

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2017  
COMMITTEE ROOM**

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

**Members Absent:** None

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

---

**1. Call to order**

Vice Chairman Gibson called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**2. Roll call**

Ms. Johnson called roll with six members present. There was a quorum. Chairman Norris arrived at 7:16 p.m.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

The following discussion item was added under Additional Business.

(b.) Camp Kane

**4. Presentation of minutes of the July 19, 2017 meeting**

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the July 19, 2017 meeting. Mr. Krahenbuhl abstained.**

**5. Lazarus House, 214 Walnut St. Special Use**

Jim Skaar, Steve Sager and William Grabarek representing Lazarus House were in attendance.

Ms. Johnson presented that Lazarus House is requesting a Special Use for Homeless Shelter in order to consolidate their operations into the St. Charles Free Methodist Church building, 214 Walnut Street. The Commission is being asked to review the Special Use with respect to its impact on the Historic District.

Mr. Gibson clarified that no exterior changes are proposed. Mr. Sager said Lazarus House is planning to install a fence across the courtyard in the future, but no specific plans have been

prepared. They are open to considering the recommendations of the Commission regarding the fence design.

Dr. Smunt asked about the plans for the sanctuary, and noted when this was previously discussed with the Commission, Bob McDowell asked whether the Commission would ever permit demolition of the structure.

Mr. Sager said the Free Methodist Church will have an 18 month lease on the sanctuary space while they look for a new location. Long term, Lazarus House may use the space as a smaller chapel, but they are sensitive to preserving the sanctuary, and understand the Commission's interest in preserving the building steeple and stained glass windows.

Mr. Colby clarified that the only item under consideration is the use of the building.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Krahenbuhl with a unanimous voice vote to the Plan Commission approval of Special Use for a Homeless Shelter.**

#### **6. Preliminary Review: 619 W. Main St. & 622 Walnut St.**

Dan Marshall, architect, and Ted Meyers, owner were present.

Mr. Marshall said he is working for the building owners, Ted Meyers and Joe Salamone, to design a redevelopment plan for the property. He said they have looked at a number of site plan configurations, and are looking for feedback on the concept of relocating the original house portion of the 619 W. Main St. building. The later additions to 619 would be demolished. He said the 622 Walnut Street house is not in a shape where it would make sense to rehab, and it also has foundation issues, so the proposal is to demolish that building as well.

Mr. Pretz said he is interested in receiving more information on the new building on Main Street to understand the full proposal. Mr. Marshall agreed and said this first step is to receive feedback on the concept of continuing to plan around relocating the 619 house.

It was clarified that the 619 address refers to the original house and the additions to the south and east, which includes the attached coach house. Mr. Colby noted the architectural survey indicates that the coach house is a standalone structure, but later additions to 619 connected the coach house to the additions. 622 Walnut is a freestanding building that was rated in poor condition in the recent historic district survey update. Mr. Gibson noted that when the Commission previously discussed this site, the Commission was open to allowing demolition of the 622 Walnut St. building.

Mr. Marshall further explained the site plan. He said the concept is to move the original 619 house to a lot fronting Walnut Street, which would be a more appropriate location for a residential structure. Different options for the garage are shown on the plans- attached, detached or with the relocated coach house. A two-unit residential building is proposed to the east on

Walnut. The Main Street frontage is desirable for professional office use, and up to a 3 story building can be accommodated, based on meeting parking requirements.

Dr. Smunt noted that this area was recently dedicated a historic district with support from the neighborhood and the full support of the City Council. He said one of the reasons this was approved was that this area along Main Street is a character defining western gateway into downtown. He noted the Secretary of Interior Standards recommend keeping a building on the original site where possible, so he would like to see the building stay in its current location if possible. He also has concerns with the proposed 3 story building height, which may dwarf some of the neighboring buildings. He asked if they had considered keeping the 619 building where it is located, and adding a second building to the east, with a connecting elevator/stair tower.

Ms. Malay suggested this type of arrangement would be similar to Heritage Square or Dodson Place, which have been well received. She said this form of development would allow you to introduce other buildings but preserve the original structure. This would also keep the street view intact.

Mr. Meyers said they did consider this option in a number of plans. He said they have an interest in preserving the house, and think it could be best preserved by re-use as a residential structure, and the location at the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> and Main is not desirable for residential use. He said they envision Walnut Street as a residential environment with a character that extends from the existing adjacent neighborhood. Reuse of the 619 building as office space is possible, but it could compromise the building further and detract from its original purpose as a residence. He said they see better opportunities to enhance the building in a more residential location and there they would be able to restore and sell it. He said they will develop and own the proposed office building on Main Street and it would be designed to fit the character of the street; he referenced the St. Charles Bank & Trust building as an example. He said their interest as investors in the project is to create a high quality development, because that will attract and retain office tenants. He thinks this design is more cohesive than trying to work with the 619 building where it is currently located. Mr. Marshall added that the office building height would be similar to the existing house and appear more like a two and half story building, which is consistent with the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Pretz noted that Mr. Marshall has done an excellent job with other similar projects and he has no concerns that the design for the office building would be appropriate for the site, but he does want to see the design as a part of the approval process.

Mr. Gibson reminded the Commission that they were previously facing potential demolition of the 619 building, so with that in mind, so he is open to considering this proposal.

Mr. Kessler said his preference would be for 619 to remain where it is located, as he would want to see the streetscape preserved. But he has no problem with a balance of old and new, so he will keep an open mind for creative ideas. He said historically buildings were often relocated to make way for other economic opportunities that benefited the city.

Mr. Kranbuhl asked for clarification on the additions to be demolished. Mr. Marshall noted there are smaller wood sided additions/connecting wings that would be removed. He noted that these additions are not sensitive to the original house and they conceal and detract from the original building. He noted that the relocated 619 building would place the curved wall/window feature out towards 7<sup>th</sup> St.

Mr. Norris noted that Main Street was lowered by IDOT when it was reconstructed. He noted the grades of the site vs. the street and how this could affect the floor level and height appearance of the building. The Commission discussed that the building would appear like a two and a half story structure.

Regarding the proposal for a garage for the relocated 619 building, the Commission expressed a preference for a detached structure, and reuse of the coach house if possible.

Ms. Malay asked about the zoning of the property. Mr. Colby said it is zoned RT-4, two family residential, and in the BT Transitional Business overlay district, so two family dwellings and limited office uses are currently permitted. He said the approval process could be a resubdivision, but a PUD may be necessary depending on whether the plans can comply with all code requirements. Ms. Malay suggested the Concept Plan process would be valuable to seek feedback. Mr. Colby noted that it would be up to the Commission to determine whether you are willing to approve demolition of 622 and the 619 additions before the entire plan is approved.

The Commission encouraged the developer to come back to future Commission meetings as the plans progress.

## **7. Additional Business and Observations from Commissioners or Staff**

**a. Architectural Survey Requirements – No update.**

**b. Camp Kane**

Ms. Malay presented a revised plan for the Camp Kane monument site, which is similar to the plan the Commission previously reviewed.

**A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Gibson with a unanimous voice vote to accept the design as presented. Ms. Malay abstained.**

**8. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, August 16, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**9. Public Comment**

**10. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.