

*Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Special Minutes Summary*

Date: April 3, 2014

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

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

Staff Members: Jean Emerick  
Natalie Ossowski  
Jennifer Tennant  
Greg Summers

*Call to Order*

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

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

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

*Chairperson's Remarks*

Chairperson O'Donnell announced the order of proceedings.

# # # # #

*Old Business*

ARC 13-07: 604 S. Cook Street – Public Hearing

Owner: Jim Carlstrom  
121 Joan Drive

Barrington, IL 60010

**Builder:** Jim Carlstrom  
121 Joan Drive  
Barrington, IL 60010

Ms. Tennant explained that ARC 13-07 went to the Village Board on appeal, but since there was no formal denial of the plan that the petitioner wants to build, it had to be remanded back to the ARC to make formal findings of fact on an approval or denial of that elevation. She said that Mr. Jim Bateman, the Village Attorney, will give an overview of what the Commission is tasked with at this meeting.

Mr. Bateman gave a short presentation regarding Commission Procedures. The Petitioner filed an appeal with the Board. The Board's review of the appeal is on the record. The Board has to uphold the decision of the ARC unless the Board determines that the decision of the ARC is not supported by findings of fact which are based upon the applicable standards. There has to be a record, the minutes and the recording, and there needs to be findings of fact that support the motion. There were no findings of fact to support the motion.

Chairperson O'Donnell said he understands that the Commission approved the first set of plans, but did not act on the plans that the petitioner wanted. He understands that the Commission needs to act on the plans that are being presented tonight.

Mr. Bateman said yes, they need to act on the plans that the petitioner wants to go forward with. They need to do a findings of fact as it relates to the standards of review.

Chairperson O'Donnell said the Commission approved a set of plans. The petitioner has a design change, so they will be poling the Commission.

Ms. Tennant said this will be treated like a final detail.

Attorney Bateman said it is important that they make a record, so that if it is appealed, they have a decision on the record. The record matters. They will look only at the record for an appeal.

Mr. Steve Klumpp, architect for Mr. Carlstrom, said there was confusion about the approval. They had presented the other plans for comparison purposes. He said Jim Carlstrom's letter explained that the approval has caused hardship for him of more than \$25,000.

Chairperson O'Donnell stated when you have to rebuild something, it adds to the costs.

Mr. Klumpp explained that while he and Mr. Carlstrom were out-of-town for spring break, the carpenter worked on plans there were not approved. There was a misunderstanding.

Ms. Tennant said that they should have had only the approved plans on site.

Mr. Klumpp said there was confusion because Mr. Carlstrom was out-of-town. They also believe that not all of the Commissioners had a chance to speak to their opinion.

Commissioner Kozak asked if any of the Commissioner did not express their opinion at the last meeting. All Commissioner thought they had. Mr. Kozak said he went out to the site and it was built according to other plans, not those approved. The north side cannot be seen from the street, so he is not concerned with it. The south side can be seen from the street. The detail is not consistent with anything in the Village.

Mr. Klumpp explained that the detail was not finished.

Commissioner Kozak said the roof deck is flush with the clipped gable. It is not what is shown on what they presented. It is not consistent with anything in the Village. It is the same issue as when it was brought to the Commission originally. The roof is the issue.

Chairperson O'Donnell said the plane will be broken by the thickness of the brick. The roof structure is very poorly thought out.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said he has as much objection with the north as with the south. He is responding to the over-imposing nature of the dormer. It is not a type of dormer you would find in the Historic District. The dormer should be a secondary feature. He thought they had compromised; the Commission asked for the structure to be brought in on both ends.

Mr. Klumpp said it is more of a second floor addition rather than a dormer. They can create a different roof line.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said the approved drawing mitigated some serious issues with the building that they had talked about. The proposed plan goes back to the original problem.

Chairperson O'Donnell reminded the Commissioners that the Staff agrees with the Petitioner. Staff is referring the house as a Cape Cod. He does not think it is a Cape Cod. He is concerned that architects on the Commission have a different opinion. He accepts and respects the architects' expert opinions.

Ms. Tennant said at the preliminary meeting, they discussed that it had Cape Cod influences. What the Commission is reviewing this on is strictly against the standards.

Chairperson O'Donnell said it is not black and white when it is art. It does not look like an architect was involved. The Village approved a plan and then it was built differently.

Ms. Tennant said the Village has placed a stop work order, and the Petitioner has been fined.

Commissioner Kozak, addressing the attorney, said the rear has always been secondary. The second set of standards for this is composition of principle facades. He could not find a definition for principle façades.

Mr. Bateman said he noticed that, too. Façade is plural, so it may mean that more than one facade can be considered. Four elevations or four facades.

Chairperson O'Donnell said they still have a standard even when it is in the back.

Commissioner Goshe said she has not been out to the site. She thinks the roof structure affects the south and the north facades more than it does the rear. People will not notice it looking at it from the rear. It is the massing and not the style.

Commissioner Kozak showed a photo of the house as it is right now.

Mr. Klumpp said they can realign the roof so there is a separation, push it back about a foot, enough to see a shadow line.

Commissioner Kozak thinks that would be acceptable.

Commissioner Geissler said with the history of this project, how can they confirm the result.

Ms. Tennant said they will have to provide a revised elevation for ARC to review and approve or deny. If the ARC approves the revised elevation, the Petitioner will also need to obtain a revised building permit. They will not be able to start work until they have the plan approved by the Building Department.

Mr. Klumpp asked if there was a way to expedite the project.

Mr. Bateman said they will have to come back to the ARC. We need to see something concrete. He asked if Mr. Klumpp had the authority from his client to make the proposal.

Mr. Klumpp answered that he thought he did.

Mr. Bateman said for the sake of continuity, he asked Mr. Klumpp to describe how they will make the changes.

Commissioner Kozak said he would like to make sure that in the drawing that is brought back, they incorporate all of the other changes and conditions of the approved set of plans.

Mr. Summers said that this is similar to what happened at the prior meeting, because they are not asking for a vote on the drawings that were submitted tonight. There will be nothing that can be appealed. The stop work order will remain in place until the vote can be taken.

Mr. Klumpp indicated that he understood that an appeal was not possible without a vote from the Commission.

Commissioner Kozak asked that the petitioner show no mullions on the windows on the next set of plans submitted.

Chairperson O'Donnell asked if staff can wait to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness until the minutes are approved.

Ms. Tennant said that depending on the ARC meeting schedule, that could create a problem and a delay for people trying to get their permits. A building permit cannot be issued until the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued. She said that she drafts the Certificate of Appropriateness from her notes and from the draft minutes.

There was no public available for comment.

#### Approval of Minutes

*February 27, 2014*

Commissioner Kozak made a motion to approve the February 27, 2014 meeting minutes, as amended, Commissioner Geissler seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Commissioner Goshe suggested that drawings and plans be dated or have a unique identifier.

Ms. Tennant said the process tonight has nothing to do with the petitioner's claiming economic hardship. The Village received the letter from Mr. Carlstrom this morning, and Staff found out yesterday that the petitioner had started work on the unapproved plans.

#### Other Business

Mr. Bateman wanted to discuss the mechanics of findings of fact. This petitioner presented one plan and then another. If they did not get a vote on the plans they wanted to build, it was their fault. They did not exhaust their administrative remedies which has created a bad record. There has to be findings of fact from the recommending body to the Village Board. The ARC process is written into the Zoning Ordinance. There must be findings of fact and they must relate to the record. He suggests that the Commission break down the staff report sentence by sentence and determine if they believe the findings of the staff report. The motion could be approval based on the findings of fact that are set forth in the staff report. Specifics are important. The ARC can either adopt staff's finding of fact in the motion or create their own findings of fact if they do not agree with staff's recommendations.

Ms. Tennant said they are going to be amending the Zoning Ordinance to define principle façade. She asked Mr. Bateman if it will affect the interpretation of these standards.

Mr. Bateman said yes, it will affect the meaning of the standards.

Commissioner Geissler asked if the word "deny" is to become part of the vernacular, to not just approve but also deny.

Ms. Tennant said the Commission can move to approve or deny.

Mr. Bateman said the Commission can reach a point where they ask the petitioner if they are prepared to accept the conditions, if they are not, the Commission should move to deny it. If they deny, they do not have to capture every standard.

Vice-Chairperson Coath said this process should help to defend the Commission's decision if another appeal to the Village Board is made.

Planners Report

No report.

Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the Board, a motion was duly made by Commissioner Geissler and seconded by Commissioner Plummer to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 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:

APR 12 2014