

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: July 28, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson
Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson
Stephen Petersen, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jeff O'Brien, Senior Planner

Call to Order

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, absent; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Marty O'Donnell, present; Mimi Troy, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Julian announced a change in the agenda. ARC 05-19 Barrington Memorial Park will be moved to the front of the agenda.

New Business

ARC 05-19 Barrington Memorial Park, 311 South Hough Street (**Public Hearing- Historic**)
Petitioner: Mr. Mark Werksman, Assistant Director of Public Works

Mr. Julian stated that this petition requests to move the fountain from one area of the park to another for safety reasons. Mr. Julian swore in Mr. Werksman and asked him if he agreed with the statement made about this petition.

Mr. Werksman said he agreed. The fountain will move to the east 20-25 feet and there will be 2 benches on either side with a brick paved sidewalk (they will sell bricks).

Mr. Julian asked for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Julian asked for staff comment.

Mr. O'Brien stated that this is non-contributing site. Based on the minor changes to park, Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Julian asked if the Commission were ready to consider a motion.

Motion by Ms. Plummer to approve ARC 05-19. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. O'Donnell- yes

Ms. Plummer- yes

Mr. Petersen- yes

Mr. Julian- yes

Motion carried.

Mr. Julian announced another agenda change; ARC 05-20 Cameron Residence will present next.

ARC 05-20 Cameron Residence, 200 Dundee Avenue (**Public Hearing- Historic**)
Petitioner: Bruce and Chris Cameron, owners

Mr. Julian swore in the petitioners.

Petitioners are proposing to add a greenhouse to the side of the house. Mrs. Cameron said they would add a glass-enclosed greenhouse on the side of their existing glass sun porch.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Coath arrived at 7:05.

Mr. O'Brien noted staff felt that this would be a minor alteration, and would be attached to an addition to the house rather than the original structure. Staff recommends approval. Mr. O'Brien stated that this petition was reviewed as an alteration to contributing structure.

Mr. Julian asked for a consensus as to whether this should be considered a contributing structure. All five commissioners agreed that the building should be considered a contributing structure. ARC members had no objections to adopt Staff's findings as their own.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that no one will be able see the structure and he believed it would be a nice structure.

Mr. Petersen asked if the greenhouse would be made of aluminum.

Ms. Cameron said it would be an aluminum framing with glass.

Mr. Petersen asked if the greenhouse would be covered under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. O'Brien replied no as it is new construction.

Mr. Julian asked the Commission if they were ready to consider a motion.

Motion by Mr. O'Donnell to approve ARC 05-20. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. O'Donnell- yes

Ms. Plummer- yes

Mr. Petersen- yes

Mr. Coath- yes

Mr. Julian- yes

Motion carried.

Commissioner Troy arrived at 7:10.

Old Business

ARC 05-06 Lewandowski Residence, 229 West Lincoln Avenue (**Public Hearing- Historic**)

Petitioner: Jim & Noreen Lewandowski, owners

Mr. Julian swore in petitioners.

Mr. Julian stated there had been a preliminary meeting, and Mr. Coath and Mr. O'Donnell had visited property.

The petitioners provided a drawing from the preliminary meeting of front and back porch. The porch will be made from stucco. The petitioners provided pictures of the windows in their home which were shot out. Because of this, they are not proposing any windows in the garage. If necessary, they will paint in windows.

Mr. Julian asked if they were still proposing to demolish the garage and replace it.

Petitioners replied yes.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Mr. O'Brien reviewed the residence as a contributing structure. Staff made findings for the front porch, but were awaiting Mr. Coath's and Mr. O'Donnell's report on the garage. Staff believed the alterations to the front porch are appropriate and recommend approval. Staff asked Mr. Coath and Mr. O'Donnell to present their findings regarding the existing garage. Staff felt that the garage should be considered a contributing structure. If the ARC concurred, they would need to make findings based on section 9.8.J of the Zoning Ordinance. If the ARC were to allow the demolition of the garage, they should use section 9.8H standards for new construction. Mr. O'Brien read additional factors that the ARC should discuss regarding the existing and proposed garage:

1. Functionality of existing garage based on size. Staff believed that the 18' x 18' is a substandard size. New 2 car garages are 20' x 24' feet in width and depth.

2. The structural practicality of constructing a small addition to expand the garage.
3. Long-term structural integrity of garage.
4. Impact of demolition of existing garage to streetscape of Lincoln Avenue.

Mr. Coath felt that the existing garage should be considered a contributing structure. He felt that the garage was structurally sound and had its own foundation. The slab inside was cracked.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed that the garage should be considered a contributing structure. The slab is badly cracked, but foundation is in good shape. It is small, but serviceable.

Mr. Julian asked if slab and footing are separate.

Mr. O'Donnell said yes.

Mr. Petersen asked if there were any signs of settlement.

Mr. O'Donnell replied no.

Mr. Coath said it had a shingled exterior and separate sheathing. He felt that the garage was more substantial than many of the surrounding garages. Mr. Coath commented that he thought the garage doors were attractive.

Mrs. Lewandowski related a story about an incident where they were not able to park a standard vehicle in the garage and the vehicle was criminally damaged after being left outside. She also felt that the cracked foundation should be an issue.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that the proposed garage is as similar to the style of the existing garage as they could get. Mr. Lewandowski stated that they want a more functional garage.

Mr. Julian suggested they discuss the issue of the porch first. He asked who did the rendering.

Mrs. Lewandowski said she sketched it.

Mr. Julian questioned the purpose of the expansion since they will be losing living space.

Mrs. Lewandowski stated that the existing porch is currently used as a porch. The back porch is enclosed in glass. They liked the inviting nature of an open front porch.

Mrs. Troy asked if the window behind the enclosed porch was original.

Mr. Lewandowski replied that the window is an original. The proposed replacement will have the same transom. The petitioners believed that the porch was originally open and that the window in question was originally an exterior window.

Mr. O'Donnell felt that the porch was originally open as well. He commented that though it would look better open.

Mr. Julian asked when house was built.

Mr. Lewandowski replied during 1920's.

Mr. Julian asked for a consensus on opening the porch. All agreed to approve.

Ms. Plummer motioned to approve porch.

Ms. Troy stated she would second, however she had a couple of questions.

Mr. Julian said he believed that the ARC is prohibited from splitting petitions.

Ms. Plummer withdrew the motion.

Ms. Troy withdrew her second.

Ms. Troy asked if the corner posts would be wrapped in stucco.

Mr. Lewandowski said yes. They are stucco now, and they would remain that way.

Ms. Troy asked if the wrought iron railing will be replaced with a wood railing.

Mr. Lewandowski answered yes.

Mr. Julian asked for a rendering of new railing.

Mr. Lewandowski described the wood railing as they did not have a rendering.

Mr. Julian asked if cap on the ledge would be concrete.

Mr. Lewandowski replied it would be cedar just like back porch.

Mr. Julian asked if they would be open to idea of the stucco banisters extending from the wall to the porch down.

Mr. Lewandowski said they are open to it but they are concerned about maintenance issues

Mr. Coath would assume these to be pretty sturdy.

Mr. Lewandowski replied that the banisters would support the wings, but they frequently crack when it connects to the house.

Mr. Coath agreed that during the first couple of years of the home, the banisters could crack, but after that they do not pose a problem and in this case would have settled by now, but have not.

Mr. Julian asked for other comments.

Mr. O'Donnell said that he would prefer a stucco rail, but the wood railing would be an improvement to what exists.

Mr. Julian said he preferred the existing closed porch.

Mr. Coath stated his concerns with the wood railing.

Mr. Petersen requested details for the proposed railing. He does not object to the open porch, but would prefer stucco railings.

Ms. Plummer asked if the front door on the drawing was an existing door.

Mr. Lewandowski said no.

Ms. Plummer requested details for the front door and window.

Mr. Petersen commented that he would like to see the proposed window header trim extend past the jam trim similar to the existing windows.

Ms. Troy asked if plans for the door replacement have been submitted to ARC.

Mr. Lewandoski replied no.

Ms. Plummer requested details for the hand rails, new door, and window.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the proposed window is not negotiable because the petitioners began replacing the window prior to the implementation of the historic district.

Mr. Julian said he would still like to see the plans for the windows. He asked the petitioners to submit a picture at the next meeting. He also requested details for the side rail and the entire balustrade.

Mr. O'Donnell stated he would prefer stucco.

Mr. Coath suggested looking around town for good examples of wood railing.

Mr. Julian asked for consensus on the proposed demolition of the garage.

Ms. Troy stated that she acknowledged the historic significance of the garage but can appreciate the petitioner's need for additional storage space.

Mr. Coath stated that the garage is an asset to the house as it contributes to the character of the property.

Mr. Lewandowski felt that the existing garage decreased the value of the home.

Mr. Coath would like to see an adapted re-use of the garage. He suggested an addition to the existing garage.

Mr. Julian asked what was located on the opposite corner of the property.

Mrs. Lewandowski replied that the area was landscaped.

Mr. Julian asked staff to read the standards for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that the proposed garage is extremely similar to the existing garage.

Mr. O'Brien read the standards for a certificate of appropriateness for demolition of a contributing structure. Mr. O'Brien read what the ARC should consider when a petitioner applies for a certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Julian stated that he does not believe that they have to meet all the standards since some do not apply. Mr. Julian stated he would not vote to approve demolition based on available information.

Ms. Plummer agreed.

Mr. Julian said the Village of Barrington has the largest number of contributing structures in the state; that garages and other outbuildings contribute to the historic character of the district and that not everyone can get new garages while maintaining the district. The community has passed an ordinance that values contributing structures.

Mr. Lewandowski asserted that there are no other contributing garages nearby.

Ms. Plummer stated that because there are very few existing contributing garages which exist on that street that is more reason not to demolish it.

Mr. Petersen noted that there are many contributing houses on that block.

Mr. O'Donnell stated he would prefer an addition to the existing garage.

Ms. Plummer stated that the issue is whether the petitioners can demolish the contributing structure.

Mr. O'Donnell said he is against the demolition of the garage.

Ms. Troy, Mr. Coath, and Ms. Plummer agreed.

Mr. Julian stated they needed to make findings on the 7 criteria for demolition of a contributing structure.

Mr. O'Brien read the seven standards apply to approve the demolition

Standard #1. All voted no. ARC believed that physical integrity is still evident.

Mr. Julian suggested adopting Commissioner Coath and Commissioner O'Donnell's findings from their visit to the site.

Mr. O'Brien read the commissioners' findings: "Garage is above moderately significant for historic district. It is still structurally sound, with significant sliding doors and shingle siding."

Standard #2. All voted no. ARC believed the streetscape would be negatively affected if structure is removed.

Standard #3 concerned existence of contributing or non-contributing structures nearby. Mr. Lewandowski noted that several of his neighbors' garages are considered non-contributing.

Mr. Petersen stated that the point was irrelevant.

Mr. Julian asked for discussion regarding Mr. Lewandowski's comment.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the 1985 report does not provide an official list of contributing versus non-contributing garage structures as they did not survey garages at that time.

Mr. Lewandowski stated that all the garages except one on his block are considered non-contributing.

Mr. O'Brien said that there are 10 properties on Russell Street between Lill Street and Dundee Avenue. Six of them are considered contributing and four are non-contributing according to the new survey.

Mr. O'Brien stated the following:

203 W. Lincoln – contributing garage and house
209 W. Lincoln - contributing garage and house
213 W. Lincoln - contributing garage and house
217 W. Lincoln - non-contributing garage, contributing house
223 W. Lincoln - non-contributing garage, contributing house
229 W. Lincoln - contributing garage and house
235 W. Lincoln - non-contributing garage, contributing house
239 W. Lincoln - non-contributing garage, contributing house
245 W. Lincoln - non-contributing house and garage
247 W. Lincoln - non-contributing house and garage

Mr. Julian asked if the determinations were based on the year the garages were built or on the consultant's determination.

Mr. O'Brien replied the consultant's determination.

Standard #3. All voted no.

Standard #4. Mr. Julian stated he felt Standard #4 did not apply. ARC members agreed.

Standard #5. All voted yes.

Standard #6. All voted yes. There is no evidence of willful neglect.

Standard #7. All voted no.

Mr. Julian requested to hear Standard #4 again and stated he felt it did apply and that the commission should deliberate and make a finding.

Mr. O'Brien read Standard #4. All voted no.

Mr. Julian summarized that on Standards #1-4 the ARC voted unanimously no, on Standards #5 and #6 they voted unanimously yes, and on Standard #7 unanimously no.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the ARC wanted to take a consensus on the recommendations relating to the porch items. He read ARC's recommendations.

1. ARC recommends exploring stucco railings.
2. Details of wood railing, balusters, and hand rails should be presented.
3. Cut sheet of proposed front door should be presented.
4. Cut sheet or picture of new picture window should be presented.
5. Examine wood railing systems around town for samples of historic craftsman rails.

Mr. Julian asked the Commission if they were ready to consider a motion.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to continue ARC 05-06 to August 25, 2005. Ms. Plummer seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. O'Donnell- yes

Ms. Troy- yes

Ms. Plummer- yes

Mr. Petersen- yes

Mr. Coath- yes

Mr. Julian- yes

Motion carried.

Mr. Julian advised the petitioners that the Commission has determined that the petitioners have not been approved to demolish the existing garage however; they will need to submit the revisions for the front porch by August 11, 2005.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he would send letter to petitioners with deadlines for submitting documents.

Mr. Lewandowski asked the commission to check with realtors regarding the depreciation value of a home by having a garage such as theirs.

Mr. Julian responded that realtor's opinions are subjective.

Mr. Julian asked to move ARC 05-16 ahead of 05-15.

ARC 05-16 Velleuer Residence, 216 Dundee Ave. **(Public Hearing- Historic)**
Petitioners: Sarah Petersen, Architect
Ronald Velleuer, Owner

Mr. Julian swore in the petitioners.

Ms. Petersen reviewed the ARC's comments from last hearing and noted the petitioner's revisions.

1. Explore using a foundation under the box bay on east elevation. *No changes would prefer a straight foundation.*
2. Explore reducing vertical dimension of second floor window openings. *No changes regarding the egress requirement. The second floor windows are the same vertical dimension as the windows on the first floor but the width is narrower.*
3. ARC recommends a masonry chimney; *The petitioner revised the plans to a masonry chimney.*
4. Correct the frieze and fascia board labeling. *The petitioner has corrected.*
5. Provide cornice detail. *The cornice detail was presented and approved at the previous meeting.*

Ms. Petersen stated that they would like to wrap the porch on the south elevation.

Mr. Julian asked if there would be railing on the porch.

Ms. Petersen said yes.

Ms. Troy asked about the posts of the porch.

Ms. Petersen answered that the posts of the porch will be square.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Julian asked for staff's comments.

Mr. O'Brien noted that staff reviewed this petition in May 2004 and found that property is a non-contributing, therefore demolition is appropriate. Staff reviewed the proposed new house under subsection 9H of historic preservation ordinance regarding new constructions. Staff commented that the ARC needs to determine whether the attached garage is appropriate. Upon review of staff's findings, staff recommends approval.

Mr. Coath again suggested a foundation under the bay. He also recommends 4-1/4" crown and a 1' x 8' frieze board may be used instead of a 1' x 10' frieze board on the raking cornice.

Ms. Troy commented that she liked the revisions.

Mr. Julian recommended lowering the slope of the roof on the mudroom on the south elevation to match the roof of the wrapped porch.

Mr. Julian asked staff to read ARC's recommendations.

1. The ARC recommends using a four and one-quarter (4 ¼) inch crown instead of a three (3) inch crown on the cornice.
2. A one-by-eight frieze board may be used instead of a one-by-ten frieze board on the raking cornice.
3. The proposed wrapped porch is appropriate and may be used provided the zoning requirements are met.
4. The ARC recommends lowering the slope of the roof on the mudroom on the south elevation to match the roof of the wrapped porch.

Mr. Julian asked if the Commission were ready to consider a motion.

Motion by Ms. Plummer to approve ARC 05-16 subject to ARC's recommendations. Ms. Troy seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. O'Donnell- yes

Ms. Troy- yes

Ms. Plummer- yes

Mr. Petersen- abstain

Mr. Coath- yes

Mr. Julian- yes

Motion carried.

New Business

ARC 05-15 Marcan Residence, 516 South Grove Avenue. **(Historic Public Hearing)**

Petitioners: Kenneth Marcan, Owner

Mr. Julian swore in the petitioners.

The petitioners are proposing to keep the wrap around porch and the detached garage per the ARC's recommendations. The addition will be constructed behind the primary building and the proposed roof will be scaled down. The petitioner has submitted an alternative design for the roof which would allow the roof to be raised approximately twenty (20) feet. The roofline on the old addition that you recommended to be demolished does extend above the existing roofline.

Mr. Julian asked if all of the proposals would be higher than the existing ridge.

Mr. Marcan replied that the existing height of the ridge will remain. There is a section which was installed in 1986 which is a little higher than the existing ridge.

Mr. Julian asked if the petitioner has any pictures of the existing house which were submitted previously

Mr. Marcan replied no.

Mr. O'Brien noted that there is a picture in the packet.

Mr. Marcan noted that the existing roof pitch is 3:12. He would like to raise the pitch to give it more height so as to match the house. He would like to build a sunroom in the back.

Mr. Petersen asked if a gable is installed on the existing home.

Mr. Marcan replied no.

Ms. Troy asked if the sunroom is attached to the house or the garage.

Mr. Marcan replied the sunroom is attached to the back of the house.

Mr. Coath asked if the petitioner is proposing a gable.

Mr. Marcan replied he would like a gable front-to-back to match the roof of the house.

Mr. Coath asked if the petitioner is proposing to open up the porch.

Mr. Marcan would like to rebuild the posts and install a turned railing.

Mr. Julian asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. There was none.

Mr. Julian asked for staff comments.

Mr. O'Brien replied that staff agreed with the garage and the house must maintain a three 3' feet distance at all times, including roof projections, to avoid the requirement to use fire-rated wall. Staff also recommends have siding and window details included.

Mr. Julian asked for the square footage of the home proposed home.

Mr. Marcan replied 3,000 square feet, which does not include the basement.

Ms. Troy commented that she would like to have a professional drawing with greater details. She doesn't like the proposed gable, hip roof and ridge lines. She asked the petitioner for greater window details and a roof plan.

Mr. Julian agreed with Ms. Troy, specifically regarding the elevations. He advised taking advantage of the slope of the property.

Mr. Coath would like to see more professional drawings. He believed that the petitioner is trying to put too much in a small area. He would like to see changes to the roof, gables, and cornice details and to explore restoration of the existing structure and character of the porch.

Mr. Julian asked the petitioner why he wants to keep the existing garage at its current location.

Mr. Marcan replied he wanted to build over it.

Mr. Petersen advised lowering the plate height of the existing garage. Mr. Petersen advised breaking up the windows in the sunroom to smaller windows.

Mr. Marcan agreed to make changes to drawings and will work on suggested changes to roof line.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if members want to see a different elevation.

Mr. O'Brien asked if ARC was ready to take consensus and make recommendation.

Mr. Julian requested Mr. O'Brien to review ARC recommendations.

1. Petitioner is requested to resubmit professional drawings for final ARC approval.
2. Drawings should include consistent building details such as eave and cornice details, materials, muntin patterns, window sizes, etc.
3. The shallow gable on the south elevation is not appropriate.
4. The rooflines should be simplified and the overall roof mass of the building should be explored. A roof plan may be helpful to help understand the roof massing.
5. The original one and on-half story house establishes the massing and the scale for the proposed addition. Petitioner is encouraged to keep the addition within this scale. It is recommended that lowering the plate height and increasing the roof pitch may help the petitioner gain more floor area while maintaining the overall mass and scale. Dormers may be an appropriate method to increase floor area.
6. The original features of the front porch should be preserved rather than replaced. Stucco on the porch should be maintained and restored.
7. Original siding material should be restored rather than replaced. Lap siding on the rear addition may be appropriate.
8. Window openings in the sunroom should be smaller.
9. Maintain existing fenestration on the original portion of the structure; however, some modifications may be appropriate.
10. Material samples and details are needed for final ARC approval. The revised drawings shall indicate detail, window and siding materials.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to continue ARC 05-15 subject to August 25th. Ms. Plummer seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. O'Donnell- yes

Ms. Troy- yes

Ms. Plummer- yes.

Mr. Petersen- yes

Mr. Coath- yes

Mr. Julian- yes

ARC 05-18 Sunrise Assisted Living Facility (**Non-Historic Preliminary Meeting**)
NW Corner of Norwest Highway & Cumnor Avenue
Petitioners: Sunrise Development, Inc.

The petitioner is proposing to develop an assisted living facility. The facility is a two story that includes 45 suites. The petitioner advised the commissioners of two changes to the plans that were distributed.

Mr. Tim Hedges of Sunrise Development presented the project overview.

Mr. John Green explained the current conditions and zoning of the site and the proposed Planned Development. He advised the commission that the turn around of the driveway has been modified to accommodate emergency vehicles. He also described the residential aspects of the building exterior, the residential scale of the lighting and the various garden areas and wetland detention.

Mr. Ruiz of Sunrise Development detailed the exterior features of the building and presented samples of building materials to the commissioners.

Carl Coster, landscape architect for the petitioner, presented landscaping detail for commissioner review. He identified the attention to certain buffering for the Cumnor neighbors and screening from Northwest Highway.

Ms. Troy thanked the petitioners for their patience in waiting to present their petition.

Mr. Julian asked if there was a facility nearby that the commissioners could visit to view the proposed materials.

Mr. Hedges explained that there was a facility in Crystal Lake and Highland Park that could be visited.

Ms. Troy inquired about the material that is under the each window.

Mr. Ruiz said the material was for ventilation and was aluminum louver.

Ms. Troy confirmed that the parking area is on Cumnor Avenue and is across from four residences.

Mr. Ruiz said that landscape screening would be used to screen parking area.

Mr. Julian asked what the roof pitch was on the porches.

Mr. Ruiz said that the average pitch was 3:12 but that it varied on different parts of the building.

Ms. Plummer asked Mr. O'Brien if the proposed signage conformed to the Village regulations.

Mr. O'Brien confirmed that the signage complies with Village regulations.

Ms. Troy asked the petitioner if the pond was aerated and if there were native plantings.

Mr. Ruiz said that the pond was aerated and native plantings would be used. Benches would also be installed near the ponds for the residents.

Mr. Coath asked the petitioner if the mechanicals could be installed on the roof top instead of in each unit.

Mr. Ruiz said that the units need to have individual controls and could not be located on the roof. The units that serve the common area would be located on the roofs. Landscape screening would help to soften the appearance of the louvers.

Mr. Coath asked the petitioner about the height of the porches and the scale and balance between the first and second floors of the building.

Mr. O'Brien advised the commission that the allowed height of multi-family residences is between 35 and 38 feet.

Mr. Coath requested that the petitioner explore raising the height of the porches for better overall scale. He also requested a sample of the synthetic stone that the petitioner is proposing to use.

Mr. O'Donnell said that he believed this project would be an asset to the Village.

Mr. O'Brien summarized the ARC recommendations:

1. Provide larger scale elevation drawings for ARC approval.
2. The landscaping along Cumnor Avenue should utilize more evergreen plantings to screen the residences across the street.
3. Detail drawings should be submitted to the ARC for approval. The drawings should include cornice and eave details, a typical wall section and material cut sheets for the windows and doors.
4. Explore methods to hide and/or disguise the ventilation louvers for the in-unit mechanical systems.
5. Explore raising the height of the cornice on the front porches.
6. Explore using a stone veneer with a greater depth.
7. Explore using a more substantial roofing material.

Mr. Julian requested that the petitioner address the commission's recommendations and return at a later date for final ARC approval.

Mr. Robert Anderson, 228 W. Russell Street, asked to be heard concerning a project he is considering. The ARC agreed.

Mr. Anderson thanked the commissioners for their time and distributed a rough draft of his proposal to build a garage on the vacant lot that is adjacent to 228 W. Russell St. He requested that the commission give him their suggestions and recommendations.

Ms. Plummer asked the petitioner if the garage would be placed on the lot in a way that would accommodate the future construction of a residence.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that he has been discussing the garage placement with Jim Wallace of the Department of Building and Planning will place the garage on the lot in a way that would accommodate the construction of a residence. Mr. Anderson requested that the commission recommend the type of materials he should use and the design of the structure. Mr. Anderson confirmed that the garage would be a 3-bay structure. He also explained the extensive landscaping on the lot and the screening of the proposed garage.

Mr. Petersen suggested that Mr. Anderson explore a historic design and avoid a “boxed” look. He would like to see an off-set type of design, i.e. 2-door with 3rd door off-set.

Mr. O’Donnell suggested that a 3 door/bay design can be aesthetically appealing if designed well.

Mr. Julian thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation and recommended that he return to the ARC for further review and recommendation.

Planners Report

Mr. O’Brien advised the Commission of future cases.

Adjournment

Ms. Plummer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Wallace
Director of Building & Planning