

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6th, 2023 – 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Rice, Smunt, Kessler, Pretz, Kramer, Dickerson (7:06), Malay

Members Absent:

Also Present: Rachel Hitzemann, Planner

1. Call to Order

Ms. Malay called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Hitzemann called roll with 7 members present. There was a quorum.

3. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Hitzemann added 211 Walnut Ave to Other Commission Business.

Mr. Pretz added 2024 Project to Other Commission Business and brief comment on demolitions outside Historic District.

A motion was made by Ms. Rice and seconded by Mr. Kessler with a unanimous voice vote to approve the amended agenda.

4. Presentation of minutes of the November 15th, 2023 meeting

Dr. Smunt requested correction to Certificate of Appropriateness application #6A, Paragraph 3 to read drip cap between siding and skirt trim.

A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Kramer with a unanimous voice vote to approve the amended Minutes of November 15, 2023. Mr. Kessler abstained.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) applications

a. 112 N 5th Ave.

Mike and Eileen Kanute presented COA to remodel sunporch and resurface wood deck.

Dr. Smunt and Ms. Rice asked for clarification on new windows. Ms. Kanute responded they will be sliding windows.

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

b. 303 N. 3rd Ave.

Mr. Matt Sweeney presented COA to install garage door and front door different from the doors shown on original COA that had been previously approved by the Historic Commission. And, adding black iron handrail by the front steps.

Dr. Smunt questioned the style of the front door and garage door. Mr. Sweeney showed pictures of the doors to be used to the Commission. Both flat panel

Mr. Kessler asked about the railing that will be used, asked for a sketch to be submitted showing the railing. Mr. Kessler added that at the beginning of the process the Commission asked for complete architectural drawings. When this was approved, everything that was on that plan is what we were expecting to see. So if there were changes we expected you to come to us and say, this isn't going to work. With regard to the front door I'm not opposed to it, in regard to the garage door, I think that should be the door that is on the plan. You could put opaque glass in the door if you are concerned about privacy.

Mr. Pretz agreed with Mr. Kessler as it relates to submitting proper drawings. The front door, we had designs that were approved with a certain front door. To make any change or variance, I can't support what you have installed. When I move to the garage, using the same railing, we approved the overall picture and design, this is the fourth time we've had to make changes. I can't support it because we have approved plans, that's what we liked, what you agreed to. I will not support the front door and I will not support the garage door. As far as the front rail I'm open to taking a look at the design.

Ms. Dickerson asked if the door was metal. Mr. Sweeney responded it is a steel door that is in there now. She said that she liked the original doors better.

Ms. Kramer added she was disappointed to see the solid style front door and garage door had been installed. I agree they are consistent with the Greek revival style. As far as the handrail I would like to see a detailed drawing.

Ms. Malay also agreed with Mr. Kessler. It is appropriate that the Commission ask to see a detailed drawing on the railing. The garage door I have an issue. It truly doesn't fit the house. What you were proposing was neutral, there are versions where you don't have to have the glass. Because nothing came to us before you ordered and changed the design, we didn't have a chance to give our input on it. As far as the front stoop I'm fine. Changes are fine, it's a matter of whether it's been installed. If you come to us ahead of time we can have a discussion and we can figure out some neutral grounds and come to a compromise. Ms. Malay asked if the COA could be broken up to 3 votes. Ms. Hitzemann confirmed it can be done.

Mr. Sweeney responded it was an oversight not bringing this to the Commission before installing. The garage and front door were installed 3 months ago. With the garage door there is a difference between stylistically what is appropriate and visually what you want to see there. Do we want to see a door that has windows in it? Maybe we're more partial to that in terms of what we like. I don't know that means it's more appropriate though more than a raised panel.

Ms. Malay responded they do make the same door proposed without the glass. It would have been more appropriate than this door.

Mr. Sweeney said, to me the carriage house style and the one that's a raised panel, when you get rid of the windows they look very similar. Ms. Malay disagreed, stating they differ in the design.

Ms. Rice added, I think the point that Ms. Malay is trying to make is you were here many

times and we approved it, then you changed it. And we had already approved it.

Ms. Kramer added that in the approval process we discussed about the balance of the 3 sections of the house and the garage door is the focal point of the north end of the house.

Mr. Sweeney asked if there was a way to fix this, budget wise I don't have the money to get a new carriage door garage door. Possibly keep the raised panel garage door but get a section with windows on the top?

Mr. Kessler responded that Mr. Sweeney has exhausted the good will of the Historic Commission. I thought favorably of this project since the beginning. A comment made that you didn't believe the plan presented has to be what it ends up as. Changes could come to us before, we are sticking with what we agreed to.

Our role as a Commission we are supposed to approve a COA with design. We approved it in good faith that this is what was going to be built. It has changed and we have not had a chance to say, prior to the changes, that yes, we are okay with those changes. Now we are looking at a plan that we don't necessarily agree with and having to make a decision to give another COA to that project. If you had come to us with this door prior to installing, I would have said no. If we deny the COA you are welcome to go to City Council. If we deny, we are recommending a denial, we are not officially denying.

Ms. Malay stated we are going to do 3 separate COAs. The first will be the rail by front steps.

A motion was made by Mr. Kessler and seconded by Mr. Pretz to table the COA for the rail by the front steps until detailed sketch is presented, with a unanimous voice vote to table.

Ms. Malay asked for a motion to approve or recommendation to deny the front door.

A motion was made by Dr. Smunt to approve the COA for front door installed and seconded by Ms. Rice.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Rice, Smunt, Dickerson, Kramer, Malay

Absent:

Nays: Kessler, Pretz

Motion passed 5-2

Ms. Malay asked for a motion to approve or recommendation to deny the garage door.

A motion was made by Mr. Kessler to recommend denial of COA for the installed garage door and was seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Roll was called:

Ayes:

Absent:

Nays: Rice, Smunt, Kessler, Pretz, Dickerson, Kramer, Malay

Motion passed 7-0

Ms. Hitzemann advised with the denial of the garage door, Mr. Sweeney has the option of going before Planning and Development Committee or come back to the Historic Commission with other options on the door.

c. 407 S 5th St.

Mr. Dan Marshall, Marshall Architects, Zach Derrico, Derrico Builders, and Ms. Brooke Greenlee, Future Homeowner, presented proposal for addition to house and garage.

Mr. Kessler asked for clarification of the area under the porch with vertical siding. Adding there is a PVC product that could work. Mr. Marshall responded PVC would be nice, if they can't find an appropriate board they would use cedar. But would use composite trim.

Dr. Smunt asked for clarification on the windows to be used. Mr. Marshall responded the new windows will be fiberglass with wood inside.

A motion was made by Mr. Pretz to approve with the condition PVC or Cedar will be used on the vertical siding under the porch and was seconded by Ms. Dickerson with a unanimous voice vote to approve COA as presented.

7. Grant Applications

None.

8. Landmark Applications

None.

9. Preliminary Reviews- Open forum for questions or presentation of preliminary concepts to the Commission for feedback

None.

10. Other Commission Business

a. 2024 Projects

Mr. Pretz presented idea of Student Design Homes which were designed and built by local High School Students. Mr. Pretz suggested it be added as part of the City website, discussing the program that was head up by Mr. Jim Holderfield from St. Charles East High School.

b. Demolition of Buildings Outside of the Historic Areas

Mr. Pretz asked if there was a possibility of finding out about homes that are just outside the St. Charles Historic areas being set for demolition in order to possibly find out the history of the building before it is demolished.

d. 211 Walnut Ave.

Mr. Tom Sieck presented window replacement with aluminum clad windows to the side to the side of his home at 211 Walnut Avenue.

Ms. Hitzemann requested review of the plan by the Commission and administratively approve the windows.

Dr. Smunt proposed a recommendation for administrative approval with appropriate width casing, matching existing, and not using brick molding and seconded by Ms. Dickerson with a unanimous voice approval.

11. Public Comment

Mr. Al Watts, Preservation Partners of Fox Valley, advised they have 16 of the 19 storm windows have been sponsored and will begin to be installed. Daily Herald is going to do an article on this in the Friday, December 8th paper.

The lawsuit in Geneva, the Shodeen Family foundation has sued the City on the Blacksmith shop decision that was made. They want the judge to overturn because they didn't like the decision.

There is a block in the far northeast corner of the district being proposed to be razed, putting townhomes in the area.

12. Additional Business and Observations from Commissioners or Staff

13. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, December 20th, 2023 at 7:00 P.M.

14. Adjournment

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 P.M.