

*Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary*

Date: May 24, 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
Michael Ward, Commissioner

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
Jim Wallace, Director-Building & Planning
Rosita Cruz 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, present; Karen Plummer, present; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, absent.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

Old Business

ARC 07-03: Wiersma, NEW SFR, 206 E. Hillside (Historic), Final Details
Petitioner: Travis Wiersma, Owner

On March 22, 2007 the ARC approved plans for the new construction of a non-contributing house at 206 E. Hillside Avenue. The ARC required the petitioner to meet three (3) conditions at the public hearing.

Mr. Travis Wiersma presented the details of the three (3) conditions to the ARC.

Mr. Coath requested clarification on the pilasters presented on the plans.

Let the record note that the pilaster detail shown on A 2.1 is correct. The pilaster on the south elevation is depicted incorrectly.

All Commissioners agreed on the following:

1. The raking detail of the front pediment shall be brought back to the ARC for review and approval.
2. The gutters on the front facade presented are acceptable.
3. The use of Marvin Ultimate wood windows is acceptable.

New Business

ARC 07-11: Meinhard Park, Bristol Dr. & Concord Ln. (Non-Historic) Public Meeting
Petitioner: Donna Jung and Jim Wallace, Director-Building & Planning-Village of Barrington

The petitioner is seeking a Certificate of Approval (COA) for the redevelopment of this park site. The property is zoned R-C Recreation-Conservation District.

Mr. Jim Wallace informed the Architectural Review Commission that the Village of Barrington is co-sponsoring this petition, and introduced Ms. Donna Jung – a citizen volunteer for this project. Mr. Wallace thanked Ms. Jung for her hard work.

Ms. Donna Jung presented petition ARC 07-11 to the Commissioners and reviewed her background. Ms. Jung also explained how she got involved in this project and handed out details on the specifics of the proposed improvements.

Ms. Troy asked the petitioner what type of material is being proposed for the gazebo. Ms. Jung presented a sample of the proposed material. It is a durable PVC product.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification on the colors being proposed. Ms. Jung replied that they are open to color recommendations from the ARC for the tables, benches and garbage receptacles. The colors for the proposed gazebo would be white PVC with a slate colored rubber roof, adding that these materials are durable and low maintenance.

Mr. Petersen asked if the petitioner has considered a cedar roof. Ms. Jung replied that the manufacturer recommends a hard rubber roof for durability and maintenance.

Ms. Troy added that she recommends green tables and benches.

Ms. Plummer also recommends green tables and benches.

Mr. Petersen recommends a cedar roof for the gazebo, green benches and tables with black legs, and green trash cans.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the petitioner if she has considered an alternative material for the gazebo stating that he is okay with the slate roof; however, would prefer a wood gazebo.

Mr. Coath stated that he does not recommend PVC because it will have to be replaced in 10 years. He recommends that the gazebo be wood with a shingled roof; and the benches and tables to be dark green with black legs.

Ms. Jung replied that she will look into wood materials for the gazebo.

Mr. Wallace asked the Commissioners for clarification on the roof. Do they recommend wood shingles or shakes?

All Commissioners agreed that wood shingles are acceptable.

Mr. Ward also encourages a wood gazebo stating that wood will age just as well as PVC.

Mr. Wallace asked the Commissioners to review the composite flooring proposed. All Commissioners agreed that the flooring proposed is acceptable in a cedar or redwood color.

Mr. Wallace asked for clarification from the ARC as to the approved details for this case.

All Commissioners agreed on the following conditions for ARC 07-11:

1. The gazebo shall be constructed of wood and painted white.
2. The roof of the gazebo shall have cedar shingles.
3. The tables and benches shall be green with black legs (model F1033).
4. The trash cans shall be green.

5. The composite flooring proposed is acceptable in a cedar or redwood color.
6. Brick or concrete pavers are acceptable.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve ARC 07-11 with the above conditions. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.
Aye: Troy, Plummer, Petersen, Ward, Coath, O'Donnell. Nay: None. Absent: Lytle. Motion carried.

ARC 07-09: Fischer Pool House, 309 S. Cook (Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Paul & Laurie Fischer, Owner; and Sarah Petersen, Architect

Mr. Petersen excused himself from this case due to conflict of interest.

The applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a non-contributing structure (pool house) in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District. The pool house will be located in the side yard. The property is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential.

Ms. Sarah Petersen presented case PC 07-09 to the Commissioners. Ms. Petersen reviewed the architectural design of the proposed pool house, and asked the ARC for direction on the location, scale, design and style of the pool house.

Ms. Plummer asked staff if there are any rules or regulations regarding buying property next door and building on it. Ms. Zurek replied that it is acceptable to do so.

Ms. Petersen clarified the zoning requirements for accessory buildings.

Mr. Ward asked if the proposed pool house would be square and the same elevation on each side. Ms. Petersen replied that, at this point, it will be. The petitioner is seeking direction on the mass and location of the pool house.

Mr. Coath asked if the windows proposed are casement windows. Ms. Petersen replied that they are casement windows to match the windows on the existing sunroom.

Mr. Coath recommends that the narrow pilasters on either side of the pool house match the pilasters on the home in proportion. Mr. Coath also recommends that the petitioner find ways to distinguish the pool house from the home, perhaps add something unique.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners if they are in agreement on tearing down a non-contributing structure and building a pool house on the property. All Commissioners present stated that they are okay with it.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that, in this particular case, the addition of the pool house will improve the streetscape.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification on the location of the property. Ms. Petersen clarified the location.

Ms. Troy asked the height of the proposed pool house. Ms. Petersen replied ten (10) feet.

Ms. Troy stated that the proportions of the new structure are elegant, but questioned the roof pitch. Ms. Petersen replied that the petitioner is matching the pitch of the sunroom roof.

Ms. Plummer stated that the proposed structure is more of an echo of the new addition and away from the existing house. She questions if this will overwhelm the house.

Mr. Ward stated that the proposed structure should be viewed as more of an out building and should not match the house.

Ms. Petersen asked the Commissioners if they were okay with the proposed location of the structure. All Commissioners agreed that the location seems appropriate.

Ms. Zurek asked for clarification on Mr. Coath's comment regarding the columns of the pool house compared to the columns of the house.

Ms. Petersen replied that they will take that recommendation into consideration and will have more details and elevations at their next meeting. They will also explore options on the size and detail of the pilasters.

ARC 07-10: Cameron Garage, 200 S. Dundee (Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Bruce & Chris Cameron, Owners

The applicants are seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a contributing garage in the Historic District. The petitioners are also seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a non-contributing garage. The property is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential and is in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Mr. O'Donnell opened the discussion stating that the survey indicates that the garage was built in 1935 which would mean that it is a contributing structure. However, Mr. O'Donnell believes that the door is not original and is about 20 years old which would indicate that perhaps the garage is non-contributing. This is the first thing that should be cleared up.

Ms. Chris Cameron, owner of the property, stated that she disagrees with the survey and believes the garage is a non-contributing structure. She stated that in working with her contractor, it appears that the garage was built in the late 1940's.

Mr. Ward asked how we, the ARC, determine if the garage is contributing or non-contributing, and asked for clarification on how the surveys were conducted.

Ms. Zurek explained the details of how the surveys were completed. The Village had a professional, historian conduct the surveys and presented his findings to the Village of Barrington who approved his findings.

Mr. O'Donnell asked staff to clarify the year of contributing vs. non-contributing structures.

Ms. Zurek replied that contributing structures were built before 1940.

Ms. Plummer suggested that before the Commissioners approve a tear down of the existing garage, the ARC look at the structure to determine if it is contributing or non-contributing. Ms. Plummer added that there are two (2) things to consider on this petition: (1) is the structure contributing or non-contributing; and (2) the condition of the existing garage.

Ms. Cameron stated that the existing garage is falling apart. The option of relocating the garage is not feasible. It is a small, one-car garage. The size is 12.4 x 18.3 feet.

Mr. Petersen indicated that he recently read an article stating that the size of a garage may determine when it was built. He will find this article and send it to staff for review. Mr. Petersen believes that the ARC should conduct a site visit.

Ms. Cameron asked staff if, according to the staff report, five (5) of the seven (7) conditions have been met for demolition, then why can't they demolish.

Mr. Coath replied that the conditions are for staff purposes and not for ARC purposes.

Ms. Cameron added that the current structure is dangerous, and her lawyer believes that the garage is non-contributing because it was built in approximately 1948. Ms. Cameron added that she doesn't mean to discount the historian; however, a new garage will be more aesthetically pleasing on the property.

Ms. Cameron further stated that she is not asking to change the contributing house and believes the new garage will make the home more charming.

It was agreed that Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath will visit the site.

Mr. Coath recommends that the petitioner seek an architect to draw the proposed new garage instead of using the builder. Mr. O'Donnell also recommends the petitioner use an architect.

Ms. Cameron replied that they would like information from the ARC as to how to move forward with the design of the proposed new garage. The builder purposely left out details because he wants guidance from the ARC.

Mr. Coath stated that it is difficult to give guidance without some detail and information; adding ideally, you want a garage that is up to the original standards of the existing garage.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested a simpler version of the existing house: two-door garage, double-hung wood windows, and wood doors. Mr. O'Donnell recommends that the petitioner look into using Marvin Ultimate wood windows or Kolbe & Kolbe.

Ms. Zurek stated that these details can be reviewed at the public hearing as well.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath will visit the site to determine the condition of the existing garage.

If the garage is contributing, another preliminary hearing will be required to determine the condition of the garage. If the garage is non-contributing, then a public hearing will be required to move forward with demolition and approve plans for a new garage.

Mr. Ward believes that the ARC should not determine if the garage is contributing or non-contributing. The ARC should determine if the structure should be demolished, moved or salvaged.

Mr. Ward added that he believes it is the responsibility of the petitioner to challenge the survey.

Mr. Petersen agreed and recommended that the petitioner work with the builder or an expert to gather documentation to prove that the garage is non-contributing. Ms. Cameron stated that she is not sure that can be done.

The ARC recommended that the following information can be used to determine if the structure is non-contributing: the materials used; the size of the garage; the design; the size of the lumber used; the nail type used; the dimension of the siding; any stamping on the lumber; the dimensions of the corner boards; and the dimension of the sheathing.

The ARC also recommends that complete architectural plans be submitted for the proposed new garage.

Ms. Zurek explained to the ARC and petitioner that this petition will require two (2) more meetings. The next meeting will be a public hearing to determine if the garage can be demolished, and the second meeting will be to present full plans to the ARC.

Ms. Zurek further explained that the June 14, 2007 meeting agenda is closed. Ms. Zurek explained to the petitioner the documentation needed to be included on the agenda in a timely fashion.

Ms. Zurek explained the process for ARC submittals.

Ms. Cameron expressed her disappointment with the process because she doesn't feel it will be resolved by the end of the summer which is their goal.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from May 10, 2007 were reviewed. No changes were noted.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve the May 10, 2007 meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. O'Donnell – yes; Mr. Coath – yes; Ms. Plummer – yes; Mr. Ward – yes; Ms. Troy – yes; Mr. Petersen – yes. Motion carried 6-0.

Other Business

Ms. Zurek reviewed the case in question from the last meeting. The homeowner is replacing the windows with all wood windows. No violation is occurring.

Mr. Coath questioned the large overhang on the Carlstrom house on the 500 block of Grove. Ms. Zurek stated that she will look at the home and compare it to the approved plans.

Mr. O'Donnell questioned the property at 603 Hough. They are tearing down the front porch and the ARC did not approve the removal of the front porch. Ms. Zurek will look into this.

Mr. O'Donnell updated the ARC on his recent conversations with Mr. Cope. Mr. Cope will build his home as approved although he is not happy with it.

Adjournment

Mr. Petersen moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosita Cruz Stein
Recording Secretary

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission