

*Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary*

Date: September 12, 2013

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Steve Petersen, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Chris Geissler, Commissioner
April Goshe, Commissioner
Joe Coath, Vice-Chairperson
Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson

Staff Members: Jennifer Tennant, Asst. Dir. Engineering and Building
Jean Emerick, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chairperson O'Donnell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Steve Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Scott Kozak, absent; Chris Geissler, present; April Goshe, present; Vice-Chairperson Joe Coath, present; Chairperson Marty O'Donnell, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Commissioner Petersen recused himself from the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

#

Old Business

ARC 13-16 532 S. Grove Avenue – Final Details

Petitioner: Jane Clement
532 S. Grove Avenue
Barrington, Illinois 60010

Architect: Sarah Petersen
523 South Cook Street
Barrington, IL 60010

The applicant is seeking approval of final details for modifications to the originally approved roofline.

Ms. Sarah Petersen, architect for Ms. Clement, said they decided to make the slope steeper, which will make more room in the addition and will add more headroom in the existing bedroom. She showed one option that raises the plate heights to six feet and matches the slope on the addition to the front of the house. The other option shows raising the plate height to six feet and bringing it all the way across the existing home, bringing the gable across from south to north. The petitioner would prefer to gain the headroom in both bedrooms.

Chairperson O'Donnell distributed comments from Commissioner Kozak. Scheme 3 seems most appropriate to Commissioner Kozak.

Ms. Petersen said that they took off some old siding and the original siding is still in in good shape underneath.

Commissioner Goshe asked how this house compares to those around it.

Ms. Petersen said that it is substantially smaller.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked how much higher it will be.

Ms. Petersen said about 30 inches higher. It will make the bedrooms upstairs much more functional.

Vice Chairperson Coath thinks it is a good solution. He asked about the post capitals.

Ms. Petersen said they are restoring them to what they used to be.

The Commission was in agreement with the A3 design, the gable end extending all the way through the existing roofline and with the condition that the cap on the porch column should be one inch rather than one-half inch.

#####

New Business

ARC 13-19: 145 W. Main Street – Preliminary Review

Petitioner: Village of Barrington
200 S. Hough Street
Barrington, IL 60010

Architect: Johnson & Lasky Architects
523 South Cook Street
Barrington, IL 60010

Commissioner Petersen returned to the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

The applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to a property in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District. The property is zoned B-4 Village Center District and is in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

As part of the restoration and reuse of the John Robertson House, also known as Barrington's White House, at 145 West Main Street, certain exterior modifications, including a rear addition are necessary. The Village is working with Johnson Lasky Architects to develop a restoration plan that maintains the original historic character of the house. The architects have developed two sets of elevations for preliminary consideration.

Ms. Meg Kindelin and Walker Johnson of Johnson & Lasky Architects, said they have worked up two schemes. Ms. Kindelin proceeded to talk about the differences between the two schemes. They are accustomed to working with historic buildings. They don't want to interfere with the look of the building, especially from the north.

They intend to keep the front facade intact. On the east elevation, there are changes to the roofline. The porches are in fair condition and will need to be stabilized. The floors are rotted and will need to be replaced. They will approach the side porch similarly. The siding has been painted and is in rough shape. They propose to remove the old siding and replace it with new siding and fresh paint. The kitchen porch was enclosed at one point; they will open that up matching the other two porches on the house. The back addition was put on in the late 1940s or early 1950s and will need to encompass an egress, an elevator, and toilet facilities.

The roof has been burned and modified. The structural engineers recommend they remove and replace the roof for safety sake. They will be returning the dormers to the new design. The two schemes are configured differently on the inside spaces.

The first scheme has a tall and separate looking addition, incorporating the addition under the hip roof. The windows on the front and the east elevations are original and they would like to rehabilitate them. They will be conservative with the historic materials and use as much of the old as possible. In the service areas some of the windows show wear. They will seek historically proportioned windows to get the look they want to replace those windows. The landscape architect has crafted a plan with a spare landscape approach.

Ms. Jennifer Tennant said that the Commission toured the house, with Ms. Beth Raseman giving an overview of the project. The project will go to Plan Commission on October 8th and come back to the ARC for final approval. They are leaning Option B with a few elements from Option A.

Ms. Tennant said that the Commission was given a window plan in their packet illustrating which windows they were planning to restore and which they want to replace. The ideal is to restore as many as they can, especially on the first floor. On the final approval, they are assuming that

some aluminum clad will be approved at that time. The State wants original if possible, especially on the primary facade, but they are comfortable with historically proportioned aluminum clad.

Chairperson O'Donnell said that Commissioner Kozak, who was not in attendance, sent some of his thoughts regarding the project. He prefers Scheme B.

Commissioner Petersen asked why they are removing the siding and replacing it.

Ms. Kindelin said that restoring the old would be costly and labor intensive.

Commissioner Petersen is concerned that it will set a precedent.

Chairperson O'Donnell said that some of the siding is not restorable in his opinion.

Commissioner Petersen said then replace only those sections.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said they have to be consistent in their consideration. The original material can be passed on to future generations.

Commissioner Geissler suggested that some of the commissioners take a look at it.

Ms. Kindelin said they can be more cautious with the existing material.

Ms. Tennant said the historic regulations take precedent over any other guidelines. Whichever is more restrictive is the more prominent regulation.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said he prefers that they scrap and repaint the original siding.

Ms. Raseman said that one of the considerations for replacing the siding is that the old paint is lead-based and would need special handling to remove.

Ms. Kindelin said they can do a mock-up of a section of the house to see if it will be acceptable.

Ms. Raseman said the costs were almost the same. Their concern is about the lead and adhesion of the new paint to the old material after treatment.

Ms. Tennant said they will finish exploring the issue and bring back the preferred option.

Commissioner Goshe left the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

Commissioner Plummer would like to see a couple of the architects examine what percentage needs to be replaced.

Ms. Kindelin said the front façade is the most important. They are under State rehabilitation standards for this building.

Vice-Chairperson Coath asked if they will match the present profile of the roof.

Ms. Kindelin said they are planning to recreate it.

Vice-Chairperson Coath asked if they can map the model exactly.

Ms. Kindelin said a laser is the best way to do it. Their main concern is the look of the house on the outside.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said he is concerned with the chimney; he would not want to see a replication.

Ms. Kindelin said they will rebuild the chimney with the original materials. They need to replace the roof structure. The IHPA is concerned with how the chimney looks from the street.

Chairperson O'Donnell said the chimney will need to look the same as it does now.

Mr. Johnson said that the dormers have compromised the roof structure. He mentioned that the west façade could become more important if the funeral home was no longer there. It could be just as important as the north elevation.

The Commission is in agreement with the roof being replaced.

Vice-Chairperson Coath asked if the roof would be replaced with sawn cedar shingles to match the existing material. Cedar shakes shingles would not be appropriate on this structure.

Mr. Johnson said that the roof material would match the existing.

Commissioner Plummer asked who determined which windows could be maintained and which needed to be replaced.

Ms. Raseman answered that they went through and documented each window.

Ms. Tennant said that the Commission was in agreement and leaning toward Option B. The Commission discussed the roof, the windows, and the chimney. The elevations will be consolidated and will have addressed the issue of the siding before coming back to the Commission with it. The approval will be the conceptual elevation. All final details will be subject to the Commission's approval.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked when the dormers were added to the building.

Ms. Kindelin answered somewhere between 1930 and 1950.

Ms. Tennant asked if they can move forward with the assumption that aluminum clad windows may be accepted in the future.

Commissioner Petersen said that on the back or addition, he has no problem with the aluminum clad window.

Ms. Tennant said on the primary front façade all the original windows will be staying. They will not place wood windows next to aluminum anywhere. They are hoping to use thermal pane glass in the original windows.

Chairperson O'Donnell said the windows will be a final detail. He stated that the State said that it is the appearance that makes the difference. The Commission was in agreement with the State after their presentation.

#####

Planners Report

No report.

Approval of Minutes

June 27, 2013

The Commission was unable to approve the June 27, 2013 minutes as the appropriate commissioners were not in attendance.

August 8, 2013

Commissioner Plummer made a motion to approve the August 8, 2013 meeting minutes, Commissioner Geissler seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

August 22, 2013 – Special Meeting

Commissioner Plummer made a motion to approve the August 22, 2013 meeting minutes, Commissioner Geissler seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

#####

Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the Board, a motion was duly made by Commissioner Plummer and seconded by Commissioner Petersen to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Emerick
Recording Secretary



Chairperson O'Donnell
Architectural Review Commission

Approval Date: OCTOBER 10, 2013