

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

Date: May 10, 2007

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

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

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
Rosita Stein, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

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

Roll call noted the following: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chair, present; Mimi Troy, present; Steve Petersen (arrived 7:08 pm), present; Karen Plummer, present; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

Old Business

ARC 06-11: Carter Addition, 240 W. Lake – Details
Petitioner: Diane Klotnia, Owner; Bob Behrends, General Contractor

Ms. Diane Klotnia presented the details of ARC 06-11 to the ARC. The petitioner is requesting to revise the approved plans for the rear entry. Instead of the hipped roof, the petitioner is proposing a gabled roof that compliments the existing front porch entry gable roof. The petitioner is also proposing that the new gabled roof extend past the door and cover the adjacent window.

Mr. O'Donnell requested input from the Commissioners.

Ms. Troy requested clarification on the hipped vs. the gabled roof.

Mr. Bob Behrends, General Contractor, clarified the gable and details.

Ms. Plummer stated that she had no comment.

Mr. Petersen stated that the roof presented should have beams and would like input from the other Commissioners.

Mr. Coath expressed concern that the petitioner did not provide details of the brackets to be used on the proposed roof.

Mr. Coath recommends that the petitioner provide drawings of the actual brackets to be used on the rear entry roof and suggests that they replicate the front entry.

Mr. O'Donnell asked Mr. Behrends if he can present detailed drawings of the brackets to the ARC. Mr. Behrends replied that he will provide details to the ARC.

Mr. Petersen recommends that the petitioner look into having beams attached to the brackets to match the front entry.

Mr. Behrends replied that he will bring exact details on the brackets, but doesn't believe an arched beam, like the front entry, would work. He requested clarification from the ARC on this recommendation.

Mr. O'Donnell asked Mr. Behrends the distance from the wall to the fascia. Mr. Behrends replied 24 inches.

Mr. O'Donnell requested a consensus from the Commissioners regarding the recommendation of adding beams to the back entry.

Mr. Ward and Mr. Lytle indicated that beams are a great recommendation, but should not be required.

Mr. Coath, Mr. O'Donnell and Ms. Troy indicated that either brackets or beams are acceptable.

Mr. Petersen and Ms. Plummer stated that they strongly recommend adding the beams.

Mr. O'Donnell requested consensus on the brackets.

All Commissioners agreed that brackets are acceptable; however, the petitioner must present the bracket details to the ARC for final approval.

New Business

ARC 07-08: Hards Residence, 614 S. Grove (Historic), Details

Petitioner: John & Donna Hards

The petitioner is requesting an exception to current Village Ordinance. The petitioner replaced three (3) existing windows on the rear of their home without ARC approval and without a Village permit.

Mr. O'Donnell requested staff input.

Ms. Zurek reviewed the details of the case as presented in the staff report, and clarified that, within the Historic District, Village approval and permits are always required.

Mr. John Hards, 614 S. Grove, presented his case. Mr. Hards explained that he replaced the three (3) windows without a permit due to mold and rotting of the wood. Mrs. Hards has respiratory problems and he wanted to replace these damaged windows as soon as possible. Mr. Hards was not aware that a permit was required because the windows are located on the back of the house and he replaced them with clad windows of the same size.

Mr. O'Donnell asked how old were the windows he removed?

Ms. Donna Hards replied that they were on the home when they purchased the home 21 years ago.

Mr. Ward stated that the big issue here is that the photos presented from 1993 vs. 2007 are quite different. The 1993 photo is more representative of a historical home. His big objection is that the new windows are historically inappropriate.

Ms. Hards stated that the back of the home is not original.

Ms. Plummer asked staff if changes to historical homes are allowed in the Village without prior approval. Ms. Zurek replied that changes are not allowed without a permit.

Ms. Plummer reviewed a past case brought before the ARC.

Ms. Plummer stated that there are two (2) concerns here:

1. The petitioner made changes to an historic home without a permit.
2. Will we, the ARC, accept these changes or require the petitioner to remove and replace?

Ms. Zurek clarified the process for replacing windows in the historic district and staff's process with homeowners.

Mr. Petersen clarified to the petitioner that all non-contributing portions of homes in the historic district require wood windows.

Mr. O'Donnell further explained the decision made by the ARC on April 26, 2007.

Ms. Hards explained that they believe they did not compromise the architectural detail of the home.

Mr. Ward stated that they did compromise the architectural detail of an historic home because of the replacement windows used.

Mr. Lytle asked the petitioner to clarify the type of windows removed. In the staff report it states that the petitioner removed aluminum clad windows; however, the photos indicate that the petitioner removed wood windows and replaced with aluminum clad.

Mr. Hards replied that they did, in fact, remove wood windows and replaced with aluminum clad windows.

Let the record note, that the Staff Report is incorrect. The petitioner removed all wood windows (not aluminum clad as previously indicated) and replaced with aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Hards stated that he replaced these windows because of his wife's health. He made a decision and moved forward with it.

Ms. Plummer stated that she understands the health concern, and the ARC would have held a special meeting to address the replacement of these windows to expedite the process.

Mr. Coath stated that the ARC needs to discuss how to handle this petition. He would like to give leniency but does not want to set precedence.

Mr. Hards stated that we were not trying to "pull the wool over" the Village's eyes in this matter.

Mr. Petersen stated that he believes the petitioner acted in good faith and they did not intentionally violate the ARC. He believes that the Commissioners need to take that, and the fact that the windows are on the back of the house, into consideration.

Mr. Ward replied that because it is an addition on the rear of the house does not eliminate it from the requirement of wood windows. We can be lenient if we choose to, but not because of that reason.

Ms. Troy stated that she understands the petitioner's actions but would like clarification on the ARC's role. Is it our role to determine leniency or is it the Board of Trustees'?

Ms. Zurek replied that the ARC has the power to show leniency or require that the petitioner remove the windows and replace with wood windows.

Mr. O'Donnell further clarified to the petitioner the role of the ARC. Mr. O'Donnell also mentioned that the petitioner did not justify the replacement windows in his letter presented to the Village.

Ms. Plummer stated that because of the many discussions of what is allowed and what is not allowed in the historic district, the petitioner should have known to call the Village for guidance. Can we, in good conscious, not support the ordinance? We're not here to decide right or wrong, but we should follow the ordinance. The letter sent by the petitioner does not justify the aluminum clad windows. When we make this decision tonight, we will have to live with it.

All Commissioners agreed that the aluminum clad windows are in clear violation of the ordinance.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners how they would like to proceed. Do we require any action from the petitioner?

Mr. Lytle – this situation is unfortunate, but votes to replace the aluminum clad windows with wood windows.

Mr. Petersen – because the petitioner acted in good faith, the windows are on the rear of the home and it is a minor violation of the ordinance, he is okay with keeping the aluminum clad windows. However, all future modifications to this home must come before the ARC.

Mr. Coath – agrees with Mr. Petersen's comments. We would like to adhere to the letter of the law, but we have to be sensitive to the homeowner. Okay with keeping the aluminum clad windows.

Ms. Troy – believes this is a violation of the ordinance, but is okay with keeping the aluminum clad windows.

Ms. Plummer – agrees with Ms. Troy's comments.

Mr. Ward – agrees with Mr. Lytle's comments. In order to serve the Village, we have to remain consistent. He understands that this violation was done in good faith, but votes to replace the aluminum clad windows with wood windows.

The ARC Commissioners reached an overall consensus (4 of the 6) to allow the petitioner to keep the aluminum clad windows on the rear of the home.

Mr. Hards asked the ARC if they can replace the wood columns on the front of the home with fiberglass columns.

All Commissioners agreed that the columns must be replaced with wood columns that replicate the existing columns. The petitioner must come before the ARC with this modification.

Other Business

Mr. Petersen asked Ms. Zurek if staff is aware of the home on the northwest corner of Station & Grove that is replacing original wood windows with aluminum clad windows. Ms. Zurek replied that staff will look into this matter.

Ms. Plummer asked staff about the Starr Couture signage. Ms. Zurek clarified that the current sign is temporary. Ms. Plummer further asked the status of the sign ordinance. Ms. Zurek replied that it is moving along.

ARC IMS Workshop - Brooke Zurek, Planner, Village of Barrington

Brooke Zurek demonstrated the ARC IMC mapping program to the ARC. This program is located on the Barrington Area Council of Governments (BACOG) website. Ms. Zurek presented the consent agreements to the Commissioners. All Commissioners signed and returned the agreement to Ms. Zurek.

Ms. Zurek further demonstrated the various aspects of the program including the address finder feature, aerial map and other features available in the BACOG district.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from April 12, 2007 and April 26, 2007 were reviewed. One change was made to the April 26, 2007 minutes.

Mr. Ward moved to approve the April 12, 2007 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Lytle seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. O'Donnell – yes; Mr. Coath – yes; Ms. Plummer – yes; Mr. Ward – yes; Mr. Lytle – yes. Ms. Troy – abstain; Mr. Petersen - abstain. Motion carried 5-0.

Ms. Plummer moved to approve the April 26, 2007 meeting minutes with the noted correction. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. O'Donnell – yes; Mr. Coath – yes; Ms. Plummer – yes; Mr. Petersen - yes. Ms. Troy – abstain; Mr. Ward – abstain; Mr. Lytle – abstain. Motion carried 4-0.

Adjournment

Ms. Plummer moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.

Aye: Petersen, Plummer, Troy, Lytle, Ward, Coath, O'Donnell. Nay: None. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosita Cruz Stein
Recording Secretary

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission