

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF ST. CHARLES**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2017**  
**COMMITTEE ROOM**

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

**Members Absent:** Krahenbuhl

**Also Present:** 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 six members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of Agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda.

**4. Presentation of minutes of the September 6, 2017 meeting**

**A motion was made by Mr. Gibson and seconded by Dr. Smunt with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2017 meeting. Ms. Malay abstained.**

**5. COA: 1 W. Illinois St. (sign)**

Ms. Johnson said the proposal is for a sign on the Fox Island Square smokestack. Shodeen, the property owner, provided a letter indicating they have given permission to Eden on the River to display a sign on the smokestack and that no other tenants will be allowed to put signage on the same tower. Other signage for Eden on the River was approved by the Commission at the 9/6/17 meeting.

Mr. Gibson questioned the form of the letter and whether or not it would be enforceable in the future. Ms. Malay said they always have the ability to say no to future requests. Mr. Pretz felt it was a very weak letter and preferred to add language that stated the space could not be used for any other tenant in the future should the sign for Eden on the River ever come down.

Dr. Smunt asked why it matters if another business uses the exact same location. He said it is either appropriate or not, and if the signage is having a negative impact on the architecture,

perhaps they should not approve it. Ms. Malay said they should state this is a one-time exception. Dr. Smunt said they can't say it is okay for one and not the other. Mr. Gibson stated nothing at this location is landmarked. Mr. Pretz felt it was a detraction to the complex. Mr. Kessler was in favor of it; especially since the Commission has the opportunity to review future requests.

Ms. Johnson noted the building department determined this tenant space has four frontages so they are entitled to four wall signs. They are comfortable with this being called a wall sign for this tenant space. Most of the other tenants only have two frontages and this would prohibit those tenants from putting signage on the smokestack.

**A motion was made by Mr. Gibson and seconded by Ms. Malay with a 4-1 vote to approve the COA as presented, with a condition that only this sign for this specific tenant will be permitted on the smokestack, per the letter received from the property owner. Motion passed. Mr. Pretz voted nay.**

**6. COA: 101 E. Main St. (façade renovation)**

Gordon Simic, petitioner, was present.

Ms. Johnson said the proposal is for replacement of the storefront doors with aluminum and new light fixtures on either side of the doors.

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

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

David Santoro, petitioner, was present.

Mr. Santoro is proposing to replace the wood siding with vinyl. He noted the building has been added on to four times since the late 1800s so there are multiple types of siding on the building. They have painted it twice and they are no longer able to get anyone to guarantee their work due to the condition of the material. The siding has now gotten to the point where it needs to be replaced. In addition to the siding work, they plan to add aluminum framing around the windows; paint the existing brick; and retain the other wood elements.

Dr. Smunt felt the paint failure is due to the actual paint used. He stated all the old paint needs to be stripped to bare wood. He also noticed there are some moisture problems. Dr. Smunt referenced the Secretary of Interior Standards which allows for replacement of siding with a like-in-kind replacement if the siding is deteriorated beyond repair or the condition of the siding is in such poor condition, such as this siding due to the extensive alligator paint. He stated the Commission would find it hard to support vinyl as a like-in-kind replacement. He suggested using a fiber cement product or something similar to Hardie board which looks and functions

like wood. He noted they could also apply for grant funds. Mr. Santoro was open to this suggestion.

Commissioners expressed the same concerns as Dr. Smunt had and agreed with the alternative suggestion to use fiber cement. Mr. Gibson noted this is the Stevens Jones home. Stevens Jones was instrumental in naming St. Charles so there is historic value to the structure. He felt this is a very important building and should be landmarked.

Chairman Norris asked if Mr. Santoro could seek Façade Improvement Grant funding for the project. Ms. Johnson advised funds are nearly depleted for this program year. There is approximately \$2,800 left in the budget. The next program year begins on May 1<sup>st</sup>. She noted the applicant would need to return with a proposal for consideration. Ms. Malay also suggested Mr. Santoro look into federal tax credits for commercial structures.

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to table the discussion on this COA.**

**8. COA: 103 S. 4<sup>th</sup> St. (fence)**

Shuki Moran, petitioner, was present.

Mr. Moran is proposing to replace an existing 4 ft. wood fence with a 6 ft. wood stockade privacy fence. Dr. Smunt expressed concern over using stockade fencing. He noted it is not a typical style that would have been used when this building was built. Mr. Pretz suggested looking into board-on-board fencing. Commissioners agreed.

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA with a condition that board-on-board fencing must be used instead of stockade fencing.**

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

Ms. Johnson noted the applicant is still in the process of obtaining quotes and requested the item be tabled until she is ready to return for further discussion.

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

**10. Preliminary Review: 423 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> St. (façade improvements)**

Ryan Samuelson and Ryan Corcoran were present.

Mr. Corcoran is seeking a new location for their office and is considering purchasing the property at this address. He would like to improve the look of the outside of the building by painting the stucco and replacing the windows with a style appropriate for the downtown area.

Mr. Pretz asked if they would consider replacing the stucco instead of painting it. Mr. Corcoran said they first need to explore the options for enhancing it.

Chairman Norris reviewed the architectural survey details. Dr. Smunt said the structures on the other corners of the street also have stucco so if they left it alone, there would not be any negative impact on the neighborhood. The huge storefront cornice seems disconnected with the other windows. Dr. Smunt suggested tying in these windows to enhance the architectural style of the building before they work on the stucco. Mr. Pretz noted this has a mid-century modern design and suggested looking into adding some architectural elements from that era into their design.

Mr. Corcoran said he would like to add illuminated signage on the side wall. Mr. Gibson said he would like to see them use the 1950s idea. He felt the cornice looks completely out of place. He suggested removing it, putting a new detail in its place, and emphasizing the front door.

**11. Discussion Item: 111 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. (garage)**

Ms. Johnson said a potential purchaser of the home would like to demolish the existing garage and construct a new two-car, two-story garage.

Mr. Pretz said he was fine with taking down the existing garage, but he would need to see a drawing of their plan before giving approval for the replacement. The other Commissioners agreed they are open to the idea, but they need to see how the new garage blends in with the house before they gave approval. They felt the replacement garage should be complementary in style to the house and materials should be consistent.

**12. Discussion Item: 411 Prairie St. (potential Historic Landmark nomination)**

Susan Olson, the homeowner, was present.

Ms. Olson is seeking feedback to determine if the Commission would support landmark designation for her home. She provided historic photos of the home from when it was located at the corner of Prairie St. and Geneva Rd. The Commissioners felt there is great history with this home and they would support seeking landmark designation. They provided guidance to the homeowner as to how to obtain the information needed to complete the application.

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

**a. Historic Home Tour**

Ms. Malay spoke with Wendy Mosier about possibly doing some type of historic home tour to highlight historic homes, especially when they are up for sale. This would be a tour that takes you inside the homes. She asked for thoughts from the Commission on this idea. Dr. Smunt said he would support it, but he felt they would need to partner with Preservation Partners because they have experience doing these types of tours. Mr. Pretz noted the hardest part is getting

people to commit to opening up their home. Mr. Gibson suggested including the History Museum as well. Mr. Kessler said he liked the idea, but was concerned with the time commitment needed on their part.

**b. Downtown Partnership**

Dr. Smunt suggested adding a regular item to the agenda that allows for updates on the work the Downtown Partnership is doing. Since the Commission has a liaison on their Board, he felt it would be good for them to know what type of work they are doing in the downtown area. The Commissioners decided to add it to the agenda of the second meeting of every month.

**c. Residential Façade Improvement Grant**

- i. Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation**
- ii. Distribution of grants**

The discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

**d. Architectural Survey requirements**

There were no updates.

**14. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, October 4, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**15. Public Comment**

**16. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.