

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

Date: June 28, 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
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 7:08 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chair, present (arrived 9:00 pm); Mimi Troy, absent; Steve Petersen, present; 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, and moved case ARC 07-12 (Ward Addition) to the last item on the agenda.

New Business

ARC 07-15: Wonrade Addition, 337 W. Main (Non-Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Mary Wonrade, Owner

The petitioner is seeking a Certificate of Approval (COA) for modifications to a commercial site. The property is zoned B-R Business-Residential District.

Ms. Mary Wonrade of 337 W. Main presented petition ARC 07-15. Ms. Wonrade explained that the property is primarily office space and a one-bedroom apartment. She has her office in the building. Ms. Wonrade reviewed her proposal to take the upper attic of the property and raise it to a livable space - making the apartment into a town home-type space. The petitioner presented architectural and floor plans, and reviewed the proposed new two-car garage.

Mr. O'Donnell verified with staff that this is not an historic property.

Mr. Ward asked the petitioner if the current second floor is uninhabitable. Ms. Wonrade responded that today it is uninhabitable.

Mr. Ward noted that the major change in the property is the dormer bump-out on the north elevation. Ms. Wonrade replied that it is, and stated that she is trying to maintain the character of the building and will be matching existing materials including the cedar siding.

Mr. Lytle suggested adding a front porch because the new gable draws more attention to the center of the house and the windows are not aligned.

Mr. Lytle asked if the proposed vinyl clad windows are acceptable.

Ms. Zurek replied, according to the ordinance, non-historic properties are required to use either wood or aluminum clad windows. Vinyl clad windows are not allowed.

Ms. Wonrade explained that the reason for the proposed vinyl clad windows is because she is matching the existing windows on the property.

Mr. Ward asked the petitioner how many windows would have to be changed in order to remain consistent. Ms. Wonrade replied too many – about 90% of the windows are vinyl clad.

Mr. Lytle asked if the ARC would make an exception because 90% of the windows are vinyl clad.

Mr. Lytle reviewed the west elevation asking if the octagonal window on the new dormer is typical. Ms. Wonrade replied that she has seen an octagonal window in town. Mr. Petersen replied that this is not normal for a dormer to have an octagonal window.

Mr. Petersen reviewed case ARC 07-15 and offered the following recommendations:

- The petitioner should consider using skylights instead of the octagonal window in the dormer to allow for more light.
- The petitioner should use aluminum clad windows for the new windows instead of the proposed vinyl clad windows adding that vinyl clad windows deteriorate quickly.
- The petitioner shall present drawings without the hatched roof to allow for more detail (leave the roof white).
- The petitioner should match the slope of the existing house on the rear elevation; perhaps study options for creating a gable or hip on the rear that matches the mass of the existing house.
- Provide details of brackets (recommend galvanized steel), soffits & fascia, copper gutters and hangers for half-rounds, etc. to the next meeting.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners how they feel about the overall concept of the addition.

All Commissioners in attendance agreed that they are okay with the proposal tonight with Mr. Petersen's recommendations.

Mr. Ward commented that he agrees with Mr. Petersen's recommendations, particularly the side elevation.

Mr. Lytle recommends that the petitioner maintain the existing pitches of the roof.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the ARC to give clear direction on the windows to the petitioner.

All Commissioners present agreed that on the following for the new windows:

- The window proportions shall be historically accurate (using Marvin Ultimate, Kolbe & Kolbe or Pella Architectural Series as examples).
- The windows shall be either wood or aluminum clad as stated in the ordinance - adding that the board and batten should be wood and pick up the details of historic proportions (i.e. thick batten with a drip cap).
- The petitioner shall maintain the Arts & Crafts style of the building.

The ARC then reviewed the proposed garage. After review and discussion, the Commissioners agreed on the following:

- The garage roof shall be steeper.
- Consider two doors instead of one.
- The service door shall be an Arts and Crafts style.
- Recommend using open rafters
- The proposed vent appears Colonial – remove vent and use a ridged vent.
- On the rear elevation, eliminate the louvers and review options for placing shingles in the gable.
- The petitioner shall provide cut sheets of the proposed light fixtures.
- The garage door presented is acceptable.

The ARC also recommends that the petitioner provide a site plan for the landscaping indicating the existing landscaping shall remain.

Mr. O'Donnell recommends that the petitioner use lead flashing for the plumbing stack.

The above recommendations and conditions were provided to the petitioner.

**ARC 07-07: Freund Alterations, 340-360 W. Northwest Hwy. (Non-Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Donald Tonyan, Petitioner**

The petitioner is seeking a Certificate of Approval (COA) for alterations to a commercial site. The petitioner is also proposing a Master Sign Plan at this time. The property is zoned B-1 General Business Service District.

Mr. Don Tonyan presented the proposal to the ARC. Mr. Tonyan reviewed the alterations and the canopy (signage) proposal.

Mr. Lytle asked for clarification on the three-phase project: Phase I is the canopy and liquor store; Phase II is the siding; and Phase III will be the other tenants. Mr. Tonyan replied yes.

Mr. Lytle and Mr. Petersen asked for clarification on the siding material being proposed tonight.

Ms. Zurek replied that metal siding is being proposed. Staff recommends using mixed materials for siding, but is looking to the ARC for direction and guidance.

Mr. Ward asked the petitioner what material is underneath the siding. The petitioner replied pylons.

Mr. Lytle stated that he prefers the color being proposed tonight over the current blue of the property.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the petitioner if the proposed metal siding is due to economics. The petitioner replied that it is.

Ms. Zurek asked the ARC if the existing brick on the front gable is acceptable, and if the painting and patching of the siding is acceptable with the brick.

Mr. Petersen replied that the proposed canopy will cover approximately 70% of the brick. Mr. Petersen recommends that the petitioner return the canopy along the west elevation of the property to extend about one (1) foot. This would allow for the band of color to be consistent.

Mr. Petersen also noted that the petitioner is replacing the siding with like materials.

Mr. O'Donnell commented that he likes the replacement of the garage.

Mr. Petersen stated that extending the canopy along the side of the property along with replacing the existing siding is acceptable to him.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the petitioner if there will be other canopies added at a future date. Mr. Tonyan replied that they will match the existing canopy to the other tenants at a later date.

Mr. Lytle recommends, when returning the canopy that it remains the same height, but a different slope.

After further review and discussion, the Commissioners present agreed that a vote can be held tonight on case ARC 07-07.

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

1. The canopy shall extend over the windows on the west elevation.
2. The petitioner shall provide 12 inch x 12 inch color samples of the siding to the ARC in the following colors: ash gray, saddle tan, desert sand and light stone.
3. The petitioner shall provide 12 inch x 12 inch color samples of the canopy to the ARC in the following colors: fern green, rustic red and gallery blue.
4. In Phase III of the project, the petitioner shall use the same canopy as approved for Phase I of the project.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve ARC 07-07 with the above conditions. Mr. Lytle seconded the motion.

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

**ARC 07-18: Turtle Creek, 777 Lake Zurich Road (Non-Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Turtle Creek Enterprises, Owners; Ronald Flubacker, Architect**

The Petitioner is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the redevelopment of an office building. Exterior modifications are proposed for the building, but no additional building space. The redevelopment includes site improvements to the landscaping, parking lot design, and lighting. The property is located in the O-R Office Research District.

Mr. Ron Flubacker presented an overview of the proposed project. Mr. Flubacker reviewed the history of the building which was built in three parts, and presented updated plans to the Commissioners. He then reviewed the landscaping proposal and the color choices for the building and awnings. Mr. Flubacker expressed that the point of the project is to update the building and make it an office-use building. He then reviewed the roof line plans.

After discussion among the Commissioners and the petitioners, the Commissioners present agreed that the roof screening was acceptable and meets code requirements.

Mr. Flubacker reviewed the proposed Senergy materials stating that it looks like stucco.

Mr. Petersen recommended that the petitioner provide samples of the current brick to review with the proposed colors.

Mr. Petersen asked staff what the code is on using a synthetic stucco material.

Ms. Zurek replied that the code is pretty general when dealing with non-historic, commercial structures.

The petitioner replied that the Senergy system is a masonry-finish product and is “bullet-proof”.

All Commissioners present find the Senergy material to be acceptable.

The ARC then reviewed the proposed canopy.

Mr. Lytle voiced concern about the arch of the canopies suggesting that the petitioner consider using the park’s natural features – perhaps consider wood or a glass canopy to keep the natural look.

Mr. Ward agreed that mirroring the park’s natural features would benefit the property.

Mr. Flubacker replied that they would be concerned that the property would have a park district feel and want to keep it separate from the park, adding that wood would not be durable for the canopies. He also stated that the petitioner likes the arch of the canopies.

Mr. Lytle suggested using glass canopies to keep the natural look and feel of the surrounding park. Mr. Flubacker replied that it would be too hard to maintain a glass canopy.

Mr. O’Donnell commented that he likes the proposal presented tonight.

All Commissioners present agreed that it is an improvement over the current building.

Mr. Lytle agreed that it is a great improvement; however, believes that the red arched canopy does not match the natural surroundings.

Mr. O’Donnell asked the petitioner what additional details were provided in the updated plans tonight.

Mr. Jean L. Jodoin of Turtle Creek Enterprises stated that the cornice details and construction details have been provided tonight.

Mr. Petersen stated that, although the building seems long and monotonous, it is acceptable. Adding it is a commercial building, not a park building, and is appropriate and done well.

Mr. Jodoin added that they are using the same light fixtures as the park on the property.

Ms. Zurek asked the ARC if the petitioner is on the right track and what do they require from Turtle Creek.

Mr. Ward stated that a few of the Commissioners present do not like the proposed colonial red color of the canopy.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that the Commissioners not present tonight should review the colors being proposed.

Mr. Ward agreed that the proposal presented tonight is an improvement. In terms of the building itself, he is only concerned about the color choices.

Mr. Flubacker went on to review the Master Sign Plan. The monument sign will be a backlit, Senergy sign. Each tenant sign will be the same plaque with the tenant's business name on it. It will be consistent throughout each suite.

After further review and discussion, the Commissioners present agreed that a vote can be held tonight on ARC 07-18.

The Commissioners agreed on the following conditions for ARC 07-18:

1. The petitioner shall provide samples of the existing brick to the ARC.
2. The petitioner shall provide 12 inch x 12 inch color samples to the ARC for the canopy and Senergy material.
3. The petitioner shall present a mock-up of the tenant (wall) signage including size, color and material details to the ARC.

Mr. Petersen moved to recommend approval of ARC 07-18 with the above conditions. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

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

**ARC 07-12: Ward Addition, 125 W. Lake St. (Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Erica Ward, Owner**

The applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to a property in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District. The petitioner is proposing alterations to the rear of the structure by constructing a two-story addition. The applicant is also proposing the construction of a non-contributing garage in the rear yard. The garage plans will be reviewed at a future meeting. The property is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential and is in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Mr. Ward excused himself from this case and the Board Room.

Ms. Erica Ward reviewed case ARC 07-12. The primary reason for the petition is the petitioner requires more space.

Mr. O'Donnell informed the ARC that he has visited the site and has reviewed the proposal.

Mr. Coath has reviewed the proposal and offers the following recommendations:

- On the west elevation, there shall be a minimum of a one-foot off set.
- On shed addition on the west elevation, the cornice shall be raised so that it sits on top of the window casing.
- The skirting on the porch shall be made of board instead of lattice.
- The crown molding shall match the existing crown molding.
- All decorative gables shall match existing gables.

Mr. Lytle asked the petitioner if they are removing the shutters. Ms. Ward replied yes.

Mr. Lytle asked staff to clarify the concern of the 10:12 pitch on the roof.

Ms. Zurek clarified that the front roof pitch is 11:12; however, the petitioner is requesting a 10:12 pitch on the addition which matches the side pitch. Should the petitioner match the side pitch of 10:12 or the front pitch of 11:12?

Ms. Ward also clarified that the side gables are 10:12. They are matching the majority pitch of the home.

All Commissioners present agreed that the proposed 10:12 roof pitch on the addition is acceptable.

After discussion and review, the Commissioners present agreed on the following recommendations:

1. On the west elevation, there shall be a minimum of a one-foot off set.
2. On the shed addition on the west elevation, the cornice shall be raised so that it sits on top of the window casing.
3. The skirting on the porch shall be made of board instead of lattice.
4. All decorative gables shall match existing gables of the home.

5. For the garage roof, the petitioner shall develop two dormers on opposite walls instead of the gabled roof.
6. The petitioner shall use all wood windows with historic dimensions for the addition.
7. The petitioner shall provide a plan to match existing details, including photos of existing cornices, soffits, crown molding, etc.
8. The petitioner shall match the existing look of the foundation using a concrete foundation with a brick ledge and stone veneer.
9. The proposed 10:12 roof pitch on the addition is acceptable.
10. The proposed 10:12 roof pitch on the new garage is acceptable.
11. The proposed wrap-around porch is acceptable.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from June 14, 2007 were reviewed. No changes were noted.

Mr. Lytle moved to approve the June 14, 2007 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Coath seconded the motion.

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

Other Business

Hough-Main project:

Staff has requested a special meeting for the Hough-Main development project. After review of dates, it was agreed that the special meeting will be held on Thursday, August 16, 2007 at 7:00 p.m.

PZED

Ms. Zurek informed the ARC that they are invited to a special PZED meeting to be held on Thursday, July 12, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. The Commissioners are to inform Ms. Zurek if they will be attending this meeting. Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath will be in attendance.

ARC 07-14: Norton's Awning

Ms. Zurek informed the ARC that the petitioner is pursuing her petition for an awning. The petitioner will go before the ARC in July.

Adjournment

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosita Cruz Stein
Recording Secretary

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission