

*Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary*

Date: August 9, 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
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Steve Petersen, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner
Michael Ward, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director-Building & Planning
Rosita Cruz Stein, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Mr. O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:02 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, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

Old Business

ARC 07-18: Turtle Creek, 777 Lake Zurich Road (Non-Historic) Final Details
Petitioner: Ronald Flubacker, Architect

On June 28, 2007 the ARC recommended approval of the redevelopment of the Turtle Creek property with the condition that the following items be brought back for approval by the ARC: (1) a sample of the existing brick; (2) color samples for the canopy and Senergy material; and (3) a mock-up of the tenant (wall) signage including design, material and colors.

Mr. Ron Flubacker presented the samples of the existing brick from different areas of the building and samples of the proposed colors for the Senergy and canopy. Mr. Flubacker also presented a mock-up of the tenant sign.

Ms. Troy asked if the petitioner is proposing to add new brick to the structure. Mr. Flubacker replied they are not; however, the ARC requested to see samples of the existing brick.

Mr. Lytle stated that he still believes the colors should be brown tones instead of the proposed red.

After review of the materials presented, the ARC agreed that the proposed colors for the canopy and Senergy material is acceptable, and the tenant (wall) sign mock-up presented is acceptable.

ARC 07-21: Barrington Automotive, 200 W. Northwest Highway (Non-Historic) Public Meeting
Petitioner: Scott Hiss, Owner

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

Mr. Scott Hiss, owner of the property, presented the petition. Mr. Hiss distributed a hand-out to each ARC member and staff with responses to 4 of the 8 recommendations on the staff report. Mr. Hiss then reviewed the reason for the alterations to this commercial site, mainly because deterioration to the existing building. He also reviewed the plans presented.

Mr. O'Donnell requested input from the Commissioners.

Mr. Ward asked what type of roof material is being proposed. Mr. Hiss replied that they are matching the existing roof material which is a wood base with vinyl. The canopy will be of the same material.

Mr. Ward asked if the petitioner will be replacing the facade. Mr. Hiss replied that they are removing the existing brick and replacing it with the new brick presented. Mr. Ward asked if the property will be for an automotive supply store. Mr. Hiss replied that it will.

Mr. Ward questioned the lentils on the front facade indicating that perhaps they should be more decorative. Mr. Hiss replied that he did not see the need for decorative lentils but is open to changing it.

Ms. Plummer asked if the building was designed by an architect. Mr. Hiss replied that some parts were his idea and others were recommended by an architect.

Ms. Plummer added that the main entrance should be more decorative and the paint samples presented should be reviewed. The trim should be lighter or the wall should be darker – the samples presented are too close in color. Ms. Plummer also recommends that the petitioner present paint samples on white paper.

Mr. Hiss indicated that he is unfamiliar with the ARC process and compiled the data presented in a short amount of time.

Ms. Troy and Mr. O'Donnell agreed that the front entrance should be more decorative.

Mr. Lytle asked if the building will have air conditioning units. Mr. Hiss replied that it will not. He will be installing ceiling fans in the building.

The Commissioners reviewed the proposed barrel roof extension and entry way.

Mr. Petersen recommends more detail on the brick work on the wall at the cornices. Mr. Petersen also suggests adding a parapit wall to the front facade that extends up to the roof.

Mr. Coath asked the Commissioners if they are okay with the rectangular front facade and a barrel roof. All Commissioners replied that they are okay with it.

Ms. Troy asked the petitioner if they have reviewed other window patterns. Mr. Hiss replied that they have reviewed other patterns and found this to be the best solution - adding that the more they experimented with different patterns, the more the building looked too modern.

Mr. O'Donnell requested public comment. None were voiced.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners if they believe they have enough information to approve this petition tonight.

Mr. Hiss added that he would really like approval tonight so that they may begin construction. He will come back to the ARC with details of the entry way at a later date.

Mr. Hiss stated that he is concerned about the joining of a parapit wall to the barrel roof.

Mr. Coath questioned the 30 inch projection of the roof, stating that it will cast a harsh shadow and call too much attention to the area. Mr. Coath recommends removing the 30 inch overhang.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioner to review the proposed extension of the barrel roof and reach a consensus.

Mr. Ward is okay with the barrel roof if the petitioner adds some ornamentation to the front facade.

Mr. Lytle recommends the barrel roof.

Mr. Coath finds the barrel roof acceptable with the removal of the 30 inch overhang. He also suggests dressing up the front facade with brick ornamentation. Mr. Coath also suggests not changing the depth of the windows.

Mr. O'Donnell is okay with the barrel roof and believes a parapit wall will look good with the roof.

Mr. Petersen believes a parapit wall could be successful; however, he has not seen an arched roof that works well. He would like to see more details of the roof to make sure it would work. Mr. Petersen added that the front entrance needs to be addressed and more defined.

Ms. Plummer is okay with either a barrel roof or parapit wall.

Ms. Troy likes expressing the barrel roof to the front; however, is concerned with the brick meeting the roof. Ms. Troy recommends that the petitioner enhance the entryway with a canopy and add ornamentation to the brick pattern on the front facade.

Mr. Wallace stated that staff believed this petition was preliminary; however, the petitioner would like to begin construction. Mr. Wallace stated that the front facade details are presented in the plans; however, if that information is not sufficient, then this meeting can be a preliminary meeting.

Mr. Petersen stated that he believes that they cannot provide approval today as there are still a lot of design issues to address.

After review of the barrel roof and 30 inch overhang on the front facade, all Commissioners agreed that the extension of the barrel roof is acceptable; however, the 30 inch overhang is not.

Mr. Wallace asked the ARC to clarify specific conditions if they are approving this petition tonight.

Mr. Petersen stated that they require more detail on the front facade and entryway in order to provide specific conditions.

Mr. Lytle clarified that they have agreed that extending the barrel roof to the front is acceptable; however, details of the cornice and trim are required. Mr. Lytle added that the ARC recommends adding a canopy to the entryway on the side entrance and those details should be brought back for approval. **Mr. Lytle also recommends the parapit.**

Ms. Plummer added that the wall colors presented are not acceptable.

Mr. Coath stated that the new brick presented today is acceptable.

Mr. Petersen added that he would like to see a photo of an existing wall with the new brick proposed.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners for consensus on the new brick proposed - four (4) of the seven (7) Commissioners find the proposed brick acceptable. The new proposed brick is acceptable.

Mr. O'Donnell asked for consensus on the proposed wall colors. After review, all Commissioners agreed that the proposed wall colors are not acceptable.

Mr. O'Donnell requested consensus on the proposed doors and windows. After review, the Commissioners agreed that the petitioner shall present color samples in light and medium bronze to the ARC for review and approval.

Mr. Hiss asked the Commissioners if the proposed back doors are acceptable as the current garage door is rotted from water damage. Mr. Petersen recommends that the double steel doors proposed be galvanized. The ARC finds the doors proposed for the back (east elevation) are acceptable.

The landscaping plans were reviewed. Mr. O'Donnell requested consensus on the proposed landscaping. The Commissioners agreed that the petitioner shall remove the spruce trees on the front facade and work with the Village Forester on the landscaping.

After discussion and review, the ARC agreed to approve case ARC 07-21 with the following conditions:

- The petitioner may begin construction of the extension of the barrel vault roof all the way to the front wall.
- The 30 inch overhang and trim method is not acceptable.
- The petitioner shall bring details of the front facade back to the ARC for approval.
- The petitioner shall bring front window lintel details back to the ARC for approval. A four (4) inch limestone or a soldier course of brick would be acceptable, and should extend past the sides of the windows.
- The petitioner shall bring details of the side (main) entrance door for ARC approval. The ARC recommends that the petitioner explore using a little barrel canopy over the entryway. The shed roof extension presented is not acceptable.
- The petitioner shall bring true color catalog cuts or samples, in light and medium bronze, of the door/window frame material to the ARC for approval.
- The green colors presented for the walls and trim are not acceptable.
- The petitioner shall explore color combinations taking into consideration the frame color, and bring samples to the ARC for approval.
- The petitioner shall remove the spruce trees on the front facade and replace with smaller landscaping materials.
- The petitioner shall review the landscaping plans with the Village Forester.
- The landscaping plans shall be brought back to the ARC for approval.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve ARC 07-21 with the above conditions. Mr. Ward seconded the motion.

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

Ms. Karen Plummer excused herself from the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

**ARC 07-22: Simonik New SFR, 625 S. Cook (Historic) Preliminary
Petitioner: Jim Simonik, Owner**

The applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction of a non-contributing house and detached garage in the H Historic Preservation Overlay District. The property is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential.

Mr. Jim Simonik of J.P. Renovations, Inc. at 137 North Avenue presented the petition. Mr. Simonik reviewed the plans for the proposed new home, and reviewed another home built in Barrington on Washington. Mr. Simonik is requesting to build a 4,400 square foot home on the subject property. Mr. Simonik distributed a notebook (notebook #2) to the ARC and staff in response to staff's recommendations.

Mr. O'Donnell opened the discussion to the Commissioners.

Mr. Ward stated that the roof lines are acceptable; however, the stone facade on the front should be removed. Mr. Ward believes that facade could be a challenge on Cook Street. Mr. Ward added that he likes the right side facade of the home.

Mr. Ward questioned the double turrets stated that this would be the only home with two turrets in the Village. He recommends that the petitioner review other options for the second turret.

Mr. Simonik replied that only one turret can be seen from the street. He is concerned that eliminating one turret would require removing both of them.

Let the record note that the left elevation presented in the plans should be the "south" elevation.

Mr. Lytle reviewed the west elevation and noted that the left side soffit on the gable does not align with the turret. Mr. Lytle added that he does not recommend the stone setting on wood underneath the window (water table ledge).

Mr. Simonik replied that it is only 1 inch thick; however, he is open to using a limestone water table ledge.

Mr. Lytle questioned the style of the home adding that it is a mix of shingle style and Tudor style. Mr. Lytle added that the window material should not be aluminum clad as the historic district requires all wood windows.

Mr. Simonik replied that he understands that wood windows must be used. He asked the ARC what style is recommended – traditional double hung or cottage-style double hung?

Mr. Wallace asked the petitioner to clarify the difference. Mr. Simonik replied that traditional double hung windows have the sash in the center, while cottage-style double hung windows have the sash higher up (not centered).

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners to review the massing and scale of the proposed home.

Mr. Coath stated that the roof pitch on the north elevation is not an historic feature. Typically, he does not like to see roof pitch changes. It is acceptable to create a flat roof at the top in order to maintain the roof pitch.

Mr. Coath reviewed the stone veneer on the front facade. If the petitioner is using a stone veneer, it must be four (4) inches thick. Mr. Coath added that traditionally, the mass of the home would be done in the substantial material while less of the home would be in the other material. However, because the petitioner is proposing the stone veneer only on the gabled facade, the home can be viewed as a newer home and not historically appropriate.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the home. Mr. Petersen stated his concerns: what is the style of the home; the massing and scale of the home is not appropriate for the streetscape; one side of the house is bungalow style and the other side is "McMansion"; the whole style of the house does not look appropriate for the Village; the proposed turret is not a turret but a bay with a peak; and lastly, the home looks like it is designed around the floor plan.

Mr. Simonik stated that he found the existing house and built the floor plan to the house.

Mr. Petersen added that there is too much going on and there is not one single style to the house. He believes that because of the floor plan and size, the house is forced into various styles.

Mr. Simonik stated that the home is an English shingle country style house. Mr. Petersen replied that style is not appropriate for the Village.

Mr. O'Donnell added that he agrees with Mr. Petersen in that the home does not look like it belongs in the Village and the massing is inappropriate.

Ms. Troy reviewed the plans. Ms. Troy stated that the proposed house lends itself towards a shingle-style home but having irregular forms makes it look like a variety of styles. She believes that the massing is too big. Ms. Troy added that if the home is truly a shingle style, then the petitioner should eliminate many of the other elements. She also questions if a shingle style home is appropriate for the Village.

Mr. Simonik stated to the ARC that he truly does not want to start at square one again with the petition and would like guidance from the Commissioners.

Mr. O'Donnell requested consensus from the Commissioners on the massing, scale and style of the home as this style of home does not exist in the historic district.

Mr. Simonik pointed out a photo of a home on page 9D of book number one (1). Mr. Simonik stated that this home is in the area and he used it for guidance.

Mr. O'Donnell believes that the home in photo 9D is appropriate for the Village of Barrington; however, the home presented tonight is not.

Mr. Petersen recommends that the petitioner have his architect drive through the Historic District and pick an appropriate style of home and develop it. Driving through the historic district will provide the architect with the character of the district.

Mr. Simonik stated that he provided a photo from a magazine to staff (Brooke Zurek) and reviewed other options with her. Mr. Simonik stated that staff said this home would be okay to present to the ARC.

Mr. Wallace replied. That is not an accurate characterization of what happened and Ms. Zurek is not here to defend herself. Mr. Wallace added that he does not like the way Mr. Simonik is characterizing the conversation with Brooke Zurek and staff, and believes it is inaccurate. Mr. Wallace stated that he is in disagreement with Mr. Simonik's statement of his discussions with staff and Ms. Zurek.

Mr. O'Donnell asked the Commissioners for consensus on the massing, scale and style of the proposed house.

Mr. Ward stated that, relative to the photos of the neighbors' homes, the massing of the house seems too large. Mr. Lytle stated that it is difficult to tell the massing as the form requires work. Mr. Coath and Mr. O'Donnell agree that the form of the house requires work. Mr. Petersen agrees that the form requires work. Ms. Troy added that the petitioner should be more sensitive to the street elevation and the form requires work.

Mr. Petersen added that too big is not an issue; however, the scale presented to the street is. Mr. Petersen offered two (2) recommendations: (1) down play the scale on the streetscape; and (2) pick an appropriate style home and develop it.

Mr. Ward added that he understands the petitioner has spent a lot of time and money on the plans presented, and recommends working with those plans.

Mr. Petersen recommends that the petitioner have the architect come to the next meeting.

Mr. Simonik asked if he should come with three or four possibilities and let the ARC pick the appropriate style.

Mr. Petersen replied that is acceptable; however, he can come with an appropriate style and elevations to his next ARC meeting.

Mr. Wallace asked the petitioner to contact staff with an achievable schedule of re-submittal and they will add the petition to a future ARC meeting.

Mr. Simonik stated that he will contact Brooke Zurek with that information, and will work with the architect and bring a style to the ARC for approval. He added that he is surprised that the ARC finds the massing of the home too large.

In summary, the ARC found that the massing, scale and style of the proposed home is not acceptable. The ARC encouraged the petitioner to downplay the scale of the home on the streetscape; and to select an appropriate style home for the area and develop it.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from July 26, 2007 were reviewed. Two corrections were noted on page three.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve the July 26, 2007 meeting minutes with the noted corrections. Mr. Coath seconded the motion.

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

Other Business

Linda Grubb letter:

The ARC reviewed the letter sent by Linda Grubb regarding case ARC 07-10 (Cameron Garage). Mr. Petersen located a website for the cementitious siding with a ½" butt as required by the ARC. Mr. Wallace will provide the website to Ms. Grubb. The ARC reaffirmed the importance of the ½" butt requirement for cementitious siding.

August 30, 2007 Special Meeting:

Mr. Wallace confirmed the attendees for the August 30, 2007 special meeting. Mr. Ward, Ms. Plummer, Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Coath will be in attendance. Ms. Troy and Mr. Petersen will not be in attendance. Mr. Lytle will let Mr. Wallace know if he will be in attendance.

Days Inn

Mr. Wallace presented the proposed new railing for the Days Inn. They are replacing the railing because the existing one does not meet code requirements. The ARC agreed that the railing does not need ARC review as long as it meets code.

308 W. Main Street

Mr. Wallace presented the ARC with photos of 308 W. Main Street. The retailer is looking to add more display to the streetscape due to business needs. The retailer is requesting input from staff and the ARC to determine what is allowed as this is a historic structure. Mr. Wallace recommends adding a bay window on the front; however, would like the ARC to provide recommendations. The ARC agreed that a bay window on the front, which can go down to the foundation, is acceptable.

Adjournment

Mr. Petersen moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.
Aye: Troy, 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