Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary – Special Meeting

Date: November 19, 2018 – Special Meeting

Time: 7:00 p.m.

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

In Attendance: Tim Renaud, Commissioner
Patrick Lytle, Commissioner
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Crystal DiDomenico, Commissioner
Joe Coath, Vice-Chairperson
Marty O'Donnell, Chairperson

Staff Member: Jennifer Tennant

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

Roll call noted the following: Karen Plummer, present; Patrick Lytle, present; Kevin Connolly, absent; Crystal DiDomenico, present; Tim Renaud, arrives late; 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 18-15: **343-345 W. Main Street- Public Hearing continued from 11/15/18**

Owner: GG Investment Properties, LLC (Dan Kuesis), 1250 Bank Drive, Schaumburg, IL 60173

Applicant: Stephen Klumpp – Ar-K-Teks Unlimited, 300 N. 11th Street, Wheeling, IL 60090
Architect: Stephen Klumpp – Ar-K-Teks Unlimited, 300 N. 11th Street, Wheeling, IL 60090

The Petitioner is seeking approval of a Certificate of Approval for the construction of a new multi-tenant commercial building and related site improvements (landscaping, lighting, signage, drainage, etc.) in the B-1 General Business District. All plans are subject to a final building, engineering and zoning review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Stephen Klumpp, the architect, approaches the podium and informs the Commissioner of all modifications that have be done. For instance, he has switched the light fixtures as requested to be rounder to match the goose neck fixtures on the building, is proposing to add dormers on both the front and back, wants utilize aluminum clad for the exterior windows and have them all be fixed windows.

After Mr. Klumpp is done, Chairperson O'Donnell asks Commissioner Renaud if the light fixtures have been modified to ease his concern.

Commissioner Renaud said yes.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks if anyone in the Commission has any questions.

Vice-Chairperson Coath asks if the gutters return to the face of the building because the drawing does not clarify this.

Mr. Klumpp says yes, they go around the dog ear and tie back in to the face of the building.

Vice-Chairperson Coath asks Mr. Klumpp to specify on the type of crown that will be utilized.

Mr. Klumpp says it will be a standard crown molding.

Vice-Chairperson Coath suggests the crown be four and a quarter inches otherwise it will be too small.

Mr. Klumpp states there is no issue with this request. .

Ms. Tennant asks Vice-Chairperson Coath if 3" molding on the dormers is acceptable.

Vice-Chairperson Coath suggests to Mr. Klumpp to utilize the same crown and size to treat the dormers so it appears consistent.

Vice-Chairperson Coath recommends dropping the little roofs that are on the returns on the dog ear edges and flash them at a lower pitch instead.

Mr. Klumpp says he will make the adjustments.

Moving forward, Vice-Chairperson Coath makes another recommendation to utilize a sill detail instead of picture frame for the windows.

For clarification, Chairperson O'Donnell asks Vice-Chairperson Coath if he suggesting a header as well.

Vice-Chairperson Coath says no, just the sill.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks Ms. Tennant is Staff's concern of the windows were addressed.

Ms. Tennant says yes.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks the Commissioners if they believe a final detail review meeting for the windows, color, and sill details is necessary.

The Commissioners reply yes.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks those in the audience and the Commissioners if they have any questions or concerns.

No one from the public comments.

Commissioner Plummer motioned and Commissioner Ltyle seconded the approval of a Certificate of Approval for the construction of a new multi-tenant commercial building and related site improvements with the conditions and recommendations stated for ARC 18-15.

Roll Call Vote: Commission Plummer, yes; Commissioner Lytle, yes; Commissioner Connolly, absent; Commissioner DiDomenico, yes; Commissioner Renaud, absent; Vice-Chairperson Coath, yes; Chairperson O'Donnell, yes. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

# # # # # #

<u>New Business</u>

ARC 18-16: **421 E Main Street- Preliminary Review**

Owner: First Church of Christ Scientist, 421 S. Main Street, Barrington, IL 600103

Applicant: Jamison Ruggles, 413 Lageschulte Street, Barrington, IL 60010

Architect: Studio Talo Architecture, Inc., 1234 Sherman Avenue, Evanston, IL 60202

The Petitioner is seeking approval of a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations including a one-story addition to an existing structure in the B-5 Village Center East District. All plans are subject to

a final building, engineering and zoning review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Before the meeting begins, Chairperson O'Donnell respectfully reminds the petitioner and those in the audience that a preliminary review is comparable to friends talking amongst each other.

Ms. Tennant notes the goal for tonight's preliminary review is to have an informal discussion on ideas, work through the designs presented, and come up with a conclusion where both the Commission and the congregation/architect are satisfied.

Mr. Thomas Ahleman, the architect, starts by mentioning he only had two business days to prepare the revisions and for the ARC meeting. The main subjects of concern from the Conceptual Review meeting were the geometry, style, and material, so what is being presented on those subjects are what the congregation members felt comfortable changing on short notice.

As Mr. Ahleman is elaborating on the adjustments made, he focuses largely on explaining what has been revised on the steeple, the praying hands, because during the Conceptual Review some members of the ARC expressed their dislike and concern with the initial design. During the Conceptual Review it was hard for some members to comprehend the geometry, so to simplify it Mr. Ahleman directs the Commissioners to the 3-D model and explains the design in more detail.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks Mr. Ahleman if the material change is the only difference.

Mr. Ahleman says yes.

Commissioner Lytle asks Mr. Ahleman why stucco and brick is being suggested.

Mr. Ahleman explains that although they are trying to adapt the design to be more to the Commissioners liking, the congregation still wants it to reflect the integrity of the initial design.
Mr. Ahleman continues elaborating on the geometry of the steeple by mentioning how at first a flat roof for the addition was suggested, but it seemed uninspiring. Therefore, a pitched roof was decided because it will allow for sunlight to shine into the addition.

Vice-Chairperson Coath states his appreciation for the changes made, but express his uncertainty of the demising wall because it seems that no effort was made on integrating the structures together. He continues by elaborating on the sophistication of the existing structure and how a demising wall does not do the building justice.

Mr. Ahleman explains his intent on meeting the two structures, and this way is the only way he can think of doing it without making the addition and the existing building appear as two separate building.

Vice-Chairperson Coath expresses his understanding, but states there are ways to integrate the two buildings without having a demising wall.

Vice-Chairperson Coath continues by asking Mr. Ahleman if he will be developing the edge of the cornice where the water will be coming down from.

Mr. Ahleman explains two potential options for gutters to handle the water.

Vice-Chairperson Coath tells Mr. Ahleman to ensure he is handling the edges in a way that addresses the history of the building.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks Vice-Chairperson Coath if a parapet wall is out of the question?

Vice-Chairperson Coath says no.

After discussing the wall, Commissioner Plummer asks if they now can deliberate on the overall image of the building.

The Commissioners agree.

Commissioner Plummer directs the Commissioners to a comment made from Staff during the Conceptual Review that needs to be addressed. She summarizes how Staff has stated how the brick added to the lower section of the building is not enough to traditionalize and integrate the modern design with the character of Main Street.

Based on the comment from Staff read by Commissioner Plummer, Commissioner Lytle asks if Mr. Ahleman if they could utilize all brick rather than mixed materials.

Commissioner Plummer says this will not be sufficient to address the issues because the comment from Staff is referring to the overall design, not just the materials.

Chairperson O'Donnell directs the Commissioners to another comment from Staff that indicates their concern about how the steeple may negatively impact the set back of the buildings from Main Street to Wool Street.

Ms. Tennant explains that last week Staff conducted an internal technical where they studied the plan commission submittal. Based on the results, Staff was not as concerned about the setback of the building as they are with the lack of local architectural context. Also, based on the location of the addition there are some engineering and grading challenges on this site that are partially addressed by the location of the addition.

Commissioner DiDomenico states her appreciation in the change of material, but like Commissioner Plummer does not think the design will fit in with the local architecture of Main Street.

Commissioner Renaud views it differently. He says there are still some perseverations to the building and since the congregation members are desiring to attract the younger generation coming into the Village of Barrington, this design being proposed incorporates the modern and classical.

Moving forward, Chairperson O'Donnell says they should continue to talk about the praying hand steeple because it is a topic the commission is split on.

Ms. Tennant says the reason she asked Mr. Ahleman to bring the three dimensional model was to allow him the opportunity to better explain the concept of the design.

Mr. Ahleman says major changes were not made to the steeple design, so asks the Commissioner for comments on how he can make the steeple fit in with the local architecture of Main Street.

Commissioner DiDomenico asks if besides the addition of the stucco if the design of the steeple the same.

Mr. Ahleman says yes.

For clarification Commissioner Lytle asks the Commissioners what was the problem with the steeple.

Commissioner Plummer says her reasoning is that there is no clear indication, beside the word Christian, that the building is a religious institution. The large panels overwhelm the building and the question of what does a person actually see when they look at the design arises. Some may see praying hands, but others may see a slab of metal. Overall, the design is very subjective and does not fit the character of the downtown area.

Ms. Tennant says the comments and design standards are not subjective as there are standard established by Ordinance which all projects are reviewed against.

Commissioner Plummer states, in her opinion, it is not compatible.

Commissioner Lytle asks Ms. Tennant if she can differentiate the Zoning Districts of where the building is and of the downtown area in general.

Mr. Ahleman asks for the Commissioners to look at the context of the building across the street which is a 1957 mid-century modern building as well as the brick modern apartment building next door.

Commissioner Lytle asks Ms. Tennant if the design of the church needs to be a traditional architecture even if it is not in the downtown area.

Ms. Tennant says yes because it needs to be compatible with the surrounding buildings of B-4 and B-5 Zoning Districts per the Zoning Ordinance.

Based on what Ms. Tennant stated, Chairperson O'Donnell acknowledges how the flat roof without a traditional cornice would not meet the requirement, but if need be, the Commissioner can override this requirement.

Vice-Chairperson Coath suggests developing a cornice.

Moving on, Chairperson O'Donnell asks if there are questions with the footprint.

Commissioner Lytle replies he is fine with it.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks Commissioner DiDomenico for her thoughts on the footprint.

Commissioner DiDomenico says she would like it more if it can be made to appear orthogonal in a traditional sense.

Commissioner Renaud says he is indifferent.

Commissioner Lytle questions Commissioner Plummer on why she does not like the modern design, and suggests giving Mr. Ahleman directions on what he can do to change her mind.

Commissioner Plummer replies it is the architect's responsibility to do that. The ARC Commissioners are here to give feedback not design it.

Ms. Tennant says based on what has been said, the comments from the Commission are identical from the Conceptual Review and tells Mr. Ahleman that the Commissioner are looking for him to make suggestions on what can be done to address their comments.

Mr. Ahleman says he feels he has already done this.

Chairperson O'Donnell asks Ms. Tennant why Mr. Ahleman only had two day to prepare for the ARC meeting.

Ms. Tennant tells the Commissioner that the Church has a projected timeline for their whole approval processes, they elected to come to the Conceptual Review despite the quick turnaround time needed to stay on their initial timeline.

After further discussion on the subject of compatibility, Ms. Tennant asks Mr. Ahleman if there was any consideration given to matching the existing building.

Mr. Ahleman explains his reasoning by elaborating how what he has designed does respect the exiting building and will make it better.

Vice-Chairperson Coath explains there are ways of colonizing the new addition to accommodate the existing building.

Mr. Ahleman says he will take Vice-Chairperson Coath comments into consideration.

Chairperson O'Donnell opens up the meeting for the audience to make comment.

Mr. Todd Sholeen approaches the podium. Mr. Sholeen begins by saying he does not understand what the Commissioners who oppose of the design are looking for when they talk about traditional because

the concept of traditional may vary based on the person. He references some building in the area that were allowed to be constructed, but, in his opinion, do not meet the traditional look the Commission is mentioning. In general, he and the congregations are unsure of what the word "traditional style" means and what the Commission is looking for.

Ms. Jamie Ruggles approaches and gives a brief introduction. Ms. Ruggles starts by agreeing with Mr. Sholeen comments. By putting classical and traditional in a box ahead of wanting the town to grow is nebulous because it is very difficult to define what that looks like. The congregation needs that vertical element so they have a feature that defines the Church. Based on how these meetings have gone, the congregation members feel they may not proceed with the project because they have not received the proper direction or encouragement from the Commission.

After Ms. Ruggles is finished, Chairperson O'Donnell asks if anyone else would like to address the Commission, no one does.

Chairperson O'Donnell informs Mr. Ahleman and the congregation members that although he does not have many issues with the proposal, there are Commissioners that have issues that exceed the subject of material, which was the only item changed since the Conceptual Review. For that reason, giving a clear direction on how to proceed at this time is difficult.

Ms. Tenant says one thing that can be discussed and given a clear indication on is if it is acceptable to use mixed materials.

Ms. Ruggles asks if one material is used would that make it traditional.

Ms. Tennant says the material is a major aspect of it, but even with changing it to have one material , that would not be the only change needs to make the building more traditional.

The Commissioners discuss this issue further, and are split, therefore the Commission moves forward and discusses the steeple.

Before the Commissioners are able to deliberate on the steeple, Mr. Joe Kirsch approaches the podium. Mr. Kirsch says based on what has been said, for him, it seems like no matter how many modern steeple designs are presented those who are opposed to it will not be satisfied. Thus, asks the Commissioners who oppose the design to give guidance on what they would like to see.

As the Commissioner continue this discussion with Mr. Kirsch, Mr. Ahleman steps in and asks the Commission where Commissioner Connolly is.

Ms. Tennant says it is not necessary for all seven Commissioner to be present for the meeting to proceed. The minimum is four Commissioner in order for the meeting to continue.

Moving forward, Commissioner Lytle asks the Commissioners if making the parapet a clean cut would help change their perspectives.

Mr. Ahleman asks Commissioner Lytle for clarification on what he in regarding.

Commissioner Lytle explains how it was mentioned of the parapet, sometimes referred to as the plinth block, being clean cut.

Mr. Ahleman states there are three option that can be done. The first, is create a gap between the new and the old building. Second, have a flat roof so the existing shed can go down and land on the flat roof and lastly, to create the plinth block. But based on what Vice-Chairperson Coath has been saying, he has the impression that he needs to go back to the drawing board.

Commissioner Lytle asks the Commissioners if Mr. Ahleman made the roof squarer instead of pitched would those who oppose to the design consider accepting it.

Vice-Chairperson Coath replies only if there was greater incorporation of the existing building.

Commissioner Lytle follows up by asking Vice-Chairperson Coath if he would accept not incorporating and instead have the plinth block be the end result.

Vice-Chairperson Coath implies he would not be satisfied with that option and informs Commissioner Lytle and Mr. Ahleman that the opportunity to incorporate the building is available.

From what Vice-Chairperson Coath said, Mr. Ahleman summarizes that from his point of view when he looks at the building he sees a dwelling with a flat roof, that is modern, and three doors with no windows.

Before the Commissioner can answer, Ms. Diane Macham approaches to speak and asks if she can give her thoughts.

Ms. Macham presents the Commissioners a picture, on her phone, of what the building actually looks like in hopes of showing the Commissioners the point of view of the congregation members when they see this building and provides a brief history of the building and the church.

Mr. David Backman approaches the podium. Mr. Backman provides a summary of his education and a history of what makes the Village of Barrington appealing and stand out compared the surrounding Villages. He states that although it is important to make building compatible with one another, the buildings are not what define the Village of Barrington, it is the people.

Ms. Tennant states that the comments from this meeting and the Conceptual Review are identical.

Mr. Ahleman reiterates what Ms. Tennant has mentioned and asks what the chances of approval are if they modify the geometry to be more orthogonal and change the steeple so it is not a metal panel.

A poll is taken to answer this question, the results are the following:

- Commissioner Lytle: Yes

- Commissioner Plummer: No
- Commissioner Renaud: Yes
- Vice-Chairperson Coath: No
- Chairperson O'Donnell: Yes
- Commissioner DiDomenico: No

After the poll, Mr. Ahleman states he does not intend to change the low slope of the roof that pitches up on the east because it will give light for the Sunday school, and with that being said, does that change any members perspective

Commissioner Lytle says that is a reason why the Commissioner are struggling to agree and suggests to attempt to make it look more traditional.

The other Commissioner agree with Commissioner Lytle comment.

Mr. Sholeen approaches the podium again and addresses the Commissioner by informing them of the congregation working on this project for three years, so he does not appreciate the misconception of the Commissioners thinking they rushed through this project. Mr. Sholeen directs his attention to Vice-Chairperson Coath and states he does understand the comments being made by him.

Vice-Chairperson Coath indicates that he believes that Mr. Ahleman understands where his comments are coming from.

Mr. Ahleman informs Mr. Sholeen and Vice-Chairperson Coath that he sees both perspectives, but does not understand when Vice-Chairperson Coath talks about traditionalism.

Commissioner Plummer asks Ms. Tennant if there is a reason why they have to have this designed pinned down and approved in a certain amount of time.

Ms. Tennant replies there are timing complications involved with the sale of the land, but that the timeline can be amended if that parties agree.

Commissioner Plummer follows up her question by asking Ms. Tennant to clarify if she is understanding this correctly where there is no time pressure for the congregation to get an immediate answer.

Ms. Tennant replies there is time pressure once they fully enter into the process. All the meetings line up, so one delay is a delay in every other step. Ms. Tennant recommends another Preliminary Review.

Commissioner Plummer asks Ms. Tennant when Mr. Ahleman and the congregation approached her about this project.

Ms. Tennant says from her recollection she was approached in 2016, but other professionals were involved. Since the beginning of their meetings on this project, Staff's response has been consistent on the need to address the local architectural context.

Commissioner Plummer asks Ms. Tennant if the other professionals were fully explained of the procedure.

Ms. Tennant says yes.

After further discussion on when the congregation approached staff on this project, Mr. Ahleman informs the Commissioner that it cannot be possible to have another sketch done by the 5th of December 2018. Therefore, he asks if he can come to the next ARC meeting, December 13th, 2018 without presenting a package in advance.

The Commissioners agree.

# # # # # #

Approval of Minutes

Planners Report

Other Business

2019 Architectural Review Commission Meeting Schedule:

The Commissioners reviewed 2019 Plan Commission Meeting Schedule. After review, a voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the schedule approved.

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 9:40 p.m. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson O'Donnell declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Esmeralda Nava
Administrative Assistant

Approved: December 13, 2018