

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3rd, 2021
Zoom/ Council Committee Room**

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

Members Absent:

Also Present: Russel Colby, Community and Economic Assistant Director
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 six members present. There was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Presentation of the minutes of the January 20th, 2021 meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the January 20th, 2021 meeting.

5. Landmark Applications

a. 511 Illinois Ave.

The Commission discussed the landmark application. Dr. Smunt noted that the foundation was likely limestone with concrete over it. He asked that the foundation material be changed on the application to reflect the proper limestone material.

A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a unanimous voice vote to schedule a public hearing for the landmark.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications

a. 50 S. First Street

Proposed is to move the previously approved Coldwell Banker sign to a new location on the building. The Commission previously reviewed this item and approved for the sign to

be placed above the first story windows. However, after the applicant received further direction from the building owner on the overall sign master plan for the building, they are now proposing to move the sign towards the center of the building above the second story windows. The sign itself is to remain the same.

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

b. 1 Illinois St.

The applicant is proposing to change the style of the patio roof to accommodate a new sign. The Commission reviewed this item at the last meeting, but tabled the COA due to the lack of detail on the drawings. The applicant and contractor have revised the plans to provide more detail.

The applicant also proposed possible light options for the pillars on the patio. The Commission recommended a style of light that is vertical to highlight the pillars.

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

c. 1 E Main St.

Proposed is to completely renovate the entire façade of the building. The applicant, Curt Hurst, provided 4 options of potential facades that addressed some of the comments the Commission made at the last meeting. The applicant's architect walked through all the options and the changes made on each one. Chairman Norris noted concerns regarding the balconies extending over land that is not owned by the applicant. The applicant replied that he did own the property in question, it just wasn't reflected in the Alta survey yet. The Commissioners each went around and expressed their thoughts on the provided options.

Mr. Pretz wished to see spandrel glass used instead of stucco. He also felt that the new railing on the north elevation was better than what was proposed before, but thought that all the railing systems and window systems should be lighter.

Dr. Smunt noted that most structures in order to survive need to undergo changes over time. He stated that option 4 had the most minimal impact on the original structure, because the railings disappear. He also noted that with the lighter railings you can see more of the skeleton of the structure and preferred spandrel glass to stucco. Overall, Dr. Smunt liked option 4. He said he preferred the simplified look of the front elevation and decreased emphases of the lighter railings, noting that the lighter colors allowed for the original elements to be more visible. Dr. Smunt said he wanted to keep an open mind to the new use and allow for some change and redevelopment to occur here, which would still allow the structure to be Mid-Century Modern, but also give it new life. Like Mr.

Pretz, he also thought that a white or aluminum windows would look best. Dr. Smunt concluded that if the applicant went with option 4, they would have his support.

Ms. Malay agreed with Dr. Smunt that for the building to continue to have life, the Commission needs to allow it to adapt to a reuse. Ms. Malay also preferred option 4. She noted at the shown scale, the railings look they disappear, but in reality, that will not be the case. She did note that the white railings will be a lot softer than the black. She asked the applicant about glass for the railings. The applicant said that after some time glass begins to weather and it won't look good. She reiterated that option 4 is the way to go, but would also prefer glass to stucco. Echoing Dr. Smunt and Mr. Pretz, she preferred softer tones on the window frames would look better and would match closer to the current building.

Ms. Mann stated that the residential units on the second floor are what cause the need for the second-floor balconies, which she felt was the biggest issue on this structure. She said that the balconies threaten the current Mid-Century Modern style and suggested that maybe residential wasn't the proper use for the second floor. She proposed potential office use instead. She also expressed that she was concerned with the lack of scrutiny being applied to the proposed changes. She noted that the applicant hasn't honored the design of the building and she doesn't believe they are honoring the building. Ms. Mann held up a book produced by the History Museum that showed 1 E. Main St. on the cover and noted that it was significant that they chose this building for the cover and its not just any other building. She felt that none of these plans were acceptable for this building, saying that the designs are destroying the top floor of the building for two apartments.

Mr. Kessler also liked Option 4 and spandrel glass. He agreed with Ms. Malay and Dr. Smunt that the building should be allowed to adapt with the times to allow for a continued use of life for the building.

The Commission walked through the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation and how the proposed project/ design related to each specific criterion.

Ms. Malay asked if the applicant would be willing to lighten up the framework. The applicant said it would take away from the style of what they are trying to accomplish with the look of the building. He also stated that architecture from the same period of this building used darker frames, it just so happened that this building did not. He felt the darker frames would still match the style of the period.

A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a 4-1 roll call vote to approve the COA with the conditions that the applicant move forward with Option 4 and that spandrel glass will be used on the north elevation and tower, instead of stucco. Ms. Mann voted no.

7. Grant Applications

None.

8. Other Commission Business

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

10. Additional Business and Observations from Commissioners or Staff

11. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting February 17th, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.

12. Public Comment

None.

13. Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.