

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF ST. CHARLES**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2017**  
**COMMITTEE ROOM**

**Members Present:** Chairman Norris, Smunt, Kessler, Pretz, Krahenbuhl

**Members Absent:** Gibson, Malay

**Also Present:** Russell Colby, Planning Division Manager  
Ellen Johnson, Planner

---

**1. Call to order**

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

**2. Roll call**

Ms. Johnson called roll with five members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**4. Presentation of minutes of the August 2, 2017 meeting**

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the August 2, 2017 meeting.**

**5. COA: 201 W. Main St. (façade repair)**

Item was moved to 10b. to accommodate the arrival of the representative.

**6. COA: 11 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. (windows)**

Item was moved to 10c. to accommodate the arrival of the representative.

**7. COA: 101 E. Main St. (signs)**

Gordon Simic, the petitioner, was present. The proposal is for the installation of two wall signs and an awning for Gordy's Quickmart. The existing awning frame will be recovered using Sunbrella material and will be located in the same general location the previous tenant had it in. The wall signage will consist of two LED channel letter signs.

Dr. Smunt expressed concerned over the signage on the awning stating it consists of an excessive amount of advertising for what would be required to identify the business. He did not support further advertising on the awning. Mr. Pretz felt it looked too busy and preferred a more minimalistic design. Mr. Kessler also agreed the awning contained too much information and suggested putting the additional advertisement on window signage as long as it met code requirements.

Mr. Krahenbuhl asked how the LED lighting will be put in place. Mr. Simic said the new signage will be placed in the same location, and installed in the same way the previous tenant had it in, to avoid any harm being done to the building.

Mr. Simic asked if they could use either dark red or black for the awning. The Commissioners were fine with either option.

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA with the condition that only four advertising categories be used along the bottom of the awning; two on the E. Main St. side, one on the angle side, and one on the Riverside Ave. side.**

**8. Façade Improvement Grant: 7 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave.**

A request was made to move this item to 10d. There were no objections.

**9. Façade Improvement Grant: 201 Chestnut Ave.**

Laura Rice, the petitioner, was present.

Mr. Colby said the request is for a Residential Façade Improvement Grant to repair and repaint a contributing structure.

Ms. Rice explained the work she is planning to do. She stated she is going to have the front door evaluated to determine if it is the original door. If it is, she will most likely provide a secondary estimate for the additional work that needs to be done to repair the door.

Dr. Smunt stated he is not that familiar with the structure and the scope of work, and would prefer to do an on-site visit before making a decision on this request. He said the project might require using a siding restoration specialist versus a painter.

Mr. Pretz explained this is the first residential grant request received by the Commission and an on-site visit would help them determine what part of the work would be considered maintenance and what part would be preservation.

Mr. Krahenbuhl said the work being done seems justified and would most likely be eligible for the grant.

Commissioners questioned whether or not the garage would qualify. Dr. Smunt said the description states “ineligible is a free-standing new construction building”. The garage falls under this description. It is not original to the property.

Ms. Rice said she is going to get another quote for the paint job and door work, and would be happy to resubmit the information. Chairman Norris asked if there would be any issues if they tabled the discussion until the next meeting. Ms. Rice expressed concern about getting close to the weather changing in September. Mr. Pretz said the additional time would allow her to get some more quotes and also allow the Commission to do the on-site visit. If she finds a painter by then, he suggested asking the painter to come to the next meeting. Dr. Smunt said the condition of the siding will influence whether or not the paint will hold.

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Krahenbuhl with a unanimous voice vote to table the discussion until the September 6, 2017 meeting.**

**10. Preliminary Review: 306 W. Main St.**

Item was moved to 10e.

**b. COA: 201 W. Main St. (façade repair)**

John Maninger, the petitioner, was present.

Mr. Maninger explained the repairs that need to be done. He is going to tear out the brick and have the area behind it inspected for structural damage. If there is no damage, he will flash and clean the brick.

Mr. Colby explained it is not certain yet if the scope of work will require a permit or not. It will depend on the results of the inspection.

Dr. Smunt said if they find any structural damage, they will need to return with alternate plans.

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

**c. COA: 11 S. 2nd Ave. (windows)**

Paul Saha, the representative, was present.

Mr. Saha presented a revised quote for steel replica windows. The Commissioners were supportive of the window material.

Mr. Saha said they are considering using a dark bronze or black color. Dr. Smunt said the bronze color would be the best choice. Mr. Krahenbuhl agreed the bronze would be a good match to the brick and would be closest to the look they currently have.

Chairman Norris asked for a manufacturer's cut sheet. Mr. Saha said once they sign a contract, the company will do shop drawings and he will provide the Commission with a copy of those. He described the materials as follows:

- 23 aluminum windows made by Universal Window & Door
- Custom sized to match the openings; duplicating the existing windows
- 1 ½ inch sash width
- ¾ inch muntins dividing lights
- Fixed windows

Mr. Colby reminded the Commission about the French door replacement on the north side included in the original COA request. Mr. Saha was not certain if they would use the same company for the door. He expressed concern over cost and asked if they could install a door similar to the existing one. Dr. Smunt said he would prefer they choose something complimentary to the windows. If cost becomes an issue, Mr. Saha can return with a new proposal.

**A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA for the replacement windows as presented.**

**d. Façade Improvement Grant: 7 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave.**

Paul Saha, the petitioner, was present.

Mr. Saha explained the project involves completely stripping, repairing, and painting the windows and doors. They expect to do a full reconstruction of the wood sills. The hardware will remain and the glazing will be repaired. Tuck-pointing of all the brick will also be done. Mr. Colby advised they have a quote for the masonry work, but not the window work.

Mr. Krahenbuhl asked if the Commission was considering the entire scope of work as restoration. Dr. Smunt felt it went beyond routine maintenance. Mr. Pretz felt it was all considered restoration. Mr. Kessler said it met two of the restoration requirements for 50% reimbursement; repair or restoration of historic features and extensive restoration/repair of historic masonry materials.

Dr. Smunt suggested they stipulate the color of the mortar must match the existing.

**A motion was made by Mr. Krahenbuhl and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve a Façade Improvement Grant for 7 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. with a condition that the mortar color and strength match existing.**

**e. Preliminary Review: 306 W. Main St.**

Mr. Colby advised the petitioner is conducting some further investigation and review of the costs due to some concerns over structural issues. They are questioning taking out the upper brick portion to replace the lintel. There are some suspicions about the foundation underneath the two columns which is causing concern about the support for the lintel.

One concept being considered is taking down the upper brick portion and replacing it with some other type of material that is lighter than brick, and then re-doing the entire front of the façade leaving only the two brick columns. They are also considering opening up the lower storefront to match the design of the upper portion. Dr. Smunt asked if the idea to open up the storefront was to give it more of a traditional, commercial storefront look. Mr. Colby confirmed that is correct.

The Commissioners made the following suggestions/comments:

- Fine with renovating the overall façade and keeping the existing entrance.
- Prefer the top parapet stay the same.
- Sign panel should remain on any new configuration of the elevation, but suggested using decorative brackets that would hold in the upper corners across the front.
- Include a storefront cornice below the sign panel.
- Windows should come up to the bottom of storefront corner or there should be a transom set of windows.

Chairman Norris said he would need to see further evidence of the structural issues associated with the columns.

Mr. Colby will advise the petitioner the Commission is open to their concept, but will need further information on the support of the columns.

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

**a. Architectural Survey requirements**

There were no updates.

**b. Lamp Factory**

Mr. Kessler said he read an article about the former St. Charles lamp factory being turned into townhouses. Mr. Pretz explained the Concept Plan presented before the Plan Commission was to eliminate all the single structure buildings that are attached to it and preserve the two/three story portions for conversion into townhomes. There would be five additional townhomes added to the east portion of the property for a total of 14 units.

**c. 314 Indiana St.**

Dr. Smunt said he was asked if they would be allowed to rebuild and if the Commission would be involved in the decision making process. He suggested they contact Mr. Colby. Mr. Colby said he has not heard from anyone. He noted the lot is very small and would most likely require some variances in order to rebuild. Dr. Smunt asked if they could use the existing foundation to build up. Mr. Colby said if the house was destroyed more than 50% of the value, they cannot reconstruct without meeting the current codes.

**d. Architecture Seminar**

Mr. Kessler mentioned he attended an architecture seminar in Chicago. He will provide further details at a future meeting.

**12. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**13. Public Comment**

Mr. Krahenbuhl advised the St. Charles History Museum is having an event on October 12<sup>th</sup> that involves visiting downtown eateries and discovering their historical ties.

**14. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.