

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2018
COMMITTEE ROOM**

Members Present: Norris, Smunt, Malay, Norris, Kessler, Mann, Pretz, Krahenbuhl

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Development Division Manager
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner

1. Call to order

Chairman Norris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll call

Ms. Hitzemann called roll with seven members present. There was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Mr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a unanimous voice vote to approve the Agenda as presented.

4. Presentation of minutes of the September 19, 2018 meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Krahenbuhl and seconded by Ms. Malay with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2018 meeting.

5. Preliminary Reviews – Open forum for questions or presentation of preliminary concepts to the Commission for feedback

a. 218 Indiana St. (Demo)

The initial inquiry was to demolish the existing building and construct a new building. The Commission conducted a site visit at this property and their overall opinion was that the house had not been maintained and they would be in favor of a demo upon approval of the new construction plans.

6. Landmark Applications

a. 515 Walnut St.

i. Public Hearing

A landmark nomination has been submitted for this structure with landmark designation materials also provided for the Commission to review. At the September 5, 2018 meeting, the Commission requested a summary be added to the application documents about a former owner of the home, Vonnie Mitchell.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to close the 515 Walnut St. Public Hearing.

ii. Landmark Recommendation

Dr. Smunt said to include the original smokehouse that still exists on the property in the resolution.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Pretz to recommend 515 Walnut Street as a Landmark siting all criteria as appropriate.

b. 203 N. 3rd Ave.

i. Public Hearing

The Commission reviewed the nomination on September 5, 2018 and requested the circa date on the application be changed to 1855. Since this home was remodeled, the home no longer contains architectural significance, therefore, the Commission requested to omit the 6th listed criteria under 3E in the Landmark criteria section of the application.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to close the 203 N. 3rd Ave. Public Hearing.

ii. Landmark Recommendation

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Krahenbuhl to recommend 203 N. 3rd Ave. as a Landmark siting all criteria as appropriate.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications

a. 303 N. 3rd Ave (Fence)

Proposed are three separate sections of fence to compliment an existing fence that is located along the north property line. The new section of fence along Chestnut Ave. needs to be

approved by the Commission as well as a matching single door gate. Mr. Pretz home is adjacent to this property and his fence is set one foot in from the lot line. The applicant's interest in trying to close their yard is for their dogs. In order to enclose the yard based on the existing fence, they would like to extend that fence on to Mr. Pretz's property.

Mr. Pretz requested, as a resident of the St. Charles community, if this homeowner could be required to install another gate that would allow Mr. Pretz access to that property. He would prefer not having the eastern neighbor come on to his property with their fence. In order for Mr. Pretz to be able to get to his fence to do any repairs on the outside, the applicant would be required to put another gate in to allow Mr. Pretz appropriate access to their yard without having to seek permission. Mr. Colby said the applicant cannot construct this portion of the fence on Mr. Pretz's property without his permission. All of the neighbors existing fencing do not physically connect with each other. In the application, the applicant displays their fence as being attached to existing fencing. With Commission approval, the plans submitted would have to be modified to demonstrate that a portion of it will be the gate.

Dr. Smunt recommended a 24 inch gate be installed on the property line with one foot on both properties.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Smunt, to approve the COA contingent upon the addition and accessibility of a twenty four inch matching gate with one foot placed on the 214 Chestnut Ave. property and one foot placed on the 303 N. 3rd Ave. property.

Mr. Pretz Abstained. Remaining Commission members all in favor.

b. 117 N. 5th Ave (Soffits & Gutters)

Homeowner Frank Florizoone was unable to attend the meeting, but notified staff that someone came to the house to do the roof insulation. The roofer said that due to the use of closed cell foam, vented soffits were not needed and therefore Frank would not be installing vented soffits. The Commissioners felt that the vented soffits were needed for ventilation to minimize moisture. Chairman Norris questioned whether the foam was carried throughout the top of the ceiling or just in the vent. He speculated that the foam was just sprayed into the vent and closed off airflow, which would cause more problems. He noted that if this was in fact done, it would be against code.

Dr. Smunt noted that the issues found on the soffit were due to a serious moisture problem. He said that this was probably due to blocked rain gutters. He felt that if the fascia board was replaced and new gutters were put on and were flashed properly, the soffit would not need to be replaced.

Ms. Malay noted that this would be a perfect project to apply for the Residential Façade Grant. She said that she would rather have the applicant apply for the grant and have the work done right.

Overall, the Commission felt that the soffits should be properly repaired and not replaced.

A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a unanimous vote to table the COA application until the applicant could be present.

c. 21 S. 4th St. (Addition/Garage)

Two additions to the home are being proposed – an addition of a bedroom to the second floor on the southeast side and a two-car garage on the west side. These additions will require new vinyl windows and 5” vinyl siding. This application was tabled at the September 19, 2018 meeting until the applicant could provide revised plans depicting suggested changes to the garage.

The plan for a two-car garage was reduced in size to a one-car-and-a-half garage, to eliminate the removal of a large walnut tree in the backyard and to adhere to the City’s code to set the garage back another 5 feet. The Commission is in favor of the new garage plan.

Dr. Smunt said there is a grant program that could offset the additional cost of the new siding if the applicant were to consider using “smart siding” – engineered wood products such as Hardy or LP Siding. Mr. Colby explained that a grant application would need to be submitted, come before this Commission for review and if recommended, to City Council for final approval. The grant is a 50/50 matching grant up to a maximum of \$5,000 with an agreement depicting what has been approved. Documentation would be submitted by the applicant showing payment for the work and a reimbursement of 50% would be made. The homeowner will investigate this option further.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA as presented.

d. 207 Walnut Ave (duplex)

This COA Application was presented at the 9/3/18 meeting by Mr. Greg Derrico. The application was tabled and the Commission requested the applicant provide a streetscape of the whole block displaying elevations of all buildings, as well as a plat showing setbacks of all other homes on the block. No new information has been submitted. Mr. Derrico requested that this item be placed back on the agenda for review.

Mr. Derrico stated that he felt the information requested by the Commission was not needed, as it would support their conclusions that the proposed structure would tower over the rest of the buildings on the block. However, he noted that across the street the parking structure also placed a large presence over the buildings, and that further down the street the back of the Arcada has a large tower like brick building. He stated that the proposed drawings fit in with the height and general streetscape feeling of other buildings further down the street. He further stated that the proposed building has a similar front setback to those other buildings on the street. Mr. Derrico expressed that his design fits into the standards and concepts laid out in the Zoning Ordinance for

the CBD-2 District, in which this property is located. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance and the Historic Preservation Ordinance were in conflict with each other. He reiterated that his proposed building is what the future of this block looks like with the zoning allowed.

After clarifying that no new information was presented to the Commission, Chairman Norris referenced the Review Criteria Guidelines found in the Historic Preservation Ordinance. The guidelines are there to guide the Commission to determine whether or not to approve or recommend to the City Council denial of a COA.

Ms. Malay stated that the Zoning Ordinance was amended in 2006, but the Historic Preservation Ordinance was amended after that date and did take into account the current Zoning Ordinance when they revised the historic review criteria.

Chairman Norris explained that the Commission will go through all of the COA review criteria and allow for Commission members to make comments based on the project information provided by the applicant.

The first review guideline is “Significance of a site, structure or building”. Mr. Colby stated that since there is no building on the site, it does not have a rating.

Chairman Norris moved to the second item, 2a “height”. Ms. Malay commented that proposed project appears to tower over all of the neighboring structures and that is why the Commission requested streetviews with elevations of the block. She stated that she could not approve the COA because of the sheer height of the building in relation to its neighbors. Dr. Smunt agreed with Ms. Malay, stating that the height dominates adjacent structures. Mr. Krahenbuhl added that the Commission cannot make decisions based on what the block could look like in the future, but rather base decisions on what is there now.

The Commission moved to item 2b “Proportions of the Front Façade”. Ms. Malay reiterated that the height is much larger than everything around the proposed building, but did not take issue with the width. Dr. Smunt agreed with Ms. Malay, that the height combined with the width of the building is out of proportion of anything else on the block.

Mr. Derrico commented that item 2b does not correspond to the City Zoning Ordinance in any way. He stated that this property is located in the transitional zone between downtown and residential districts, and the Historic Preservation Ordinance does not allow for a transition structure to be placed.

Chairman Norris moved to item 2c “Proportions of Windows and Doors”. Ms. Malay stated that the two garage doors take up more than half of the front façade of the building. She said the garage doors are the front elevation of the building and a garage dominant façade isn’t the ideal appearance in a Historic District. Mr. Krahenbuhl said that the garage doors added to the height of the structure. He noted that if those were taken out, the relationship between the height and the front elevation appearance would be more appropriate with the surrounding structures.

The Commission moved to Item 2d “Relationship of Building Masses and Spaces”. Ms. Malay stated that it was hard to tell how the proposed building relates to masses and spaces on the block, because they did not receive the additional information they requested. Mr. Kessler noted that from what the Commission received, he did not see any information showing that the proposed structure was incompatible.

Mr. Derrico commented that the parking structure across the street from his lot has a larger mass and size than his proposed building. He also stated that the view the parking structure causes should outweigh the view of his proposed front façade garages.

The Commissioners had no issue concerning item 2e “Roof Shapes”, as they were supportive of the roof.

For item 2f “Scale”, the Commission deferred back to their previous comments regarding height and mass. Mr. Derrico commented that there was no compatibility in terms of masses of structures on the block. He stated that the proposed building fits in line with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, his building would be in harmony with the masses of future structures as the neighborhood changes to reflect the standards of the Ordinance.

Dr. Smunt commented on item 2g “Directional Expression” that the new construction would be the dominate vertical and horizontal expression, overpowering the other building expressions of the block. He noted that the vertical expression of the new structure is excessive and that it was hard to determine how large the horizontal expression is compared to other structures on the block, because they were not provided with the additional information they requested.

The Commission had no issues with item 2h “Architectural Details”, stating that they were in favor of the details. Ms. Malay noted that no list of materials was given. Mr. Derrico stated that the materials would be the same as some of the other homes he has built around the City.

The Commission felt the structure was compatible to the neighborhood in terms of architectural style and therefore has no issues with item 2i “New Structure”.

Under review criteria 3 “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation”, the Commission felt that all of the standards, except for 3i, did not apply since the proposed project is new construction. The Commission noted that the size, mass and scale of the new construction were not compatible with the surrounding environment (the other structures on the block).

The Commission noted that no Code Conflicts existed between the City Code and the proposed design.

Mr. Derrico introduced a neighbor of the subject property. Thomas Sieck, owner of the home at 211 Walnut Ave. Mr. Sieck stated that he was in favor of the proposed building. He said that the building would dwarf his house, but he doesn’t believe his house will be there in the future. He believes that when he leaves his home in the next five-six years, another house like the one being proposed will go up. He said that before long, the whole neighborhood will be redeveloped with

similar structures to the one being proposed. Mr. Sieck expressed that the height of the structure would not be as towering as the Commission envisions, because the block is located on a hill. The Commission voiced that they were unable to determine the impact the hill would have on the height of the structure, because Mr. Derrico did not provide them with the elevation drawings they requested. Dr. Smunt asked Mr. Sieck if he felt the proposed building met the Historic Preservation Commission Review Guidelines. Mr. Sieck said he believed the project did not.

Chairman Norris asked Mr. Derrico if he would provide the additional information the Commission was requesting regarding streetscape elevations and site plans of the block; or if he would be willing to revise his design. Mr. Derrico stated that he would not provide additional information and that he would not revise his drawings unless the Commission provided him with a height they would feel comfortable approving. The Commission members expressed that because they were not given the additional elevation information they requested, they would not feel comfortable giving an exact height.

Mr. Derrico said that he was providing a plan that displayed a height the City was allowing with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Kessler asked if there was a height outside of the Historic Ordinance for the property. Mr. Colby clarified that there are two Ordinances that provide building guidelines for this property. The first is the Zoning Ordinance that Mr. Derrico is conforming to with his proposed plans. The second is the Historic Preservation Ordinance, where the conflict with the design occurs.

Mr. Pretz commented that conflict isn't the right word. He said that the design is compliant with one guideline, but there are two guidelines that affect that property.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Smunt and seconded by seconded by Ms. Malay to recommend a COA denial to City Council based on review criteria 2a, 2b, 2f, 2g, and 3i. There was a voice vote of 4-2 for approval to recommend denial, with Mr. Pretz and Mr. Kessler voting against the motion.

8. Grant Applications

No items were submitted.

9. Additional Business and Observation from Commissioners or Staff

a. Administrative Approvals

Ms. Hitzemann informed the Commission that staff has approved five COA Applications administratively since late June.

10. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, October 3, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.

11. Public Comment

a. Heritage Green Fence

Phil Germann attended the meeting on behalf of the Heritage Green HOA. John, the HOA President attended the last meeting. They are looking to put in a fence along 5th Ave between townhomes. Mr. Pretz commented that the Commission would like to see a design plan of what the fence and landscaping would look like. The Commission members expressed overall favor towards a wood-grain pvc fence that matched the earth tones of the townhomes.

b. 303 N. 3rd Ave

Dove Thiselton the applicant for the fence at 303 N. 3rd Ave attended the meeting late and was not there when the application was discussed. The Commission informed her that the application passed, with the condition that she put up a gate. Ms. Thiselton said that she would coordinate with Mr. Pretz about how the fence should be constructed when they started to build.

12. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to adjourn the 10/3/2018 meeting at 8:45 p.m.