

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2017  
COMMITTEE ROOM**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Russell Colby, Division Planning Manager

---

**1. Call to order**

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

**2. Roll call**

Mr. Colby called roll with seven members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**4. Presentation of minutes of the September 20, 2017 meeting**

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Gibson with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the September 20, 2017 meeting. Mr. Krahenbuhl abstained.**

**5. COA: 504 E. Main St. (siding)**

Mr. Colby stated the applicant requested the item be tabled. They intend to pursue a Façade Improvement Grant. However, there is no further funding available for this year. They will be returning in the spring with a new proposal for their siding project.

LP SmartSide is being considered as the siding replacement in place of the hardie board that was suggested at the last meeting. Dr. Smunt said the hardie board has a faux wood grain to it, but the LP SmartSide has an aggressive wood grain finish. A house built with conventional wood siding would generally have a smooth finish. The LP product seems to have a more rustic, course style to it. He didn't think it was an appropriate look for this building. However, he said they may offer other textures and he would like to see samples. Mr. Kessler said it is a composite material and he would need to know more about it. Mr. Pretz suggested the applicant return before the spring for additional guidance on materials.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to table the discussion on this COA and request the applicant return with samples of the wood product and paint color selections.**

**6. COA: 605 W. Main St. (sign)**

Eric Larson, the petitioner, was present. Mr. Larson is representing the next four items on the agenda.

Mr. Larson would like to remove the sign from 619 W. Main Street and install the stanchions in the concrete pads that has already been poured for 605 W. Main Street. He will then add wood sub-panels for the new tenant. Ms. Malay suggested looking into using Alumilite. Mr. Kessler said MDO is another product that might be an option. Chairman Norris said plywood will break down and a composite material would be more durable.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA with the exception of not using any wood products.**

**7. COA: 619 W. Main St. (sign)**

Mr. Larson is proposing installing a new monument sign. He is replacing the brick with stone. He is also considering illuminating the sign and/or building with external up-lighting.

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

**8. COA: 619 W. Main St. (roof)**

The Commission previously approved a proposal to replace the roof material. It was approved for a different owner for the replacement of wood shingles with asphalt that had a wood shingle appearance. Mr. Larson would prefer to use an architectural asphalt shingle to match the warehouse behind the house.

Dr. Smunt said a wood roof should never have been put on the house due to the attic space being finished. Mr. Gibson noted in their previous discussion the Commission agreed this may not have been a wood shingle roof originally. He also stated the roof is not an identifying characteristic of this home. Mr. Larson said he does not want the roof to stand out.

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

The Commission briefly discussed potential grant funding and federal tax credits for the building.

**9. Preliminary Review: 605-619 W. Main St. & 622 Walnut St. (redevelopment)**

Mr. Larson discussed his plans for the structures on these lots. He is planning on moving his business into the red brick building and renovating the white ranch building into offices if a tenant presented themselves.

He said his initial thought was to separate the warehouse from the red brick house and put all new facades on it to be used as an office building or possibly a medical building. He was also considering taking a roadway, utilizing the existing roadway that cuts into 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and bringing a parking lot through it to tie it into 605 W. Main Street. He said he liked what was done at Heritage Green and would like to do something similar to that.

Mr. Larson expressed concern over how to use the back barn/warehouse for commercial purposes while leaving the carriage house structure in place. Dr. Smunt felt the carriage house is out of context with the barn. He didn't think its location would be enhanced by a commercial redevelopment and asked if it could be moved. Mr. Larson said it's possible it could be moved and repurposed, but he preferred to have a new development instead. He felt it might be in the way. Ms. Malay suggested being open to ideas and working with an architect who has experience dealing with old buildings. Mr. Pretz said for the overall project, he needs to know what is going in its place to make sure it is an appropriate replacement.

Mr. Gibson felt the carriage house did not tie in with any other buildings on the lot; nor was it a significant structure that needed to be kept in its current place. He felt it was more important to have contiguous parking lots that allowed entry from another street.

Mr. Larson said he is not planning on putting much funding into the 622 Walnut structure. He would like to use it for two-family row homes, but he may need to adjust the lot lines to do that. Mr. Colby said the project could involve a PUD so they may have more flexibility with the lot area. Mr. Larson said he liked the idea of doing row homes to provide a transition from the commercial area going into the neighborhood.

Dr. Smunt advised the policy regarding demolitions is for the applicant to show the Commission what is going in its place. If the replacement makes a greater contribution to the historical integrity of the district, the Commission will be more likely to approve the demolition over keeping a less desirable structure.

Mr. Larson asked if he needs approval to do repairs to some railings and a deck. Mr. Colby said if the building department requires a permit, then the Commission would need to review it.

The Commission returned to agenda item number 8.

**8. Continuation of COA: 619 W. Main St. (roof)**

Mr. Larson would also like to replace the porch decking on the original structure with like materials.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA for the re-decking of the front porch with like/kind materials if the existing materials cannot be sanded; and orientation of the boards should remain the same.**

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

Mr. Pretz said he is willing to offer assistance to the owner of 411 Prairie St. if she has questions about landmarking her home.

Mr. Pretz said the owner of 608 State Avenue claimed it was the family home of Col. Baker, and she was asking about landmarking the home. Mr. Pretz thought it might be outside of the district. He said it might have significance based on the historical figure, but its architecture is questionable.

Ms. Malay asked if the old George's site was going to be used to help the Arcada and if anything was going to be done to stabilize the building. Mr. Colby did not have any specific information.

Mr. Gibson attended the last History Museum Board meeting and said they mentioned the City will be installing new windows for them. Mr. Colby said the Public Works department was advised they would have to come before the Commission for a COA.

##### **a. Residential Façade Improvement Grant**

###### **i. Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation**

###### **ii. Review of grants**

The Commission covered both items within one discussion. Dr. Smunt advised the Secretary of Interior Standards information was already a component of their ordinance. They should be using those standards when necessary during the review process.

Mr. Pretz expressed concern over managing the grant process once residents became more aware of it. He wanted to make sure the Commission has time to properly review the project presented and the homeowner knows they won't receive immediate approval. Ms. Malay said that could be done through staff. Mr. Colby requested the Commission provide direction as to what their expectations are.

The Commission discussed noting the following requirements.

- Spell out grants require the use of like and kind replacements of historical features.
- Stipulate vinyl and aluminum would not be covered.
- Prepare a list of all materials that would not be considered.
- Must allow a minimum of 4-6 weeks to go through the review process.

- The Commission may require vendors to attend the review meeting when requested.
- The cause of the failure would also need to be repaired, even if it is not covered by the grant. Expectation is the cause of the failure will be dealt with.

If there are a significant amount of requests, Mr. Gibson suggested they address the first 5 or so and put the rest on hold until those projects are done.

Mr. Colby will prepare a draft of the requirements discussed for review at the next meeting.

**b. Architectural Survey requirements**

There were no updates.

**11. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, October 18, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**12. Public Comment**

**13. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.