

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2016  
COMMITTEE ROOM**

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

**Members Absent:** Bobowiec, Gibson, Withey

**Also Present:** Russell Colby, Planning 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 four members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of agenda**

Ms. Malay added item 10c. Jones Law Office sign.

**4. Presentation of minutes of the July 6, 2016 meeting**

Dr. Smunt noted a correction on page 2, under item 6b., paragraph 2: "History Museum" should be replaced with "History in Plain View sign at the Municipal Building."

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Ms. Malay with a voice vote of 3-0 to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Pretz abstained.**

**5. COA: 201 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. (sign)**

Mr. Colby stated the proposed wall sign has already been installed and he provided a picture. The material is PVC.

Dr. Smunt noted that the sign for the auto repair business was approved for the other section of the building. Mr. Colby confirmed this was a sign for a different business. That sign was to be made of alumilite or a similar material.

Ms. Malay suggested a frame could be installed around the proposed sign.

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

**6. COA: 520 Indiana St. (fence)**

Zach Derrico, applicant, was present. He said a new house is to be constructed on the adjacent lot (present location of a pool) and that the proposed fence is to be made of cedar.

Regarding the portion of the fence along 6<sup>th</sup> Street, the Commission discussed the location relative to the street. Mr. Derrico clarified the fence is actually located at the property line, which is set back from the curb line. Ms. Malay clarified that it should be noted in the approval that the fence will be behind the tree located along 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

Regarding the portion on the east property line, Dr. Smunt questioned the need for the 4 ft. fence to extend all the way out to the street. He stated that this fence did not appear to serve any purpose and would visually block the yards along Indiana Street. The Commission discussed that the 6 ft. fence could turn and connect to the house. Mr. Derrico agreed with this idea and will omit the portion extending into the front yard.

The Commission also discussed conceptual drawings for the house on the vacant lot. Dr. Smunt noted a preference for the Craftsman style architecture over the Colonial Style which is more common in new construction. Ms. Malay brought up the location of garage and suggested options to minimize its appearance from the street. Mr. Derrico said the garage could be turned as a side load. Dr. Smunt recommended including a front porch.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA, subject to the 6<sup>th</sup> Street fence being located behind the tree and the fence not continuing in front of the house along the east lot line.**

**7. COA: 116 W. Main St.**

Dean Courser, applicant, was present. He said the original concept was to provide an ADA accessible ramp at the rear of the building adjacent to the door that exits out onto the parking lot adjacent to Rt. 31. However, the ramp location obstructed the parking lot, so an alternative is being proposed, which would place the ramp in an internal location accessible from Main Street. A new storefront door just west of the salon space would be added, with an internal ramp providing ADA access to both the salon and the future west tenant space.

Chairman Norris questioned how high the storefront windows would extend and if the cornice would be modified. Mr. Courser clarified the door and window would be within the existing opening. It was noted that there is a solid wall/panel above the existing window that is part of the existing storefront cornice system for the western building. This element will not be modified.

Dr. Smunt suggested that the existing knee wall be preserved to maintain consistency with the rest of the western building storefront. Mr. Courser said this could be done, assuming there is enough granite salvaged to cover the rest of the wall adjacent to the storefront window.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA, subject to the kneewall being maintained as granite at the existing height.**

**8. COA: 304 Cedar Ave. (detached garage)**

Ed Snyder and Annette El-Sherif, applicants and owners, were present. They explained their proposal is to construct an outbuilding that is similar to a barn, and passed around a photo of a similar structure.

Dr. Smunt questioned the height of the structure relative to the house. Mr. Snyder said based on the height as drawn, the barn would be 6” shorter than the house.

Mr. Snyder walked through the proposal and the Commission discussed each element of the structure and offered suggestions to the applicant. The following scope of work was agreed to:

- Fiber cement siding with 4” reveal, 1x8 fascia boards, 1x6 corners and casing.
- West wall (front): Doors to be sliding barn doors; upper level French doors to have a similar light pattern as the windows in the house; iron juliet guard rail at the French doors; coach lights on both sides of the French doors.
- South elevation (patio): Door to be a sliding barn door; patio to be concrete, ceiling to be beadboard, option to use a dental detail similar to the house.
- North elevation: Double hung window in center, matching design/style of the windows in the house.

Ms. El-Sherif noted they were planning to re-install shutters on the house, including some salvaged from the basement. The Commission supported this idea.

The Commission discussed that they could approve the COA as discussed, but that use of any stone for a knee wall would need to be reviewed based on a plan.

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA, subject to the scope of work agreed to at the meeting and documented on the COA approval form.**

**9. Landmark Nomination: 514 Oak Street.**

Ms. Malay stated that she had completed the research on the property and contacted the owner, Carol Scholl, who was very excited about the landmark nomination.

Ms. Malay reviewed the nomination form, noting the building is an excellent example of Craftsman style and is well preserved. Regarding the construction date, the assessor date is 1923 and Ms. Scholl was told this date as well, but tax records shows a jump in value in 1925. Dr. Smunt noted the assessments are a year behind, so a circa date of 1923 is appropriate.

Regarding a name, Ms. Malay noted Charles Hunt originally owned the house or possibly built it, although it didn’t appear he lived in the house. She questioned what name to give the property,

given that none of the other residents were significant historical figures. Dr. Smunt said it would be appropriate to use the name of the original owner or builder.

Chairman Norris noted the landmark nomination needed to be signed and a plat of survey was needed. Mr. Colby said Ms. Malay could sign off on the form. The Commission discussed that it would be preferred to have Ms. Scholl sign off as record owner to demonstrate her support. Ms. Malay will ask Ms. Scholl if she can provide a copy of a plat of survey.

Dr. Smunt said the descriptive statement should note that the aluminum storm doors and windows and the modern railing are non-contributing.

**A motion was made by Dr. Smunt and seconded by Mr. Pretz was a unanimous voice vote to set a public hearing date for the Landmark Nomination for 514 Oak Street, to be listed as the Charles Hunt House with a date of circa 1923.**

Mr. Colby said the hearing would be scheduled for Sept. 7.

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

**a. Landmarks Research-** The Commission discussed removing this item from the agenda going forward.

#### **b. 2016 Projects**

- i. City Council Tour/**
- ii. Survey of Pottawatomie Area**

The Commission discussed the map and information distributed via email. The Commission discussed the objective of the tour and decided that the tour should be designed to be educational and for sharing information about projects in the existing district and outside of the district. The Commission should share that they are interested in conducting a survey of the Pottawatomie area and provide an opportunity for feedback on the idea.

Mr. Colby asked for input on structuring the tour, in terms of what locations to highlight. The Commission discussed providing background information on all of the locations, but planning a route from City Hall along State Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Park Ave. and return down 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. A few defined stops would be made to present information.

The Commission directed Mr. Colby to draft introductory information to go along with the tour map and background.

#### **iii. Residential Design Guidelines update**

The Commission discussed bringing a paper copy to the meeting to utilize for making notes. The Commission would focus on individual chapters, with a goal of providing more photos in certain chapters.

**iv. Nantucket initiatives**

The Commission agreed to remove this item going forward.

**c. Jones Law Office sign**

Ms. Malay presented a revised material for the Jones Law Office sign that is a coated pressed paper. She said it is graffiti proof and has a 10 year guarantee, which is longer than alumilite. She said this material would also save \$400. She passed around a sample. The Commission was supportive of utilizing this material.

**11. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, August 17, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**12. Public Comment**

None.

**13. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.