

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

Date: June 14, 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
Mimi Troy, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner
Michael Ward, Commissioner

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
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, absent; Karen Plummer, absent; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

New Business

**ARC 07-13: Kaper Fence, 300 E. Main (Non-Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: David A. Schulz, Architect; William Kaper, Owner**

The petitioner is requesting a Certificate of Approval to construct a decorative wall and fence on the rear (north) and interior side (east) of the property. The property is zoned B-4 Village Center District.

Mr. Dave Schulz, architect for the project, reviewed the proposal for the fence and decorative wall. Mr. Schulz also summarized the reasoning for requesting the masonry (decorative wall) and stated that they are matching the character of the existing building.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the masonry portion of the fence will resemble the building. Mr. Schulz replied that it will.

Mr. O'Donnell requested comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Ward clarified the look of the fence and questioned why wrought iron was not used when originally built. Mr. Schulz replied that the fence and decorative wall will capture the property and make it more private from the church.

Mr. Lytle questioned if the proposed fence/wall is too busy and if the spacing is appropriate. Mr. Schulz replied that they tried many angles and styles. He and his client agreed that the one presented is most appropriate.

Mr. Lytle asked if the caps are appropriate. Mr. Schulz replied that they are matching the existing building.

Mr. Coath asked if the capstone overhang will be marble. Mr. Schulz replied that it will as they are matching the existing overhang.

Mr. Coath questioned if the decorative, brass ball will be too eye catching. Mr. Schulz replied that the decorative ball will be 6 inches in diameter and is the client's preference.

Mr. Coath recommends that given the scale of the fence, the brass ornamentation be less ornate.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified the portion of the property north of the building. Mr. Schulz clarified that the northern edge of the wall to the retaining wall will be 4 feet.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification of the retaining wall as depicted on the A2 elevation. Mr. Schulz clarified the location.

Ms. Troy questioned the maintenance concern of having a solid wall in the back of the property. Mr. Schulz replied that they have considered the landscaping and snow removal concerns. The client will have the snow removed with buckets and not pushed.

Ms. Troy recommends that the arches mimic the proportions on the actual building. The reveal should be narrower, perhaps thin the breadth of the arches. Mr. Schulz replied that they appreciate those comments and input.

Mr. Ward asked the proposed color of the caps, balls and fleur de lis. Mr. Schulz replied that the caps and balls will be brass and the fleur de lis will be black.

Mr. O'Donnell presented the staff recommendations from the Staff Report. They are:

- Does the masonry wall compliment the architecture of the property and the District?
- Are the proposed arches appropriate for the design of the wall?

Ms. Zurek asked the Commissioners if they would consider voting on this case tonight as there are not many conditions.

Mr. Ward asked if the petitioner would consider using wrought iron balls instead of the brass proposed. Mr. Schulz replied that the petitioner prefers the brass balls and would not consider changing them.

Mr. William Kaper, owner of the property, stated that he would like to keep the brass balls.

Mr. Lytle stated that the ARC would consider voting on this petition tonight with the recommendation that the proposed fence and wall look like an extension of the existing building.

Ms. Zurek asked the petitioner to clarify if the balls and caps are brass or bronze. Mr. Schulz replied that they are brass in color; however, typically outdoor balls are referred to as bronze.

All Commissioners agreed that the fence and wall shall look like an extension of the building.

Mr. Ward moved to approve ARC 07-13 with the above recommendation. Mr. Lytle seconded the motion.

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

ARC 07-14: Norton's Awning, 400 Lageschulte (Non-Historic) Public Meeting

Petitioner: Deborah Leydig, Owner

Petitioner did not attend meeting. Case was not presented.

ARC 07-16: Hutchinson Master Sign Plan, 232 E. Main (Non-Historic) Public Meeting

Petitioner: Karen Hutchinson, Owner

The petitioner requests approval of a Master Sign Plan. The ARC must approve a Master Sign Plan prior to the issuance of any new sign permits. The plan will be on file in the Department of Building and Planning so that future sign permit requests are expedited.

Ms. Karen Hutchinson presented the proposal for ARC 07-16. Currently, there are no signs in front of this building and she has worked extensively with the Village on various sign options. The proposal presented tonight was the best option.

Ms. Zurek stated that Ms. Hutchinson has been working on the Sign Committee with the Village for quite a while. This proposal will be a prototype of how the Village of Barrington wants to move forward with signage.

Ms. Troy asked the size of the wrought iron and the bracket. Ms. Hutchinson replied that she is not sure of the exact dimensions; however, it will be wide enough to support itself. The signs will be 1 ½ inch thick, therefore, the bracket will be a minimum of 1 ½ inches.

Ms. Troy asked if the petitioner is presenting a drawing or cut sheet of the bracket being proposed. Ms. Hutchinson replied that she does not have that information. Sign City in Barrington will be constructing the sign.

Mr. O'Donnell asked staff what they would like from the ARC tonight.

Ms. Zurek replied that staff has been working with Ms. Hutchinson extensively on this project and would like approval of the proposal tonight.

Mr. Coath stated that the ARC really needs to see drawings or details of the proposed bracket.

Ms. Hutchinson replied that the tenants have been waiting over 6 months for signage at this location.

Ms. Troy stated that the concept is acceptable, but would really like to see details or a cut sheet of the bracket before approving.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the bracket will be wrought iron. Ms. Hutchinson replied that it will and will be 60 inches in length.

Mr. Coath stated that, conceptually, this is a great solution to the signage problem. He then clarified the material and thickness of the sign board.

Mr. Tom Hutchinson approached the podium. Mr. Hutchinson stated that they will submit detailed drawings to the Village for permit approval. He then explained the details of the proposed sign. The hanging boards will be pre-finished aluminum in 1 ½ inch thickness. It will look like wood. The bracket will resist wind, snow, ice and other conditions. The brackets will be a minimum of 1 ½ inches wide and ½ inch thick.

Mr. Hutchinson further explained that the bracket will be powder-coated wrought iron. He also reviewed the maintenance and durability of the proposed sign.

Mr. O'Donnell asked staff if they have approved an inside radius for the signage. Ms. Zurek replied that the inside radius of each sign has not been determined; either clipped corners or squared corners will be approved. The Sign Committee will decide which is preferred.

Mr. Ward stated that he is concerned that the aluminum, hollow sign will move too much in the wind, and people will be able to tell that it is not wood. Mr. Hutchinson replied that the sign will have substantial weight – approximately 25 pounds.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the petitioner if the sign proposed will be commercially available or is it custom made. Ms. Hutchinson replied that the sign will be a standard sign with adjustments. It will be made at Sign City.

Mr. O'Donnell reviewed the condition that staff is recommending: The existing internally illuminated box signs located on the east and west walls of the structure shall be removed within one year of the final installation of the new projecting signs.

Ms. Zurek stated that staff is looking for approval of this project.

Mr. Ward is concerned that, as a Village, we are not requiring wooden signs.

Ms. Hutchinson stated that, as a Committee member, they have reviewed all options for signage and chose aluminum due to maintenance, durability and cost. Sign City has given their guarantee that it will not look like a "tin box".

Ms. Zurek recommended that the ARC review and vote on this sign as an individual case, and vote only on the subject property. Ms. Zurek further explained how they reached this solution for the current signage problem at this location.

Mr. Lytle stated that, as a group, they are concerned about the overall signage in the Village of Barrington.

Mr. O'Donnell recommended that the Commissioners vote on this sign for the property presented tonight, and not as a sign plan for the Village as a whole.

Ms. Troy agreed that this would be okay as long as the following conditions are required: the triangulation pieces shall be 1 ½ inches wide; and the inside swirls shall be more than a ¼ inch flat bar if structurally sound.

The Commissioners agreed on the following conditions for ARC 07-16:

1. The triangulation pieces shall be 1 ½ inches wide.
2. The inside swirls shall be more than a ¼ inch flat bar if structurally sound.
3. The existing internally illuminated box signs located on the east and west walls of the structure shall be removed within one year of the final installation of the new projecting signs.

Mr. Coath moved to approve ARC 07-16 with the above conditions. Mr. Lytle seconded the motion.
Aye: Troy, Lytle, Ward, Coath, O'Donnell. Nay: None. Absent: Petersen, Plummer. Motion carried.

ARC 07-17: Champion Dealership, 495 W. Northwest Hwy. (Non-Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Callas Family Partners, Owners; Matt Powell, Champion Dodge

The petitioner is seeking a Certificate of Approval (COA) for alterations to a commercial site. The property is zone B-1 General Business Service District.

Mr. Matt Powell of Champion Dodge presented an overview and architectural drawings for the petition. Mr. Powell stated that much of the design and changes are driven by Dodge, including the requirement of a second floor. The petitioner further presented the materials being proposed and asked for input from the ARC.

Mr. O'Donnell requested input from the Commissioners.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification on what part of the building is new and what is existing. The petitioner clarified the new and existing buildings. The petitioner is matching the existing building.

Ms. Troy asked for clarification on the second floor. The petitioner replied that there will be offices and storage on the second floor and this is required by Dodge.

Mr. Lytle asked for clarification on the location of the trash enclosure. Mr. Powell replied that there will be two (2) trash enclosures and are being changed.

Mr. Lytle further clarified with the petitioner the roof top on the north elevation.

Ms. Troy stated that it is unusual for the windows to run all the way down to the ground. Mr. Powell replied that the drawing is incorrect, and they will be 12 inches up from the floor.

Mr. Coath stated that the building has the feel of a strip mall, and recommends that the new building should have more of a likeness to the existing structure. He recommends there be more consistency with a hint to classicism in the architectural design.

Mr. Powell replied that this is car dealership.

Mr. Ward stated that he understands it is a car dealership; however, we have to keep in mind that this is Barrington. It should not look like Golf Road. Mr. Ward further stated that he would like the petitioner to pick up more details of the existing building and use more brick.

Mr. Powell replied that the plans presented today are subject to review. He is presenting a take-off of the plans Dodge presented to them.

Mr. Lytle commented that he would like to see more texture, and the archways to be more decorative with brick. He recommends a more traditional look for the building.

Ms. Troy recommends that the petitioner not design the new building around the concrete building of the service department. The new building should have more detail and enhancements around the front.

Mr. Lytle recommends that the petitioner take the side view of the building and extend around the front.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners if the proposed pre-cast concrete panels were acceptable.

Ms. Troy recommends a brick front facade for the service building and pre-cast concrete panels on the sides and back.

The Commissioners agreed that use of the pre-cast concrete panels for all sides of the service building is not acceptable. The Commissioners suggests that the petitioner add a masonry veneer to the front facade of the building.

Mr. O'Donnell presented staff recommendations.

Mr. Lytle asked the petitioner if they have selected colors. Mr. Powell replied that they anticipate taking the richer colors around the building especially to the windows, doors and coping.

Mr. Ward asked if the glass will be clear or tinted. The petitioner replied that it will be clear glass so that the cars may be viewed.

Ms. Zurek stated that she believed the petitioner was proposing tinted glass. The petitioner replied that they are proposing all clear glass even on the existing building.

Ms. Zurek asked if the decorative brick pavers in the car display area will be built-up. The petitioner replied that they will not due to handicap accessibility.

Ms. Zurek informed the petitioner that there are a lot of details lacking on the plans presented, for example, the doors, lighting fixtures, trims, accents, etc. These details will need to be presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Ward recommended to the petitioner that they keep the character of the existing building.

Mr. Powell stated that they will bring more details and updated plans to the next meeting. Greater detail will be provided for all trim, accents and materials. The petitioner further reviewed the landscaping plans and stated that they are working with IDOT to obtain more land.

Mr. O'Donnell asked staff the expected timeframe of this project. Ms. Zurek replied that staff believes that the next meeting for this project can be a public meeting.

Mr. Powell stated that they will work with staff before the next meeting in order to bring the appropriate information to the public meeting.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that, because this is a big project, the ARC might require one more preliminary meeting before the public meeting. Ms. Zurek replied that staff would like the ARC's timing to coincide with the Plan Commission's timing. Thus, they are expecting one more meeting.

After further discussion and review, the ARC offered the following recommendations to the petitioner:

1. While the ARC understands that no new E.I.F.S is proposed, the ARC suggests that the extensive use of stucco finish detracts from the quality of the project.
2. The use of the pre-cast concrete panels for all sides of the service building is not acceptable. The ARC suggests, at the least, adding a masonry veneer to the front façade of the building.
3. Explore options for adding stone and/or bricks to define the architectural features of the building, especially the windows, doors, and coping.
4. Draw on the details of the existing structure such as the arches, pilasters, and reveals and incorporate them into the proposed addition.
5. Explore options for using rich colors on the addition that would compliment the existing structure.
6. The ARC agrees that the trash enclosure should be revised.
7. An 18-inch knee wall shall be added below the windows of the front facade.
8. All new windows shall be clear, non-tinted.
9. Much greater detail shall be provided at the final ARC meeting. All materials, trims, and accents shall be called out and dimensioned.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from May 24, 2007 were reviewed. No changes were noted. Ms. Troy moved to approve the May 24, 2007 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. *Roll Call Vote: Mr. O'Donnell – yes; Mr. Coath – yes; Mr. Ward – yes; Ms. Troy – yes. Mr. Lytle – abstain. Motion carried 4-0.*

Other Business

ARC 07-1: Norton's Awning, 400 Lageschulte (Non-Historic) Public Meeting:

The Commissioners discussed ARC 07-14 (Norton's Awning) although the petitioner did not attend the meeting. The case was not officially presented or voted upon; however, the ARC made two (2) recommendations. They are:

1. The ARC will not approve the proposed big awning in the front of the building.
2. The awnings over the door and windows are acceptable.

ARC 07-10: Cameron Garage, 200 S. Dundee (Historic)

Mr. O'Donnell passed around drawings from Jim Wallace of the proposed new garage at 200 S. Dundee.

Mr. Coath provided a summary of the existing, contributing garage. Mr. Coath visited the site and believes the garage is historic (built before 1939) and worth saving. There is a little bowing on one wall but the foundation and siding are in good condition. Mr. O'Donnell also visited the site, and agrees with Mr. Coath's assessment.

Staff informed Mrs. Chris Cameron of the above findings. The existing, contributing garage cannot be demolished and they are working with the petitioner on a redevelopment plan.

Staff would like the ARC to give Mrs. Cameron direction for her next hearing.

The ARC discussed a total of three site plan concepts:

- A.) relocating the existing structure to the rear and attaching the existing structure to a new structure by a breezeway,
- B.) relocating the existing structure to the rear and attaching the existing structure to a new structure so that an L-shaped courtyard is created: and
- C.) maintaining the existing structure in its original location and constructing a new two-car garage in the rear.

Overall, the ARC did not object to any of the concepts. They prefer the idea of leaving the garage in place, but did not object to the idea of relocating the garage and building additional space with it.

The ARC did not express a strong preference for either concepts A or B – noting that it might be difficult to make concept B (the ell) work, with driveway and overhead door issues to be dealt with. The ARC further expressed one concern with concept A: the architect would have to be diligent to assure that this layout does not look awkward.

Site Visits

The ARC agreed that, before hearings, the Commissioners will be notified via email by staff of cases that require site visits. The Commissioners shall view the subject property before the meeting to assess the condition.

ARC Meeting Preparation

Mr. O'Donnell recommends that each Commissioner review the meeting packet before the scheduled ARC meeting.

Adjournment

Mr. Lytle moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. *Aye: Troy, Lytle, Ward, Coath, O'Donnell. Nay: None. Motion carried.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosita Cruz Stein
Recording Secretary

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission