

*Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Minutes Summary*

Date: August 14, 2008

Time: 7:00 PM

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

In Attendance: Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson  
Steve Petersen, Commissioner  
Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner  
Michael Ward, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Evans, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development  
Jennifer Pack, Zoning Coordinator  
Rosalie Lauerman, Recording Secretary

**Call to Order**

Vice Chairperson Coath called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

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

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

**Chairperson's Remarks**

Vice Chairperson Coath announced the order of proceedings.

**Public Comment and Question**

**Old Business**

**ARC 08-17 Namaste Spa, 141-143 South Northwest Highway (Non-Historic) Preliminary Meeting,  
Continued from July 24, 2008 meeting**

**Petitioner: Carolyn J. Gable, Owner, and Robin Rach, Contact, 1881 Rose Road, Lake Zurich, IL  
Paul Psenka, Psenka Architects, 148 West Station Street, Barrington, IL**

**Summary: Petitioner seeks a Certificate of Approval for expansion of an existing commercial building in the B-1  
General Business Service District.**

Mr. Psenka introduced the petition saying the applicant plans to renovate the existing building at the north end of the property, construct an addition to that building and demolish the greenhouse. The building at the south end of the property will remain as is. The addition will replicate the architecture of the original building. Brick, fenestration, columns, colors, materials and details will match. The entry will be accentuated with a stone veneer. The building will no longer be a retail strip center; it will be a single use building. Rooftop mechanicals will be screened with a fence similar to that on the neighboring property. The proposal includes additional parking and enhanced landscaping. The existing monument sign will be repaired.

Mr. Ward asked if the two gables could be made to match the stone veneer. Mr. Psenka responded that both gables could be done in brick to match the rest of the building but keep the proposed timbering.

Mr. Coath asked if the timbers will be actual timbers. Mr. Psenka confirmed that they would be.

Ms. Plummer suggested that the cupola looks small. Mr. Psenka said it could be made larger. The consensus of the board was to remove it.

Mr. Psenka presented a photo of the proposed foundation for the addition, a rock face block, and a photo of the proposed stone veneer.

Samples will be presented at the next hearing.

Mr. Coath suggested that if the stone accents are too strong, it will look like an added piece.

Mr. Psenka said he would consider using the same brick that is on the building instead of the stone. Both gables could also be brick.

Ms. Plummer said it is clear where the front door is without the stone.

Mr. Petersen asked for detail drawings of the canopy and the columns as well as section plans of trim details. He added that the main entry canopy should have a lintel beam and the eave elevation on the front should match the side elevation.

Mr. Psenka agreed to bring the requested drawings to the next hearing.

Mr. Ward added that a color rendition as well as stone and brick samples would be helpful.

Regarding adding windows to the south elevation, Mr. Psenka said that there are stairs in the tower portion and he would be opposed to adding windows there.

The Commissioners reviewed the recommendations listed in the Staff Report. The consensus of the Commissioners was that the number of windows on the south elevation was adequate. The proposed colors will be reviewed at the next hearing.

Regarding the trash enclosure, Mr. Psenka said that it will be block to match the base of the building and will be fenced with a gate.

Ms. Troy asked if all trim will be green, as currently exists. Mr. Psenka confirmed that it would.

Mr. Psenka said the proposed rooftop equipment screen will match the painted wood fence at the rear.

Commissioners were concerned about maintenance. Mr. Petersen suggested that the applicant explore other pre-finished options. He asked Staff if recycled material that does not need painting would be permitted.

Mr. Evans replied that he thought that would be acceptable. Mr. Psenka suggested aluminum. Board asked for a cut sheet and color sample for the next hearing. Applicant agreed.

Mr. Psenka said that the applicant intends to clean up and enhance the existing landscaping.

Mr. Evans advised that the Village has reviewed the landscape plan and encouraged more plants. The ARC may defer landscaping to the Village.

Mr. Psenka said that parking lot lights will be located on the building and there will be some lighting inside the canopy, perhaps can lights. A cut sheet will be presented for the parking lot lights.

Mr. Evans advised that Staff will need to verify that details match the existing. The petitioner needs to come back with additional detail before the application can move forward. The next hearing will be for final approval.

#### **New Business**

**ARC 08-22**

**Petitioner:**

**Langendorf Park Recreation Center, 235 Lions Drive (Non-Historic) Preliminary Meeting  
Patrick McCord, Manager, Planning and Development, Barrington Park District, 235 Lions Drive,  
Barrington, IL**

**Thomas LaLonde. Williams Architects, 450 East Gundersen Drive, Carol Stream, IL  
Charlie Crump, JJR, LLC, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL**

**Summary:**

**Petitioner seeks a Certificate of Approval for renovation of an existing recreation building and construction of a new recreation center and administrative facility including construction of a new two-story building, renovation of an existing building, creation of additional parking, and enhanced landscaping and lighting, in the Recreation-Conservation District.**

Mr. Petersen recused himself from the board because of a conflict of interest.

Mr. LaLonde presented the case saying that the proposal includes renovations to the existing building and construction of a new 56,000 square foot building. The north elevation of the new facility will be glass and masonry. Materials will be representative of what exists on site; there will be architectural harmony between the two facilities. Natural stone and face brick similar to that on the existing building are proposed and samples were presented. The new facility will have a precast concrete wall system with a representation of mortar joints and individual bricks. It can be stained to match the existing brick. The foundation will be masonry with precast material above it.

Mr. LaLonde continued, saying that eyebrows and shade structures are proposed over the windows to shade the interior as part of the green component. A metal band along top of building gives scale and horizontality to the building. The gymnasium roof will be metal barrel vaulted truss form. Both the north and south ends of the gymnasium will have glazed panels. The roof will be simulated standing seam design. Roof screening will be horizontal aluminum panels to screen mechanical equipment. The entrance canopy will be clear anodized or painted aluminum. The proposed shades over the windows have a louvered look. Renovations to the existing building include reconstruction of the entrance. The two buildings will be tied together by the same natural stone and similar materials at the main entrances. Parking will be expanded.

Mr. Crump, landscape architect, addressed the landscape plan saying that existing trees will be the most significant feature. The historic park has been sustained while providing recreation space. The detention pond will be altered; as many trees as possible will be saved. The applicant will continue to work to develop a planting plan that will last for twenty or more years. Memorial pavers will be retained. Native plants, grasses and shrubs are planned in a natural relaxed form.

In response to Mr. Ward's question about the detention pond, Mr. Crum said that it will be a developed wetland with a mix of plants that thrive in moist areas. The applicant is committed to a long term maintenance program.

In response to Mr. Ward's question, Mr. LaLonde said that the playground area will be relocated.

Ms. Plummer asked if there will be standing water in the detention basin. Mr. LaLonde said it will be a detention not retention basin. It will have a moist bottom.

Ms. Troy questioned the proposed location for gymnasium. Mr. LaLonde replied that it is adjacent to ball fields and is a nice setting for the community room. Tennis has been relocated to Citizens Park.

Mr. Ward requested an illustration showing both buildings together; Mr. LaLonde said he would create that.

Mr. Coath expressed concern that precast material has a tendency to look machine made in the presence of actual veneer. Mr. LaLonde volunteered to bring samples and pictures of precast walls. He added that the precast is a cost consideration.

Ms. Troy said she thought there should be additional landscaping on the east façade of the gymnasium. Mr. Crump agreed.

Mr. Ward asked if there was a reason not to change more of existing building. Mr. LaLonde replied that it is budget driven.

Mr. Coath asked if the simulated standing seam gymnasium roof material is a new product. Mr. LaLonde said that it is PVC and he will submit photographic images of it.

Ms. Troy noted that the proposal uses many different materials and asked how they are being tied into the existing building. Mr. LaLonde said that the existing facility has three or four different bricks. The choice for the new facility is a compromise that best ties the two buildings together. Ms. Troy suggested that the applicant should not limit the brick to the existing. Mr. Lalonde said the brick choice was an attempt to stay in the same color range. He believes that the client would have selected this or similar brick even if it was not tied to the existing facility.

Regarding the construction schedule, Mr. LaLonde said they hope to begin construction this fall or next spring and completion either the end of 2009 or the beginning of 2010. Construction will not affect swim season.

Ms. Troy asked about the glazing color.

Mr. LaLonde presented a sample and explained that it is tinted gray glass with some reflective value. From a green perspective, it has a low e-coating and is thermally efficient. Mr. Coath said the commission has preferred clear glazing in the past because it is a more traditional look. Mr. LaLonde strongly recommended some level of tinting from an energy standpoint. Some light diffusion is needed

for users of the building. For the next hearing, he will bring examples and pictures of the glazing, roofing material and the precast concrete. The precast concrete will not be stained in a range of brick shades but in a single shade.

The Commissioners addressed the recommendations of the Staff Report. Additional landscaping will be included on the east side of the new building. Pictures and samples of the exterior wall materials, cross sections of trim detail, and cut sheets of light fixtures will be submitted at the next hearing.

Mr. LaLonde said that the trash enclosure will be all masonry because it is prominent on the site.

Mr. Coath expressed concerns about maintaining the precast elements over time. Mr. LaLonde replied that it would be repainted every five to ten years, perhaps longer with mature trees. He estimated the roof life to be about thirty years; he will confirm that.

Mr. Coath asked for Staff comments.

Mr. Evans said most of Staff's comments have been addressed. He was glad to see the applicant showed more color. How the stain wears on the precast elements is a big question

Mr. Petersen returned to the Commission.

#####

**ARC 08-20 Kraus Addition, 546 South Cook Avenue (Historic) Preliminary Meeting**  
**Petitioner: Kaia and Matt Kraus, Owners, 546 South Cook Street, Barrington, IL**  
**Linda F. Grubb, Linda F. Grubb and Associates, 102 North Cook Street, Barrington, IL**  
**Summary: Applicant seeks approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to a property in the R-6 Single Family Residential and H-Historic Preservation Overlay District. Petitioner is proposing constructing a two-story addition to the rear of the structure, repairs to existing windows, rehabilitation of the front porch and replacement of an existing window with a pedestrian door on the existing garage that is also a contributing structure.**

Ms. Grubb, architect for the petitioner, presented the application saying that the applicant is seeking guidance on a proposed addition to a historic house and an alteration to the contributing garage. The house was built in 1905 and is an American four square. The porch was redone about twenty years ago but not in the style of house. Petitioner proposes to redo the railings and columns on the front porch in a style appropriate to an American four square house. The proposed design is similar to an existing four square in Barrington. Petitioner proposes to replace one window in the existing garage with a pedestrian door. The new door will match a door in the house. The applicant will go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a height variance. In order to match the height of the existing cornice and soffit lines, a height variance is necessary. The addition is inset a foot from the original house on the north side. On the south side a small room has been added and treated as a glassed in porch. The existing house is quiet small with a living room, dining room, very small kitchen, one bathroom and three small bedrooms. The applicant proposes to add a family room and sunroom on the first level and an addition to the master bedroom with a new master bathroom on the second level. Original windows will be kept and repaired. New Marvin windows in the addition will match the existing windows. Some replacement windows are proposed in order to meet egress requirements. Wood siding, trim and soffits will match the existing. A small porch in the rear will be removed in order to construct the addition. The porch is not on a foundation, is in bad shape and has no historic integrity.

Mr. Ward asked for clarification on the need for the height variance.

Ms. Grubb explained that it is needed in order to match the addition to the existing house which is higher than the ordinance allows.

Ms. Troy asked if the commission typically reviews the petition prior to the variance request.

Ms. Pack advised that the ARC reviews it first to indicate support of the variance. After the Zoning Board and the Board of Trustees hearings, the application will return to the ARC for final approval.

Mr. Coath said that the commission is sensitive to the height variation request; it is a problem in the Historic District.

Ms. Grubb said the petitioner wishes the house to remain in scale with the existing two story houses in the Historic District.

Mr. Coath stated his support for the height variance and the front porch improvements. He suggested that the caps on the plinths could be continuous with the rail height. Ms. Grubb said she would submit a drawing for next hearing.

Mr. Petersen said the capital should project past the shaft of the column on the porch. Ms. Grubb agreed to review the plan.

Ms. Troy asked if the applicant is planning an additional column on the porch. Ms. Grubb said no; the proposal is for three columns centered on the midpoint of the porch. That is true to the way American four square porches were designed.

Mr. Coath asked for clarification of the material proposed for the flat paneling on the addition's corners. Ms. Grubb said it will be a flat panel exterior grade plywood painted to match the trim. She will submit drawings of the detail for the next hearing.

Mr. Petersen suggested that the end panels look too wide and too heavy. Ms. Grubb replied that width is necessary in order to keep the windows the same width as existing windows.

Mr. Ward asked for precedent on the proposed corner panel. Ms. Grubb said she will bring pictures to the next hearing. As a new addition, it is not intended to create a sense of false history; there should be some subtle difference. American four-square vernacular houses are simple houses. The existing corner board will be used to differentiate between the existing and the new addition on the south wall.

Mr. Petersen asked about the material of the existing foundation. Ms. Grubb replied that it is block. A poured concrete foundation is proposed for the addition. Most of the addition will not have enough foundation above grade to match the block. There will only be room for one row of block. Landscaping will cover much of it.

Mr. Petersen said, in his opinion, the foundation should match the existing. One row of block would be better than no block, especially at the front. The consensus of the board was that the foundation should match the existing block foundation.

The Commissioners agreed that the existing columns and railings on the front porch are non-historic and can be removed. They also were in agreement with supporting the variation for the height of the addition.

Ms. Grubb agreed to submit cut sheets for the windows, doors and columns, and section plans for all trim for the next hearing.

Ms. Pack advised that she will send a letter summarizing the Commissioners' comments.

#####

**ARC 08-21      Olsen Addition, 526 South Grove Avenue (Historic) Public Hearing**  
**Petitioner:    Karen Olsen, 526 South Grove Avenue, Barrington, IL**  
**Sarah Petersen, SA Petersen Architects, 523 South Cook Street, Barrington, IL**  
**Summary:      Applicant seeks approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition of a front porch and**  
**construction of a two-story addition to the rear of a property in the R-6 Single Family Residential and H-**  
**Historic Overlay District.**

Mr. Petersen recused himself from the board because of a conflict of interest.

Vice Chairperson Coath sworn in Ms. Petersen as this was a public hearing.

Ms. Petersen introduced the case saying that the house was built in 1888. There have been two subsequent additions. The west wall of a prior addition straddles the basement garage. The purpose of the addition is to construct a new west wall to completely cover the garage. The garage has never been waterproof. Kitchen pipes run through the garage and freeze in winter. The proposed addition will extend the first and second floors seven and a half feet out the back. The roof line will be continued. The addition will be wood siding; the house is aluminum siding. Over the years the majority of the windows have been replaced with consistent windows. There is a crown underneath the trim. The rake and fascia trim will be replicated. The existing pergola at the rear of the house will be reduced. The addition will be flush with the existing walls on both sides. On the north elevation the siding will extend all the way across. On the south elevation the siding will extend to the corner board. The applicant proposes to keep two over two windows and will add a wooden French door. The existing wood door on south elevation will be replaced; it has no weather stripping. The addition will provide a larger kitchen and a small bath upstairs.

Ms. Olsen, owner of the property, was sworn in. She stated that the garage has no support beam and no foundation. She "plugs in" the kitchen pipes every winter to prevent freezing.

Addressing the proposed front porch, Ms. Petersen said that Mr. Wallace, Village Zoning Officer, advised that a front yard setback variance is required. The proposed changes to the front porch are being sought as a safety measure. The porch freezes easily. If the ARC thinks the proposed small porch is appropriate, the petitioner will request the variance and proceed with the porch that is not the full width of the house. The longer porch is a financial hardship and will be quite close to the sidewalk.

Ms. Olsen stated that the existing porch is covered with ice all winter.

Mr. Coath explained that the petitioner is requesting an incremental change to something that the commission would not have approved.

Ms. Petersen said that the petitioner is making the ugly look better.

The consensus of the Commissioners was that they supported the rear addition. The front porch is an issue.

Ms. Plummer said that she has no objection to the smaller front porch as proposed.

Ms. Olsen said the porch is almost at ground level and is quite close to the street. She would never sit on it, it will shade the front rooms, and it would be an unnecessary expense.

Mr. Ward said that he has no objection to the small porch.

Mr. Coath said there is an aesthetic argument for the larger porch but agreed to accept the proposed smaller porch.

Ms. Plummer moved to approve ARC 08-21 with the understanding that a variance is required for the front porch. If the Zoning Board of Appeals does not approve the variance; the petitioner will return to the ARC to propose an alternative, if they plan to change the porch. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

*Roll Call Vote: Ms. Plummer, yes; Ms. Troy, yes; Mr. Ward, yes; Mr. Coath, yes. The result of the vote was 4 – 0. Motion carried.*

Mr. Petersen returned to the board.

#### Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the June 26, 2008 meeting of the commission will be carried for lack of a quorum of eligible voters.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the July 10, 2008 meeting minutes as drafted. Voice vote of the eligible voters recorded all ayes. Minutes were approved.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2008 meeting as presented. Voice vote of the eligible voters recorded all ayes. Minutes were approved.

#### Planners Report

#### Other Business

#### Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the commission, Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn; Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Vice Chairperson Coath adjourned the meeting at 9:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rosalie Lauerman  
Recording Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission

Approval date: October 23, 2008