

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

Date: December 13, 2007

Time: 7 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
Mike Ward, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Brooke Zurek, Planner
Michael Hren, Zoning Coordinator

Call to Order

Mr. O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:07 P.M.

Roll call noted the following: Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson, present; Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, absent; Mimi Troy, present; Steve Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Mike Ward, present; Patrick Lytle, absent. Mr. Coath arrived at 7:11 P.M.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings, noting that ARC 07-28 and 07-29 had been postponed to a later date. Ms. Zurek confirmed this.

Old Business

ARC 07-23: Hough-Main Phase I, 132-138 W. Station (Non-Historic) Final Meeting
Petitioner: Mr. James Wallace, Deputy Village Manager, 200 S. Hough Street, Barrington, IL

Mr. Wallace said that the Village is requesting a recommendation for a Certificate of Approval of Phase I of the Hough-Main development. This includes the clearing of the properties at 132 and 138 West Station Street and the relocation of the Kilgoblin Storm Sewer.

Mr. O'Donnell asked when the buildings would be razed.

Mr. Wallace replied that there is not a finalized redevelopment agreement with the developer, so there is no need to etch the date in stone.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if there is not an agreement with the developer, is there a chance that the footprint could get smaller at some point.

Mr. Wallace stated that there is a very limited chance for that, as the Village is attempting to acquire the Chuck Hines property, which takes the footprint west.

Mr. O'Donnell noted his concern that the buildings would be torn down and there would be three years of cleared lot on the site.

Ms. Troy asked if the properties has been rezoned and removed from the Historic District.

Mr. Wallace stated yes, that historic review no longer applies. These are 2 houses in the B-4 district. This second petition is start of the Plan Development. The Village seeks a Certificate of Approval for phase I of the Plan Development.

Ms. Plummer moved to approve the petition.

Mr. O'Donnell noted that if the ARC does not approve, this will happen anyway.

Mr. Ward asked for clarification regarding the petition.

Ms. Zurek clarified that the removal of the houses is a part of the petition.

Mr. Ward felt that there should be a proposal as to what would replace the houses.

Mr. Petersen noted that the buildings sit abandoned. Mr. Wallace confirmed this.

Mr. Petersen asked if the Village would rather tear down the buildings rather than maintain them.

Mr. Wallace said yes. The Village's purpose is to have no impediments to the development process.

Ms. Troy asked if the sewer project was a definite project.

With regard to the Kilgoblin Storm Sewer, Mr. Wallace could not say that it would occur for certain, but felt that it was likely.

Ms. Plummer asked, with regard to the houses, is the Village seeking a buyer.

Mr. Wallace said yes. Since the redevelopment agreement is not yet finalized, there is no certainty that there will be an agreement. The final shape and extent of this project will take more months to work out. The Village's intent is to leave the buildings up for as long as possible, in order to avoid re-grading as well as exposing hazardous materials. The Village seeks the ability to relocate the structures in a manner that will not cause a minute's delay once a development agreement is reached.

Mr. Ward asked if the moving of the Kilgoblin Storm Sewer would only happen with a redevelopment agreement.

Mr. Wallace said that the original intent was for it to be moved regardless of the developer agreement, but at this point in time he feels that the moving of the sewer would hinge on a developer agreement, yes.

Mr. Petersen suggested making a developer agreement a condition of the proposal.

Ms. Zurek pointed out that the Village could sell the buildings to a party interested in restoring them before such time as a developer agreement was reached.

Ms. Plummer withdrew her motion.

Mr. Petersen asked if the eyesore was acceptable provided that the homes were saved.

The form of the condition was discussed.

Mr. Petersen suggested that disapproving the eyesore unless the homes are preserved is contradictory.

Mr. Ward said that they were attempting to protect the structures, and that his concern was not the open lot. The ARC could also tie the moving of the houses in any case to an executed redevelopment agreement.

Mr. Petersen asked why the ARC was suggesting a condition.

Mr. Coath noted that there was the concern that the houses could be torn down and nothing put in their place.

Mr. Petersen pointed out that this was the case even if the buildings were sold and preserved.

Mr. O'Donnell did not want there to be any impediment to someone preserving the houses.

Mr. Coath said that his first concern was to save the houses, whether on that lot or otherwise.

The viability of moving the houses was discussed.

Mr. Petersen asked what is to prevent other developers from removing houses from the Historic District.

Mr. Wallace stated that the Village feels that there are unique circumstances for this case. This area, on the edge of the H District is in a specifically designated redevelopment district. This is also an area with active negotiations and TIF funding involved. This would be a very difficult situation to ever match by any other developer. He also noted that the Plan Commission voiced the same concern. It is staff's and the Village Board's opinion that this is an arguably unique situation.

Mr. O'Donnell noted the ARC's options. No conditions to the approval, an executed redevelopment agreement as a condition to the approval of the demolition, or the combination of conditions requiring a redevelopment agreement and the provision that the houses can be moved if sold for preservation purposes.

Mr. Coath asked what the Village is doing to encourage moving the houses.

Mr. Wallace said that the Village is selling the houses for \$1, and are willing to grant Zoning Exceptions if necessary.

Mr. Coath suggested putting more money backing the sale of the houses.

Mr. Wallace said that a wider financial commitment has been discussed with the Board. The Board said it would prefer to spend its redevelopment dollars on the Catlow structure.

Mr. O'Donnell called for a poll of the commissioners' stances on the necessity of a condition.

Ms. Troy wanted the single condition of the redevelopment agreement.

Mr. Ward wanted the dual condition of redevelopment agreement, with the provision that the houses being moved for preservation would be allowed.

Mr. Coath wanted the single condition of the redevelopment agreement.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed with Mr. Coath.

Mr. Petersen felt that there should be no conditions, as the ARC's responsibility for this property is to the future of the site, since it is not in the Historic District. He agrees that a developer is more likely to sign an agreement with a clear site than otherwise, making the site available for realistic development sooner.

Ms. Plummer agreed with Mr. Ward, as her goal is to preserve the houses.

The ramifications of the conditions were discussed. Several commissioners changed their stances, ultimately having a majority agree that a signed development agreement would be a condition of the removal of the houses except in the event that they are sold for redevelopment purposes.

Mr. Ward moved to approve the petition, with the condition that a signed development agreement was necessary in the case of tearing down the homes. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Mr. Coath asked about the viability of selling the houses.

Mr. Wallace pointed out that narrow lots would be the most economic use of this, as the Village has noted that they would consider Zoning Exceptions.

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

New Business

None.

Other Business

The ARC reviewed the proposed schedule for the ARC in 2008. *Ms. Plummer moved to approve the schedule. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried.*

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from November 8, 2007 were reviewed. No corrections were noted. *Ms. Plummer moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all ayes. Motion carried.* Mr. O'Donnell abstained from voting due to his absence from the meeting in question.

Adjournment

Ms. Plummer moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. Voice vote was in favor 5-1, Mr. Petersen dissenting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Robert Hren
Zoning Coordinator

Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission