

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2018
COMMITTEE ROOM**

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

Members Absent: Krahenbuhl

Also Present: Russell Colby, Community Development Division 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 six members present. There was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

The following items were added:

- 9a. 217 Cedar Ave.
- 9b. 225 W. Main St.
- 9c. Reappointments
- 9d. Downtown Partnership representation

4. Presentation of minutes of the February 21, 2018 meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the February 21, 2018 meeting.

5. Presentation of the minutes of the February 28, 2018 meeting

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the February 28, 2018 meeting.

6. COA: 10 Illinois St. (signs)

Robby Whitehead of Olympic Signs was present. He said the signs will be painted gray and will be halo lit.

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

7. COA: 162 S. 1st St. (changes to storefront)

Mario Grado, the business owner, was present. He stated he is interested in installing overhead garage-type doors to open the business to the street, instead of the sidewalk café area used last year. He said the door would have a screen panel that would lower down.

Dr. Smunt noted that the door shown is divided into many lites and suggested that a door be chosen with a more similar light pattern to the existing storefront.

Mr. Gibson said he liked the overall concept but felt they need further details on the actual door and the installation. He suggested accordion doors or panels might work also. Mr. Grado agreed to provide additional information at an upcoming meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to table the COA.

8. COA: 612 W. Main St.

Amanda and Gary O'Connor, applicants, were present. They said they have proceeded with designing the continuous porch/veranda around the building, as discussed during a previous preliminary review.

Dr. Smunt noted that the previous plan showed square columns and the commission suggested turned columns, but the proposed round columns are seen on similar examples of Queen Anne architecture, with similar porch layouts. He asked about the flooring and whether tongue and groove boards could be used. Mr. O'Connor said he would like to use a deck system with boards parallel to the house.

Vice Chairman Gibson said this is not a reconstruction of previous existing architecture. He felt the scale was ok, and noted they did a good job matching the roof lines. It will look great from the street.

Dr. Smunt said the original architecture showed two porches. If someone wanted to change the wrap around porch in the future to two separate porches, they would have the flexibility to do so.

Mr. Kessler said he felt differently. He said with it being a landmark building on Main Street, they have an opportunity to make an impression. If they are going to build it, he said they should make it look like it has always been there. He said when they tie it into the building they will be removing elements such as siding and trim. This will be a major addition. He disagreed with the flooring. If it's a porch then it needs to be a porch floor. He said if they are going to use fiberglass columns they should go look at the addition being built on Oak Street and 5th. Those columns look like they have always been there.

Mr. Kessler asked how far the retaining wall will be from the porch. It will be two feet. He asked if anything will be behind it. Mr. O'Connor explained the back side will have a double built up board with a waterproof membrane. Underneath it will be dirt that will be used as a planter box. Nothing will be open under the porch.

Chairman Norris commented on the engineering aspects of the project. He felt some of the items needed to be rechecked with the building permit review.

Ms. Malay said she was fine with the proposal. Mr. Pretz was in favor of the project, but was concerned with the unlock block. He said it was too modern.

Mr. Gibson expressed some concern about what it will look like once they approve the final engineering plans; and what if any changes will need to be made. He felt the front steps would not come forward. Mr. O'Connor stated they start flush with the wall and only protrude into the deck about three feet. He would like to keep the deck open as much as possible.

Dr. Smunt referenced a photograph that showed an example of the Queen Anne style with a round column porch with no handrail and a planter out front. He said it is very similar to the proposal and provides evidence that homes were built like this in the past.

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a 3-1 voice vote to approve the COA as presented. Mr. Kessler voted no. Mr. Pretz abstained.

9. Update to Architectural Survey for 21 S. 4th St.

Chairman Norris recused himself. Vice Chairman Gibson presided over the discussion.

The Commissioners conducted an on-site visit on February 28th, 2018. They decided to revisit the 1994 Architectural Survey to determine if it would be appropriate to change the status from contributing to non-contributing based upon the findings from that visit.

Dr. Smunt suggested the following revisions to the individual categories:

Architectural Integrity

- Major Alteration: check boxes for 1 (first floor), 2 (upper floors), and 3 (roof cornice)
- Additions: remove check on “sensitive to original” and check boxes 1, 2, and 3 for “insensitive to original”

Architectural Significance:

- Downgrade to non-contributing

Building Condition:

- Downgrade to poor; or fair at best

Dr. Smunt said there are no longer any stylistic features present. They could say the only Queen Anne element left is the front picture window. The Commissioners discussed several other items they observed during the on-site visit. Vice Chairman Gibson noted the survey is an exterior architectural survey so it is not necessary to include wording regarding the interior.

Dr. Smunt suggested adding the following items to the features list:

- Synthetic siding and trim has been added since the original survey
- Evidence of structural damage of foundation exists
- Majority of windows are not original

A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve revising the architectural survey to include the ratings as stated by Dr. Smunt.

a. 217 Cedar Ave.

Vice Chairman Gibson asked for clarification as to whether or not the approval for demolition of 211 and 215 Cedar Ave. was still in place since the petitioner rescinded their COA. Mr. Colby said that approval is still in place; the petitioner asked to withdraw their request that was before the City Council and asked that the Council not take action. The City Council did not take formal action to deny it, but they did take action to place the Historic Preservation Commission's recommendation on file. The petitioner could demolish 211 and 215, but they would need to put the site in the state that was presented. Mr. Colby said when they submit the permit they would be advised they defined a use for this site as a prayer garden. Since they did not receive approval to demolish the building that was in the way of the improvements associated with it, they would need to show how they are going to meet the intent of the COA. This might require revising the site plan.

Mr. Colby said that any new proposal should include new information about the building or the reuse of the property. He said the church could submit the same proposal, but they are not entitled to it being reheard by the Commission at the same level of detail because the Commission previously rendered a decision based on the same information.

Ms. Malay asked if they should consider landmarking the building. Dr. Smunt suggested they update the survey first. He noted the building has historical significance, but visually, he felt it doesn't qualify as architecturally significant. It's missing many elements. Ms. Malay said if it is landmarked there would be no question as to its significance. Vice Chairman Gibson said landmarking it will create a permanent record that stays with the home. Ms. Malay felt the survey is based on architecture. She said they really have no other place to include the historical aspect of it. Dr. Smunt suggested they modify the survey based on the information they now have, and then decide whether or not to move forward with the landmark designation. Mr. Pretz noted they could hold the public hearing, but decide to table action until further review. It was decided they would modify the survey at the next meeting.

b. 225 W. Main St.

Mr. Colby said the contractor for The Home Brew Shop was installing the electrical boxes for goose neck lighting before the work received approval. They will be put on the schedule for a COA at the next meeting. He showed a picture of the proposed goose neck lighting. The Commissioners supported the proposal and commented on the improved appearance of the building.

c. Reappointment

Mr. Colby said Chairman Norris and Dr. Smunt are both up for reappointment this year. He asked if they were still interested in being reappointed. Both Commissioners said they are still interested. Mr. Colby asked for suggestions on new members to fill the vacancy when Vice Chairman Gibson leaves. The Commissioners suggested David Pietryla, Carol Schulz and Dave Amundsen's wife. Mr. Colby asked if there might be someone at the history museum who would be interested. Vice Chairman Gibson said he would ask at the next history museum board meeting. Ms. Malay said she would also check with Joe Tegan.

d. Downtown Partnership

Dr. Smunt asked if anyone was interested in being the representative on the Downtown Partnership Board. Ms. Malay said she is planning on doing this, but will know more next week.

10. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, March 21, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.

11. Public Comment

12. Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.