

*Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Minutes Summary*

Date: March 10, 2016

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

In Attendance: Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
April Goshe, Commissioner  
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner  
Joe Coath, Vice-Chairperson

Staff Members: Jennifer Tennant

*Call to Order*

Vice-Chairperson Coath called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

*Chairperson's Remarks*

Vice-Chairperson Coath announced the order of proceedings.

# # # # #

*Old Business*

**ARC 15-09: 238 Coolidge Avenue – Public Hearing**

**Owner/Applicant:** James Carlstrom  
121 Joan Drive  
Barrington, IL 60010

**Architect:** Steve Klumpp  
Ar-K-Teks

300 N. 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Wheeling, IL 60090

The applicant is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition and alterations to a contributing structure and construction of a new noncontributing structure in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Steve Klumpp, project architect, presented the project to the Commission. Mr. Klumpp began by explaining a change from the preliminary plans is the removal of the dormers on the east elevation. Removal was necessary in order to comply with daylight plane.

Mr. Klumpp said another question from Staff was on the proposed siding material. Mr. Carlstrom wants to use hardi-board siding on the addition and wood siding on the original part of the house. The garage door will be wood.

Vice-chairperson Coath stated that it would be best to go through the items listed in the Staff report.

**#1 Explore the original foundation. If the original foundation is present, it must be exposed. If the original foundation is not present, an exposed foundation should be replicated on the original portion of the structure.**

Vice-chairperson Coath asked what they have discovered about the foundation. Mr. Klumpp replied that they have explored the foundation and discovered a parge coat. They are planning on cleaning up and replicating on the east elevation. Mr. Klumpp also explained that they did not find original siding. Under the aluminum is just masonite backing and pine sheathing.

Vice-chairperson Coath asked Staff to verify the absence the original siding. Ms. Tennant stated that Staff will verify.

Vice-chairperson Coath stated the importance of the exposed foundation. It should be exposed on all sides. The foundation is visible on the west side where the porch drops down. Mr. Klumpp said they would make that change.

**#2 The pitch on all dormers must be consistent. The overhangs and trim details on all dormers must also be consistent.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said the pitch had been adjusted. Mr. Klumpp said they were matching the crown.

Vice-chairperson Coath said that it would be the crown on the outer edge. He is concerned that the crown should be continuous on all edges. He said there was a tendency to leave it off in many locations but it should be continued everywhere. You cannot skip trim where gutters are present. Commissioner Lytle agreed and said it would be more obvious with a half round gutter. The cornice is not present on the porch and it should be present on the porch.

The eave detail on sheet A-4 shows the detail is cut-off.

Vice-chairperson Coath said that many people want to skip this detail but it is important to carry it through on all sides. Commissioner Lytle, Commissioner Plummer and Commissioner Goshe all agreed that it should be a condition that the eave/cornice detail is carried through everywhere.

**#3 Carefully consider the location of the second entrance door and wraparound porch configuration per the discussion at the ARC meeting.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said that they have elected not to modify the wraparound porch. He is OK with the design.

Commissioner Lytle said that he cannot believe that you are OK with the design. He really does not like the design and it really feels like the porch wants to be one level.

Commissioner Goshe agreed. It is misleading having a fake front entrance at the front of the house. Commissioner Goshe thinks the porches should be separated.

Mr. Klumpp explained that the circulation would be a real problem if the porch configuration was changed.

Vice-chairperson Coath said the porch design is eccentric but the porch is not historic, it is a modern addition. IT is attempting to connect the old structure to the new structure and he is willing to take a risk on it.

**#4 The shoulders on the chimney should have a 12/12 pitch. & #5 The proposed bay window must be set on a foundation.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said these issues have been addressed.

**#6 The window pattern should reflect the folk/farmhouse style of the original structure. The ARC finds that a one-over-one pattern or a two-over-two pattern is appropriate. The proposed three-over-one is not appropriate.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said they went with the two-over-two pattern and it looks good.

**#7 Explore the existence of original materials. All original exterior material including siding, trim and other original architectural details must be retained and restored rather than replaced. In the event that limited replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced. All original architectural details should be matched on the addition.**

Ms. Tennant said that Staff will conduct an initial inspection. If Staff finds any evidence of original material than a further inspection will be scheduled with the ARC. The Commission indicated that this is acceptable.

Commissioner Plummer questioned whether the addition can be wood or hardi-board. Ms. Tennant replied that hardi-board is acceptable on additions provided it has a 5/8" butt dimension.

Ms. Tennant questioned how they deal with the transition between wood and hardi-board in order to accommodate the thicker material.

The Commissioners indicated that the changes will take place in inside corners so it will be OK.

The Commissioners agreed that they recommend smooth, clear cedar siding but hardi-board is technically permitted.

**#8 Applicable section details, wall sections, chimney detail, porch details and final material selections (including all doors and windows) must be provided as a part of the final submittal.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said the crown must be on the outer edge, a fascia board of some dimension and on the outer most edge of the tipped soffit there is a bed mold there. This detail must be matched. That is going to be typical everywhere and this is not shown on the plans even though it is shown in the photo of the existing house. Mr. Klumpp indicated that they will match it. Vice-chairperson Coath said even if it is not under siding, they need to replicate it because the original house would not have been built without it. All must be matched on the addition.

Commissioner Lytle asked if this would be brought back as a final detail. Vice-chairperson Coath said that this must be a final detail.

The Commissioners discussed the porch column detail and determined that this detail must be revised and brought back as a final detail. The column, neck and lintel cannot all be located in the same plane.. A more in-depth railing detail is also required as a final detail. The porch skirt should be traditional spaced boards not solid, the detail should be 1" x 3" boards with 3/4" spacing between. The porch floor should extend out with a 1-1/8" cove underneath.

Commissioner Lytle stated that the window detail is more correct than the elevations. No picture frame trim and no apron board. The other Commissioners agreed. The dimension of the sill must be clarified.

Commissioner Lytle pointed out several errors in the drawing where the eave detail is not consistent. On the side of the east elevation on the side of the front porch and on the north elevation. This should be corrected.

**#9 Carefully consider the size and scale of the proposed dormers (on the garage). The ARC would also accept the removal of the dormers all together.**

Commissioner Goshe indicated that this comment was satisfied. The garage looks better now.

Commissioner Plummer asked if they should require windows on the north elevation of the garage.

Mr. Klumpp said the garage is only five feet off the property line and there is going to be a six foot fence there as well.

The Commission recommended the addition of one window on the north elevation of the garage.

Ms. Tennant reiterated the following conditions, recommendations and final details:

### **Conditions**

1. An inspection is required to determine if original siding exists. This inspection must be completed prior to the final details meeting so that Staff may report the findings to the ARC. If original siding is present, it must be retained and restored. If original siding is not present, the original structure must be sided with smooth, clear cedar siding. The siding material must be noted on the permit plans.
2. The addition may be sided in cementitious siding with a 5/8" butt dimension or clear, smooth cedar siding. The ARC strongly recommends the use of smooth, clear cedar siding on the addition. The siding material must be noted on the permit plans.
3. The foundation must be exposed on all sides of the original structure.
4. All original trim details must be retained and restored. The crown detail on the outer edge must be matched on all elevations including areas where gutters are present as well as the front porch.
5. All porch materials shall be wood. The porch material must be noted on the permit plans.
6. The eave detail for the rear gable on the addition and the west side of the porch should be revised to match the rest of the house.
7. The window trim/detail should match the section, not the elevations. The apron board on the elevation should be removed.
8. The concrete cap on the recreated "original" chimney should be consistent with the proposed cap on the new chimney.
9. One window should be added to the rear elevation of the garage.

### **Recommendations**

None.

### **Final Details**

1. The applicant must verify additional details that may be masked by the aluminum siding. The ARC expects that there was/is a 1" x 8" fascia board present. This detail along with the visible 2" x 2" bed mold should be matched on the original structure and addition. The plans should be revised to show this detail.
2. Provide an additional porch detail clearly showing the railing and balusters with dimensions.
3. Reconsider the porch column capital, neck and lintel detail. Typically, the neck of the porch column must be in line with the width of the lintel with a wider capital. Provide a revised section detail with clearly labeled dimensions.
4. The porch floor must extend past the porch skirt. A 1-1/8" cove detail should be installed under the porch floor. Provide a revised section detail showing this change.
5. There must be spacing between the boards of the porch skirting. The typical detail is a 3"

- board with ¾" spacing between boards. Provide a revised section detail showing this change.
6. Provide dimensions on the window detail, specifically addressing the sill length.
  7. All final window and door selections for the primary structure and accessory structure must be provided.

Vice-chairperson Coath asked for public comments.

Jerry Cramer, 234 Coolidge Avenue, asked how large the house can be. Ms. Tennant responded the maximum floor area is 4,600 square feet. The proposed is approximately 3,700 square feet not including the detached garage.

Mr. Cramer asked if this was a three level house. Ms. Tennant responded that this is a two level house. Mr. Cramer stated there is a three story house on his street now.

Susan Hartless, 230 Coolidge Avenue, asked how far the porch sticks out in the front. Mr. Klumpp responded that the porch extends 5 feet and is approximately 16 feet from the property line.

Mr. Cramer said he thinks the house goes too far back. Mr. Klumpp explained the house goes back approximately the same as the existing house. The house will be 30 feet from the rear property line.

Ms. Hartless said there was a comment made about dormers on the east side. Mr. Klumpp explained that the dormers on the east side were removed.

Mr. Cramer asked if they were changing the grade because they don't get any water now. Ms. Tennant said they will have to submit a full engineering plan for review by our Village Engineer. Mr. Klumpp said the footprint isn't really that much more than what is there now.

A motion was made by Commissioner Plummer and seconded by Commissioner Goshe for ARC 15-09, to approve of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition and alterations to a contributing structure and construction of a new noncontributing structure in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

*Roll Call Vote: Commission Plummer, yes; Commissioner Kozak, absent; Commissioner Geissler, absent; Commissioner Lytle, yes; Commissioner Goshe, yes; Vice-Chairperson Coath, yes; Chairperson O'Donnell, absent. The vote was 4-0. The motion carried.*

#####

**Old Business**

**ARC 15-18: 208 W. Lake Street – Public Hearing (continued from 2/25/16)**

**Owner:** Don and Jennifer Macdonald  
208 W. Lake Street  
Barrington, IL 60010

**Architect:** Chris Wichman  
135 Park Ave.  
Barrington, IL 60010

The Petitioner is seeking approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to an existing detached garage. The exiting detached garage is a contributing structure in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

Chris Wichman, architect for the project, presented to the Commission. Mr. Wichman explained that they feel they made most of the changes requested. They have decided to move the structure back several feet or leave it in its current location.

Vice-chairperson Coath said they will go through the items from the Staff Report.

**#1 The ARC determined that relocation of the garage is acceptable. However, the structure shall not be disassembled during relocation.**

The Commissioners agreed this was acceptable.

**#2 The ARC determined that a minimum of three (3) original corners of the original structure must be visible.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said it looks like they have a conceptual change and were able to reveal all four corners. The other Commissioner agreed this was acceptable.

**# 3 The roof pitch of the addition must match the roof pitch of the original structure**

Vice-chairperson Coath stated that this item has been addressed.

**#4 All original exterior material including windows, siding, trim and other original architectural details shall be retained and restored rather than replaced. In the event limited replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced. All materials, new and existing, must be clearly noted on the plans.**

Commissioner Plummer stated that this comment was very self-explanatory. Commissioner Lytle said the existing garage is pretty unique. Mr. Wichman said it was their intention to match the original siding on the new addition.

**# 5 The windows removed to accommodate the addition should be reused on the new wall of the addition.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said this item was addressed.

**#6 The architectural style of the addition should mimic the style of the original structure.**

Mr. Wichman said they decided not to leave the addition exposed. His concern is adding gutters in the future that it would be weird looking. Commissioner Lytle said they make gutter hangers specifically for exposed rafters. Commissioner Lytle said it would be better to match the existing garage.

Vice-chairperson Coath said we had this discussion before and our recommendation was to match the detail from the original on the new addition.

Commissioner Lytle said the detail will have to be redrawn. This will have to come back a final detail.

**#7 Final door selections for all service doors as well as the overhead garage door must be provided. All doors must be wood.**

Ms. Tennant stated that she believes the property owner prefers the garage door cut-sheets provided in the submittal rather than the garage doors as drawn.

Vice-chairperson Coath said this discrepancy must be corrected on the drawings.

Commissioner Lytle asked is the existing steel door is permitted. Ms. Tennant said if it is existing it is allowed. If they install a new door, it must be wood. It will be a condition.

**#8 The final submittal must include wall sections and section details for the main components of the addition including the eaves/cornice.**

Vice-chairperson Coath said we already talked about this and we need a new detail.

Vice-chairperson Coath said the dormers may not be appropriate. There is no detail on the drawings. Are they something you would see? The scale is troubling and I don't sense any precedent for something like this unless you can find a great example locally.

Mr. Wichman said they can remove the dormers. Vice-chairperson Coath that would be his suggestion.

Commissioner Goshe said the window muntin pattern on the new windows should match the existing. The other windows have 6 panes per window.

Vice-chairperson Coath said they will be asking for some windows on the rear elevation. They should match the existing.

Vice-chairperson Coath asked for public comment. No public present.

Ms. Tennant reiterated the following conditions, recommendations and final details:

**Conditions**

1. The exposed rafter detail from the original structure must be matched on the addition.
2. The dormers on the addition shall be removed.
3. Two (2) windows shall be added to the rear elevation of the addition.
4. The muntin pattern on all new windows shall match the existing windows.
5. The existing steel service door may be reused. If not reused, a new wood door is required.
6. Original siding shall be retained on the original structure. The material and profile of the original siding must be matched on the addition.
7. All other original materials including windows and trim shall be retained and restored.

**Recommendations**

None.

**Final Details**

1. Revised elevations and revised section detail addressing all of the conditions must be submitted for final details approval. All materials must be clearly labeled on the plans.

A motion was made by Commissioner Plummer and seconded by Commissioner Lytle for ARC 15-18, to approve of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition to a contributing structure in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District.

*Roll Call Vote: Commission Plummer, yes; Commissioner Kozak, absent; Commissioner Geissler, absent; Commissioner Lytle, yes; Commissioner Goshe, yes; Vice-Chairperson Coath, yes; Chairperson O'Donnell, absent. The vote was 4-0. The motion carried.*

#####

**ARC 16-02:                    322 N. Hough Street**

**Owner/Applicant:**        Owner – Village of Barrington  
    Applicant - Monroe Residential Partners

**Architect:**                HKM  
    43 S. Vail Avenue  
    Arlington Heights

The applicant is seeking conceptual feedback on a potential multi-family project proposed for 32 N. Hough Street.

Mike Obloy is one of the developers from Monroe Residential Partners. Mr. Obloy presented several slides showing completed projects in the City of Chicago. Mr. Obloy explained that their target product is 30-80 residential units with amenities such as a clubhouse, fitness center and/or a rooftop

terrace. At this location in Barrington we are planning a high quality product at a market rate and serve a need that hasn't been address for a longtime in this community.

The architect for the project, Mark Hopkins from HKM Architects, presented the conceptual design for the project. Some of the context for the proposed project has been influenced by buildings in Barrington such as the McGonigals building, the Ice House Mall building and the Cycle Werks building. The project is also influenced by old mercantile buildings which have been repurposed.

Mr. Hopkins explained the subject property is at the southwest corner of Liberty Street and Hough Street. There is not a lot of significant context surrounding this property. Whatever we do here will set the pace for future redevelopment in the triangle area. They are proposing an L-shaped apartment building with basement parking with 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units with amenity spaces including a rooftop deck.

Mr. Hopkins said they are imaging this as a three story brick industrial building from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Over the course of time they would have added additions to the rear and eventually an additional floor with lighter weight materials. Now this industrial building has been converted to a residential building with hung balconies. They have tried to address the street by setting the building back approximately 20' and setting the top floor back an additional 35' from the front face of the building.

Commissioner Lytle stated that the proposal is a lot to take in but he likes the story they have created for the building including some of the celebrations of the existing buildings in town. He appreciates the setback of the top level which makes the pedestrian experience more friendly. He isn't sure about coming into town and seeing all the hung balconies but understands that outdoor spaces is a necessary part of a project like this.

Vice-chairperson Coath said he has not thought about what might go on this site so he is a little reserved and would like to think about it. He is concerned about the size but he does like the story of evolution of the building. He would like to think more about the impact of the massing. Relating the front of the building to existing or former buildings in town is an interesting concept. There is no obvious context to me as someone who had lived in town for a long time. The Jewel Tea building may be something worth looking into.

Commissioner Lytle said the rhythm of the bays may be problematic because we don't want vertical repetition that you would see in a suburban apartment complex. There may need to be a front entrance to make the building more honest as an original building. He likes the overall concept. He also said that the use of quality materials will also be very important in this project.

Commissioner Plummer said her main concern is the exposed balconies. If they have to have balconies they will have to be screened. The town will not accept balconies with plastic chairs and other debris visible. There are many different way of doing the screening.

Vice-chairperson Coath said the balconies may be too troublesome to really pull off a great building. It could really be a great repurposed factory building or old school building. You wouldn't normally see this much movement in the façade. Buildings that really do well don't always tote the line of market standards. Really successful buildings inspire people to go beyond those norms.

Mr. Hopkins said that recessed balconies would create even more movement in the façade which wouldn't be compatible with the story they are trying to tell. He agrees they need to work out the balcony issue and screening can definitely be figure out.

Commissioner Lytle said we need to understand the market and that people want outdoor space and try to be supportive of that.

Commissioner Plummer said it may be worth trying something new, different and unique. Think outside the box. We do need rental properties. We need places for the kids who grew up here to come back to and be able to walk to town and walk to the train.

Mr. Obloy said this is the demographic they are trying to program for but this building will also be a draw for the empty nesters.

Mr. Hopkins says they we are trying to tip our hats to history but let's not be slave to it and introduce something more hip and modern.

Commissioner Lytle said this market needs this product and he doesn't think we can go much more modern that what they are proposing.

Commissioner Plummer asked is they would be required to do any step backs of the higher stories.

Ms. Tennant said they are proposing to set the top floor back approximately 35' form the front face of the building.

Commissioner Plummer asked if they explored a U-shaped building. I know it is not as practical because you will lose space.

Mr. Hopkins said it is a small site. The site is 1.1 acres.

Ms. Tennant said at this point they are planning to have the preliminary review on April 14, 2016.

####

Approval of Minutes

February 25, 2016

The February 25, 2016 minutes were unable to be approved because the appropriate commission members were not in attendance.

Planners Report

No Planners Report.

Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the Board, a motion was duly made by Commissioner Plummer and seconded by Commissioner Lytle to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Vice-chairperson Coath declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Tennant  
Assistant Director of Development Services



---

Joe Coath, Vice-Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission

Approval Date:

March 9, 2017