of the voice vote was unanimous; the petitioner should construct the gutter returns.

### **New Business**

**Other Business**

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Lytle moved to approve the minutes of March 27, 2008 as submitted; Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes, motion carried. Ms. Troy abstained.

Mr. Coath left the meeting at 7:46 PM because of a prior appointment.

**Planners Report**

Mr. Hren reported that there will be four items on the agenda for the April 24, 2008 meeting. They are: the Naughten addition, the Finn addition following the Commissioners' site visit, a preliminary case by Ms. Petersen and a master sign plan for the area including the Viking Ski Shop.

**Adjournment**

Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Troy seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes; motion carried. Mr. O'Donnell adjourned the meeting at 7:53 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rosalie Lauerman  
Recording Secretary

---

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission

Approval date: April 24, 2008