

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021  
Zoom/ Council Committee Room**

**Members Present:** Pretz, Kessler, Malay, Norris, Dickerson

**Members Absent:** Smunt, Rice

**Also Present:** Russell Colby, Asst. Director of Community and Economic Development  
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner

**1. Call to order**

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

**2. Roll call**

Ms. Hitzemann called roll with 5 members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

**4. Presentation of the minutes of the June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting**

**A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Ms. Dickerson with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting.**

**5. Presentation of the minutes of the June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting**

**A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting. Ms. Dickerson abstained.**

**6. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications**

**a. 112 S 3<sup>rd</sup> St.**

The applicant proposed to replace the current wood windows and wood scale siding with vinyl windows and siding. The new style of window will not have grids like the current windows. Mr. Pretz felt that the grids in the windows are an architectural element of the home and should be maintained. The Commission did not feel comfortable voting on the COA until a site visit could be conducted to determine the quality of the windows and siding.

**A motion was made by Mr. Norris and seconded by Ms. Dickerson with a unanimous voice vote to table the COA until a site visit could be conducted.**

**b. 104 S 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave.**

Proposed is to replace the current windows with aluminum windows. The applicant stated that the new windows will be as close to the old windows in style as reasonably possible. The Commission stressed to the applicant the importance of the windows matching in size and style. They felt comfortable with the window material since some of the other windows on the home were already replaced.

**A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Norris with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA with a condition that the new window will match the current window and frame thickness as much as possible.**

**c. 12 S. 1<sup>st</sup> St.**

Proposed is to seasonally install two canvas covers on the outdoor container bar. One cover contains the Alter logo and the other has text relating to the Alter Brand.

**A motion was made Ms. Dickerson and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a 4-1 vote to approve the COA as presented. Mr. Kessler voted no.**

**7. Grant Applications**

None.

**8. Landmark Applications**

None.

**9. Other Commission Business**

**a. Special Use: Alter Brewing**

Alter Brewing is requesting a Special Use to install two canvas covers on their container bar. One canvas will have the Alter Logo and the other will have text relating to the Alter Brand. Canvas Covers with graphics/ text are not currently permitted under the First St. PUD.

Overall, the Commissioners expressed approval of the covers. Some members felt that the text on the one cover was too busy and would prefer for both covers to have the logo instead. Mr. Pretz asked about the timeframe on how long the covers will be up. The applicant stated that the covers and the tent go up around the same time. Mr. Norris asked about whether the covers could be backlit. Ms. Hitzemann said that the covers are only lit when someone is using the container, but noted that the light could be left on to give the illuminated appearance. She stated that there could be a condition made to limit how long the light in the container bar could be on. Mr. Kessler asked if other business around town have been permitted extra signage beyond the Zoning Ordinance. Ms.

Hitzemann said that no business has requested signs like the ones being proposed, but additional signage is often granted with the use of PUDs.

A recommendation was made by Ms. Dickerson and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a 4-1 vote approve the Special Use with a condition that the time frame for the covers correlate to the 180-day time frame required for the tent. Mr. Kessler opposed.

**b. Concept Plan Review: River East Apartments**

Curt and Conrad Hurst are proposing to construct a 5-story mixed-use building with commercial on the first floor and residential on the upper floors. The Hurst's stated the building's architecture is intended to be reflective of older architecture and not the modern style. The proposed building will be brick with a slanted roof.

Commissioner Norris noted that the scale and proportion of the building is something that will need to be reviewed and reworked throughout the project. He also said that the height is concerning, since the surrounding buildings are only 1-2 stories. Since the building isn't closer to First St. or Hotel Baker, the building is getting too much attention. Commissioner Norris would prefer that the building height conform to the current zoning and not grant a 13ft height variance. Mr. Norris also felt that the parking layout would be too tight for residents and the public.

Commissioner Pretz agreed with Mr. Norris that the building should remain within the height permitted by the ordinance, based on the sightlines and surrounding properties. He suggested that maybe the building could be stepped back to present a more pedestrian friendly street view. He noted that because there are no tall structures around the site, there is nothing for this building to blend into/ with. He said he would protect the park and ensure that there is proper greenspace on the site, since it is valuable to the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Pretz stated that the architecture doesn't "wow" him and it isn't close to what he would like for the property.

Curt Hurst noted that it did not "wow" him either, but it is hard to show the architecture with a rendering. Conrad Hurst noted that the architecture is the one point in the project where they can be the most flexible.

Commissioner Kessler was also concerned with the height and scale of the structure. He felt that the architecture was better than what was originally proposed, but it could still use some work.

Commissioner Dickerson said the architecture was an improvement from the last plan presented. She liked the inspiration architecture, but felt that their building doesn't look the same. She suggested to add more green space around the building to give a more park like appeal. She said that a smaller building that didn't extend the whole length and width of the lot would be preferred.

Chairman Malay said that she was concerned with the height in relation to the neighborhood. She noted that they are going from a one-story building to a 5-story building and this change would impact the view of the neighbors, the congestion of the area and in general what the residents will be looking at. She suggested sticking with the 4-story building permitted by Code. She also noted that she would like to see better architecture. She stated that the mansard roof style is not currently a style in the downtown area and should not be used on this building. Ms. Malay also recommended incorporating some of the architecture found in the downtown and surrounding area to tie this building into what is currently in downtown. She also noted that this site is the gateway to the downtown, so it really needs to be wonderful architecture. Finally, Chairman Malay said that the one thing you try to do in historic neighborhoods is keep your parks and open space. She felt that the greatest effort should be made to keep the park and open space.

All commissioners felt that the current building was not architecturally or historically worthy of being saved.

Curt Hurst noted that they want to save the building because it is built very well and tearing it down would increase the construction costs.

Several members of the public spoke at the meeting. Their comments were predominantly centered around several topics. The first topic was the closure of Indiana Street. The residents stated that the street sees a lot of traffic, especially school bus traffic, and the closure would cause a lot of congestion. Another concern that residents had was in regards to the impact of new development on an already over strained sewer system and the cost to the public of increasing the system. Height was another major concern for the residents and they would like to see a building that is capped at two stories. They would also like the building to have architecture similar to the rest of the surrounding buildings and the park and greenspace preserved. One member of the public suggested a step back building approach so that all 4 sides are not the same height, noting that the side facing the neighborhood could be shorter. Finally, residents were concerned about the parking required vs. available on the site. They felt that the increased use of the building will negatively impact the neighborhood parking situation, noting that parking within the neighborhood is an issue in the area now and this will only make it worse.

**c. Architectural Surveys for Approval**

The Commission tabled the item until the next meeting.

**b. Architectural Surveys for Review**

The Commission tabled the item until the next meeting.

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

**a. 314 Walnut St.**

Ms. Lamasky presented a plan to have a chair lift off of the front porch. She noted that the chair lift will block the front window a little, but the street view of the porch will remain unchanged. The lift will extend out to the driveway between the two Tri-City Health buildings. The Commissioners expressed approval of the plan and requested for Ms. Lamansky to submit a COA for the next meeting.

**11. Additional Business and Observations from Commissioners or Staff**

**12. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.**

**13. Public Comment**

**14. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.