

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

Date: April 24, 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
Steve Petersen, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner
Michael Ward, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
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, present; Karen Plummer, absent; Mimi Troy, present; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, present; Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson, absent; Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present. Mr. Coath arrived at 7:11 PM.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings. Applications will be heard in the following order: ARC 08-09, ARC 08-05, ARC 08-10 and ARC 08-02.

New Business

ARC 08-09 Suppes Master Sign Plan, 101-135 West Northwest Highway (Non-Historic) Public Meeting

Petitioner: Rolf Suppes, Tom Suppes, 230 Oak Knoll Road, Barrington, IL

Mr. Tom Suppes introduced the case stating that the application is for approval of a Master Sign Plan for a shopping center at 101-135 West Northwest Highway, which he owns.

Ms. Zurek clarified that the applicant is proposing all wall signs at the site be two by ten feet with the exception of the sign for the Viking Ski shop which ordinance permits to be a maximum of 100 square feet and Rick's Pet Shop, a pre-existing sign that may remain two by twelve feet until a new business enters that unit. The new business will be required to comply with the two by ten feet regulation. A tenant directory wall sign is also proposed.

Mr. Ward moved to approve the Master Sign Plan as presented, including the recommendations and conditions of the Staff Report and the comments at this meeting. Mr. Lytle seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Petersen: yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Ward, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. Motion carried 5 – 0. The ARC recommends approval of the Master Sign Plan.

#####

Old Business

ARC 08-05 Finn Addition, 141 West Lincoln Avenue (Historic) Public Hearing

**Petitioner: Patrick A. Finn, 59 Ridge Road, Barrington, IL
Keith Ginnodo, Kingsley + Ginnodo Architects, 314 North Pine Avenue, Arlington Heights, IL
Kirsten Kingsley, Kingsley + Ginnodo Architects, 314 North Pine Avenue, Arlington Heights, IL**

The applicant was sworn in for testimony.

Mr. Finn introduced the application and stated that the board reviewed the application at a preliminary hearing on March 13, 2008.

Mr. Hren advised that the applicant submitted various proposals for the garage including demolition and constructing a new garage, relocation of the existing structure and construction of an addition to the historic garage.

Mr. Coath arrived and joined the board.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners for comments on the proposed garage alternatives.

Ms. Troy said the old garage is a charming little structure but is not in great condition.

Mr. O'Donnell said it does not look salvageable.

Mr. Coath said he believes that preservation of the existing building is borderline, it could be made an asset as a garden shed attached to the new garage. The existing garage is an interesting piece constructed of unique materials. The siding is in good shape; there is no slab underneath. It is a humble shed from the 1920's.

Mr. Hren reported that the survey says circa 1940. He said he discussed the garage with Mr. Wallace, Zoning Official, and it appears that, because the survey was adopted by the board, the garage is considered a contributing structure.

Mr. Ward suggested that the Commissioners review the requirements for demolition of historical structures as stated in the Staff Report. He recognizes the need to save a historical building but if structural components are rotted it will fall apart.

Mr. Hren referred the commissioners to the Staff Report, garage option A, list of standards for demolition of a contributing structure.

Mr. Finn said that if he thought they could salvage it he would, but in his opinion salvaging it makes no sense. If it falls apart it can't be replicated with 80 year old wood. If reused it would need to be brought up to code.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners to consider the question of the appropriateness for demolishing the garage, a contributing structure, and to comment on each standard for demolition of a contributing structure as stated in the staff report.

1. The physical integrity of the site is no longer evident. Mr. O'Donnell said that the garage was a shed from the beginning. He added that it has no foundation, no ridge and the walls are leaning. It was not built to meet construction code. Mr. Ward said the physical integrity of the garage is borderline, at best.
2. The streetscape would not be negatively affected. Commissioners agreed that demolition of the garage would not have a negative impact on the streetscape.
3. Demolition would not adversely affect the Historic District due to surrounding non-contributing structures. The consensus of the board was that removal would not adversely affect the district. The subject is unlike other examples of small garages that are an asset to the district.
4. Base zoning of the site is incompatible with reuse of the structure. The consensus of the commission was that the zoning is appropriate.
5. Plans for reuse are consistent with the ordinance. The commission agreed that the reuse plan, the construction of a new non-contributing garage, is acceptable.
6. Site has not suffered from willful neglect, failure to perform normal maintenance, failure to solicit and retain tenants or failure to secure and board the structure. The board found no willful neglect on the part of the current owner. Mr. Finn stated that the current condition is how it was when he purchased it. Mr. Hren added that the staff believes this standard is met.
7. Denial of demolition would cause an economic hardship. Mr. O'Donnell said that the site is being developed for sale and it would be easier to sell without the structure.

Mr. O'Donnell called for a roll call vote on the question of permitting demolition the contributing garage.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Petersen, yes; Ms. Troy, abstain; Mr. Ward, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 5 to 0 with 1 abstention. The ARC recommends permitting demolition of the contributing garage.

Mr. Hren advised the members to disregard the alternate proposals for moving the garage and for construction of a garage addition.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for members' comments on the proposed demolition of existing additions to the house and whether the additions have gained historic significance.

Ms. Troy said that the bathrooms in the house look like they were added later rather than original to the house. The additions are not necessarily significant; the porch may have been moved from a neighbor's house.

Mr. Coath said historic early additions have rubble foundations. Mr. Finn said that the addition's foundation is not accessible.

Mr. Coath commented that it is sad to see additions from around the turn of the century go. It appears that the proposed new work does not seem to be able to accommodate the old additions.

Mr. Lytle said he believes that the additions are not significant.

Mr. O'Donnell said he agrees that the additions are not significant and is pleased that the applicant is trying to save the house. He does not think the additions gained any historic significance over time. The additions were not built with the same standards as the original house.

Mr. O'Donnell called for a roll call vote on the question of preserving the existing additions to the house and that the additions are historically significant.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Petersen, no; Ms. Troy, no; Mr. Ward, no; Mr. Lytle, no; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, no. The vote was 5 to 1. The ARC finds that the additions are not historically significant and may be removed.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the applicant to address the ARC recommendations that resulted from the preliminary hearing on March 13, 2008.

1. All windows should be wood. Mr. Finn agreed to use wood windows.
2. Restoration of windows where possible. Mr. Finn agreed to restore the windows that can be restored and to replace those that cannot be restored. Ms. Kingsley said that replacements will be Marvin, Magnum series windows.
3. Condition of the siding and windows. Ms. Kingsley referred to the plans and explained the proposed window relocations. The applicant agreed to a condition to restore windows to their original placement if they find original window placements during demolition and construction. The applicant agreed to return to the board if window placements vary from the approved plans.
4. Porch railing height. Mr. Hren advised that porch railings are required to be a minimum of 36 inches.
5. Foundation of the addition shall match the existing foundation, with a stone ledge and no more than six inches of exposed concrete. Mr. Finn said the intent is to construct a stone ledge and install landscaping.
6. Portions of the chimney should be visible from the exterior of the house. Mr. Finn agreed with salvaging the chimney. Cut sheets were provided.
7. Cut sheets shall be provided for the front door, garage door and pedestrian door on the garage. Ms. Kingsley said that cut sheets were submitted. She pointed out that the submitted plans indicate that the original front door will remain.

Applicant agreed with conditions eight through twelve as listed in the Staff Report, including providing details of the porch cornice work, using ¾ inch tongue-in-groove boards for the porch decking, half-round gutters, lead flashing and installing windows on the north and east elevations of the proposed garage.

Mr. O'Donnell opened the meeting to questions and comments from the public.

Robert Anderson, 228 West Russell, was sworn in and stated that he applauds the work and results of the commission. He said he passes the site two or three times a day and the house already looks better. He is pleased that the Commissioners agreed to recommend demolition of the garage. It will be a great improvement; the old garage was a neighborhood eyesore.

As there were no further comments from the public, Mr. O'Donnell closed the public session.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested that the members review the proposed construction, beginning with the proposed new garage.

Mr. Petersen said he thought the windows look tiny, perhaps they should be longer, maybe double hung. He also thought the proposed eight foot high garage door looks too tall.

Mr. Ginnodo offered that the applicant could make the garage taller or drop the garage door to seven and a half feet. Mr. Finn agreed to drop the door to seven and a half feet. Mr. Coath agreed saying it would be more appropriate for an older garage style. Mr. Petersen suggested raising the plate six inches and using a seven and half foot door.

Mr. Ginnodo agreed to longer double-hung windows, as well as centering the rear window between the door and the end of the rear wall.

Mr. Ginnodo said it is their intent that the proposed garage details match the details of the house.

The Commissioners discussed open rafter detail to match the house. The consensus was to recommend open rafter detail on the proposed garage but not to require it.

In response to Ms. Troy's question Mr. Finn said that rake and frieze board detail will match the house as well. Mr. Petersen asked and Mr. Finn confirmed that rake and frieze board detail will match the house detail in all profiles. Mr. Petersen said this should be a recommendation.

In response to a question from Mr. Coath, Ms. Kingsley replied that the garage door opening will be 16 feet. Mr. Ginnodo added that the door will be painted.

Mr. Finn confirmed that the garage will be cedar siding to match the house, with an asphalt shingle roof.

Mr. Petersen moved to recommend approval of the plans for constructing the proposed non-contributing garage with the conditions as discussed. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Petersen: yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Ward, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The result of the roll call vote was 6 – 0. The ARC recommends approval to construct the non-contributing garage.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the members for comments regarding the proposed addition and alterations to the house, a contributing structure.

Ms. Troy suggested that the front porch needs a frieze board above the post. Mr. Finn confirmed that it is there, it does not show clearly on the plan.

Mr. Lytle said that the shoulders on chimney seem to squeeze the windows a bit. Mr. Petersen recommended that the width of the exterior lower portion of the chimney be reduced by eight inches.

Mr. Coath suggested that the vent on the east elevation be made proportionally smaller.

Mr. Ginnodo said that they plan for the chimney brick to meet the concrete foundation. Members agreed that they preferred that treatment and will make it a requirement.

Mr. Coath suggested that the shoulders on chimney have four inch limestone caps instead of two inch.

Mr. Coath questioned the porch gutter returns. Mr. Ginnodo said that the returns make the corner column look better and avoid the need to bring the downspout down the column. Mr. Coath asked if the column on the cut sheet is the chosen column. Mr. Ward added that most of the farmhouses on his street have round columns. The proposed columns may be too plain. Mr. Ginnodo said that

he believes the proposed columns are more accurate than site-constructed columns. They intend to use manufactured columns as illustrated on the submitted cut sheet.

Mr. Hren asked if the commission made a determination on the gutters. The consensus of the Commissioners was to not make a recommendation on gutters.

Mr. Coath asked if molding was planned where the frieze meets the soffit. The frieze board and any additional trim should match the existing. The consensus of the Commissioners was to make this a recommendation. Mr. Finn agreed to the recommendation.

Mr. O'Donnell reminded the applicant that, if they need to make changes during construction, they must come back and discuss the changes with the Village. Mr. Hren reminded the applicant that they must also apply for a building permit.

Mr. Finn said that an earlier version of the plans included a breakfast room which was inadvertently omitted from the current plan. Ms. Kingsley submitted markups of the proposed breakfast room. The board said they preferred the look of the house with the breakfast room. Mr. Hren said it can be made a condition that the shed roof be extended to the north per the revised plans for the breakfast room. Mr. Ginnodo circled the section of the original plans showing the breakfast room.

Mr. Hren read the conditions of approval:

The lower portion of the chimney below the shoulders should be reduced by eight inches.

The east elevation vent should be reduced proportionally.

The brick of the chimney should be extended to the top of the concrete foundation.

The limestone shoulders for the chimney should be increased to four inches.

The porch column shall be built as per the cut sheet rather than the plans.

The frieze board and any additional trim shall match the existing rake.

The shed roof shall be extended to the north as per the sketch provided by the petitioner at this meeting.

Mr. Petersen moved to recommend approval of the proposed alteration and addition to the contributing house with the specified conditions. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

Roll call. Mr. Petersen, yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Ward, yes; Mr. Lytle, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. O'Donnell, yes. The result of the roll call vote was 6 – 0. The ARC recommends approval of the proposed alteration and addition to the contributing house.

The applicant thanked the Commissioners.

Mr. Petersen recused himself and left the meeting because of a conflict of interest with the remaining applications.

#####

NewBusiness

ARC 08-10 Lundgren Addition, 239 West Lincoln Avenue (Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Kristi and Matt Lundgren, 239 West Lincoln Avenue, Barrington, IL
Sarah Petersen, SA Petersen Architects, 523 South Cook Street, Barrington, IL

Ms. Petersen, architect representing the petitioner, introduced the application saying that prior to this meeting the commission heard plans for this property and offered feedback on the issue of massing. The petitioner plans an addition to the rear of the house that will extend 17 feet to the rear and will be 30 feet wide. The addition will include a family room, mud room and a relocated kitchen on the first floor and a master bedroom with bath on the second floor. The sloped roof over the front door and the existing concrete stoop, both of which are not original to the house, will be removed.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the applicant plans to alter any historic windows.

Ms. Petersen replied that they plan to remove some windows that are not original to house. Most windows in the house are new; some first floor windows are original. Siding, crown, trim board on rake, gutters and cross gable details on the addition will match the existing details. The proposed foundation will be the same as the existing rock face concrete block foundation. A new gable roof over the front porch is planned. It will project three feet. The porch columns will be carpenter-built and porch trim will reflect the house trim.

Ms. Petersen continued saying that the front of the existing house probably was a porch originally and the intent is to redesign the front to look like an enclosed porch by maximizing the windows. The proposed additional windows will match the existing windows; they will be narrow, double hung and hung in pairs.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification of the proposed foundation for the addition.

Ms. Petersen responded that the front foundation is slip face concrete block; the proposed foundation will be the same.

Referring to the Staff Report, Mr. O'Donnell suggested and members agreed to discuss each recommendation separately and indicate agreement or opposition.

1. Removals from the front facade.

In reply to Mr. Coath's question, Ms. Petersen said that the slope of first story front roof cannot be changed without impacting the upper windows. She believed that this section of the house was originally a porch that was enclosed later. It does have a foundation under it.

A poll of the Commissioners reflected a majority agreed with the proposed removals.

2. Large blank wall on west elevation.

Ms. Petersen explained that the master bath, shower and closet are located in the section without windows. She speculated that an additional window could be included.

Ms. Troy asked why the addition wrapped around corner of house. Ms. Petersen answered that the wrapped design defines it as a porch as opposed to a flush elevation. A consensus of the board indicated agreement with the proposed blank wall.

3. Appropriateness of the north elevation.

Mr. Coath suggested that the pitch of the front porch gable not match the pitch of the existing house. He suggested that the applicant consider slightly reducing the pitch of the porch pediment and the height of the porch frieze, which looks too tall.

Ms. Petersen agreed to provide details of the porch for the final hearing.

Mr. Coath questioned the treatment around the front windows, saying the post area is not well defined. He suggested adding more detail to the pilasters to look more like columns. Ms. Petersen agreed to consider this.

4. Details to be brought to the public hearing.

Mr. Hren said a section of the front porch including details of columns should be provided at the final hearing. Mrs. Troy added details of the chimney should be provided, shoulders should have limestone tops and the slope of the shoulders should be reduced.

Ms. Petersen asked the board if they are in agreement with the removal of the east elevation door that faces the side yard. The door is not used and interior remodeling requires eliminating it. The commissioners agreed with the removal.

Regarding the east elevation, Ms. Petersen said the owners wish to limit the number of windows on that side to allow for built-ins and a TV. Ms. Troy suggested small clerestory windows above the built-ins. Ms. Petersen agreed to consider the suggestion.

5. Acceptability of siding to match existing siding's exposure.

Ms. Troy asked if new siding will match the existing. Ms. Peterson replied that it would.

6. Material of proposed siding.

Ms. Peterson confirmed that the existing siding is wood and submitted a sample. The new siding will be wood to match.

7. All building materials. In response to the commission's question about replacement of the front door, Ms. Petersen said that if the front door is replaced she will submit a cut sheet for new door.

Chair opened the meeting to comments from the public.

Mr. Anderson said that he attended the meeting to understand the process as he will be coming before the commission in the future. Several applications on tonight's agenda are in his neighborhood and he applauds the Commissioners for the work they are doing. The neighborhood improvements are welcome. The Commissioners thanked him for his comments. Mr. Anderson left the meeting room.

Chair closed the public session.

Mr. Hren summarized the ARC's recommendations to the petitioner for the final hearing:

1. Review reducing the pitch of the pediment on the north elevation.
2. Review removing the siding between the windows, adding a window, adding detail to the pilasters and utilizing other methods of encouraging the appearance of an enclosed front porch on the north elevation.
3. Add limestone shoulders to the chimney and reduce the slope of the chimney shoulders.
4. Provide a section of the front porch and details of the pediment, columns, window trim, rake, fascia, corner boards, horizontal trims, balusters, doors, windows, columns, chimney and foundation.

#####

Old Business

**ARC 08-02 Naughten Addition, 528 South Grove Avenue (Historic) 2nd Preliminary
Petitioner: Phil and Marney Naughten, 528 South Grove Avenue, Barrington, IL
 Sarah Petersen, SA Petersen Architects, 523 South Cook Street, Barrington, IL**

Ms. Petersen, architect representing the applicant, introduced the petition saying that the plan was presented at a prior preliminary hearing when the commission made several recommendations. The applicant has addressed the commission's comments and recommendations. The addition will have wood siding. Original eave detail has been researched and sloping soffits without returns are proposed.

Ms. Petersen said that she found pictures of the original house that indicate that the house has been moved from a Main Street location where it was built. A window plan incorporating original window placement, where possible, has been provided. One small window will be lost. A bump-out will also be removed. A detailed demolition plan and a roof plan have been submitted.

Ms. Petersen continued, saying that four schemes for the addition's ridge line and eave height have been submitted. Applicant prefers scheme C, it has more space and the height of the gable meets the owners' needs. The hip roof treatment could be constructed as a gable if the board prefers. She added that, in her opinion, the hip blends away and has less impact on the house.

Mr. Ward asked if the foundation will feature a step down. Ms. Petersen replied that the house and addition will be level from the front to the back. Ms. Petersen said that the foundation for the addition will be rough face concrete block which breaks up the elevation and anchors the house.

Mr. Lytle suggested that the window on the north elevation looks large. Ms. Petersen responded that it is because code requires an escape window. The other windows match existing.

Mr. Ward said he preferred scheme C and believed it to be better than the original plan. He would like to see a sketch of the front elevation. Ms. Petersen said she will bring sketches of both scheme A and scheme C with a hip treatment and with a gable treatment to the public hearing.

Ms. Troy said she prefers scheme A where the addition is not taller than the original.

Mr. O'Donnell said he also likes scheme A with a wider back gable. Mr. Ward expressed concern about the front view with a higher gable. Ms. Petersen responded that it will not be seen from the front because of perspective from the street.

Mr. Coath said he prefers scheme C.

Mr. Lytle said he also prefers scheme C with hip or gable treatment.

Ms. Troy recommended limestone shoulders on chimney, with a little less slope.

Mr. Coath recommended a more simple style railing for west elevation.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that the front vinyl siding will remain. The board recommends replacing it but the board is not requiring it.

In response to the commission's request, Ms. Petersen agreed to provide gutter detail.

Mr. Hren asked the Commissioners if they consider the west elevation circular and arched windows appropriate. Ms. Petersen said she felt they are in keeping with the style of the house. The windows will be simulated divided light. The commissioners agreed that the windows are acceptable.

Mr. Hren summed the commission's recommendations for the public hearing:

1. Bring documents for option C.
2. Provide a front elevation for both a gable and a hip roof option of the roof lines.
3. Add limestone shoulders to and reduce the slope of the shoulders on the chimney.
4. Select a more simplified railing for the west elevation.
5. Provide details of the window trims, rakes, fascia, corner boards, horizontal trims, balusters, railings, doors, windows, chimney, columns and foundations.

#####

Other Business

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Lytle moved to approve the minutes of April 10, 2008 as submitted; Mr. Coath seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried; minutes were approved as submitted.

Planners Report

Mr. Hren announced that application ARC 07-03, Wiersma Residence, will return to the board with a list of items to review for compliance after building a single family residence. Also, Hospice will be presenting a request for a Certificate of Approval for development of corporate offices and clinical care facilities. Both are scheduled for the commission's May 8, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Hren said that the staff letter to all applicants includes a reminder that any variation from the approved plans should be discussed with staff and may require another meeting before the commission. He suggested and the Commissioners agreed that a verbal statement at the meeting would be useful as well.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Troy moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Coath seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried. Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Rosalie Lauerman
Recording Secretary

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission

Approval date: May 22, 2008