

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2013  
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM**

**Members Present:** Chairman Smunt, Boboweic, Norris, Prestidge, Pretz, Withey

**Members Absent:** Weals

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

---

**1. Call to order:**

Chairman Smunt called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

**2. Roll call:**

Chairman Smunt called roll with the five members present and two members absent. Mr. Bobowiec arrived during the meeting.

**3. Approval of the agenda:**

Chairman Smunt suggested reordering the agenda to hear item #9 before item #8.

**A motion was made by Mr. Pretz and seconded by Mr. Prestidge with a unanimous voice vote to reorder the agenda.**

**4. Presentation of minutes from March 20, 2013 meeting:**

**A motion was made by Mr. Prestidge and seconded by Mr. Withey with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes as presented.**

**5. COA: 111 E. Main St. (sign)**

Mike Hoffer from Aubrey Sign was present. He said the proposal is to install a wall sign in the sign panel on the building for Riverview Child and Family Therapy.

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

**6. 314 Illinois St. (detached garage)**

Raymond Klaus was present. He presented elevation drawings showing the proposed garage, which was drawn based on the Commission's recommendations from the previous meeting. The

Commission agreed the design was appropriate and thanked Mr. Klaus for providing the drawing.

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

**7. 14 N. Riverside Ave. (windows)**

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Pretz, who was not in attendance at the previous meeting, stated he would not support the proposed window replacement.

Chairman Smunt suggested the applicant needed to attend to discuss other options. He stated that his preference would be to remove all of the windows and replace them with something more appropriate, such as pairs of commercial grade double hung windows, which would match surrounding structures.

**A motion was made by Mr. Norris and seconded by Mr. Withey with a unanimous voice vote to table the COA.**

**9. Preliminary Review: 404 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. (addition).**

John Hunecke, future owner, was present. He stated that the house has been in his family for many years and he and his wife are interested in moving in and restoring the house. He wanted to get the Commission's feedback on the project and proposed elevations. He indicated that the details of the addition would match the existing house in term of architecture. On the existing house, the synthetic siding would be removed and wood siding restored. Windows would be replaced similar to existing windows. There was a discussion that a narrow second floor window would need to be widened; however, it was noted that the existing narrow window was inconsistent with the first floor, so the change would be consistent with the other architecture.

The Commission did not have any specific concerns with the proposal.

Mr. Hunecke noted he would be applying for a zoning setback variance along the rear property line. He asked if the Commission would support having the addition off of the rear of the house versus the sides, as a side addition could negatively impact the character of the structure as viewed from the street. The Commission agreed and were supportive the of the variance request.

Mr. Colby noted this would be reflected in the minutes, although it is not formally documented as the Commission' recommendation.

Mr. Hunecke asked about the Commission's COA review process and how many meetings were necessary. Chairman Smunt indicated that with most projects, if the information is complete, only one review is necessary, and this is completed concurrently with the building permit review process.

**8. COA: 2 E. Main St., Municipal Center (façade repair, windows, re-roofing)**

Peter Suhr, Public Services Manager for the City, was present, along with Steve Vasilion and Rob Ezerins, architects from the Prairie Forge Group. Mr. Suhr stated the project has been brought back to the Historic Commission for formal approval after a preliminary discussion in February. He stated the intent is to present the project to the Government Services Committee of the City Council on April 22; therefore, he was looking for the Commission to make a recommendation on the COA this evening.

The Commission first reviewed the elevations of Old City Hall and the Annex building, which includes window and door replacement, adding new stone base, salvaging brick, and tuck-pointing. Mr. Pretz commented on the stone base on the Annex building elevation, which appeared flat, and he suggested perhaps the window could extend further down. Chairman Smunt noted the rendering makes it appear as a monoplane without any relief at the base. Mr. Ezerins clarified that there is relief; it just does not appear on the rendering. He referred to the cross section in the plans. He also noted there is limited depth to work with in the window recesses because of the limited depth of the brick. The 4" of relief proposed was acceptable to the Commission.

Mr. Vasilion described the proposed changes to the Old City Hall building, including replacing the lower 39" of brick with limestone. He indicated the limestone would be more random cut/rough and not as it appears in the rendering. The belt course along the window sills will be larger rectangular sections of limestone. Wood windows with bronze cladding are proposed, and the project bid has an alternate of painting the second floor windows to match if they are not replaced. The Commission had no further comments on the proposal for Old City Hall.

The Commission moved to discussion of the Municipal Center building. Chairman Smunt stated that since the preliminary review meeting, he had done a visual assessment of the east brick wall proposed for replacement. He stated while he is not an architect or engineer, his first reaction was that the wall doesn't appear deteriorated enough to the point that it requires demolition. He has consulted with two other architects who agree with him, although they have not been up the roof to view the wall in detail. He recalled there was a comprehensive analysis of the masonry of the building at some point and he questioned if there was an independent analysis of the wall ever completed.

Mr. Ezerins responded that it is not only an issue of structural integrity. There are two lintels deflecting and pushing bricks up vertically. In order to control cracking, expansions joints are needed, which is a good solution more so for a new wall. But given the lintel repair, cracked bricks, and the need to rebuild sections of the parapet wall, there may be more value in replacing the entire wall. The new wall would have a membrane behind it to be water tight. Repair would leave multiple patches in the wall. He stated the brick replacement is more of a value proposition than because of structural failure.

Chairman Smunt noted that repair rather than replacement is required per the Secretary of Interior Standards and noted this is being done on the Annex and Old City Hall buildings. He stated the Historic Preservation Ordinance recommends retaining original materials to retain the historic fabric and character of the building.

Mr. Suhr noted that the end result would be a “swiss cheese” effect of numerous patches and repairs, and in the end, the total cost approach the cost of full replacement.

Mr. Norris suggested that replacing the brick wall and using a membrane changes the way the building works and breathes and questioned if interior moisture will be able to escape with the new system. Mr. Ezerins responded that this is more of an HVAC issue.

The Commission moved on to discuss the proposed metal coping. Mr. Vasilion described that on the brick section, the caps will be lifted to replace the roof and no coping is proposed. The coping has been proposed on the marble sections of the upper roof. He stated that the smaller, lower roofs do not have an issue with water penetration and these can be replaced without use of coping. Mr. Ezerins stated that the coping is proposed on the upper roof because of issues caused by the height of the roof surface intersecting the top of the parapet on one side of the roof. This condition makes it difficult to slope the water away from the parapet wall. He discussed potential alternatives, including the use of a reglet, where a channel in the mortar joint is created and caulked, or the use of “through-wall flashing” passing under the caps, which directs water to the wall.

The Commission discussed that they were opposed to the installation of metal coping and the resulting visual impact. The Commission thought either alternative presented was acceptable. Mr. Ezerins noted that it was not known what the exact conditions will be once the roof surface is removed, so one or both methods could; however, through-wall flashing is generally preferred with a reglet as a second alternative.

Chairman Smunt read a suggested motion to approve the COA subject to:

- The east brick wall of the Municipal Center- repair only, no full demolition, replace/repair with salvaged brick and like-in-kind material.
- Along the marble walls of the Municipal Center- No coping, use through-wall flashing under the marble caps, or use of a reglet where not feasible.

He further suggested coming back before the Commission if new information is available, and the Commission is open to considering this information.

**A motion was made by Mr. Prestidge and seconded by Mr. Pretz with a voice vote to approve the COA with the suggested conditions. Mr. Withey voted no.**

Mr. Ezerins added that the lower level canopy flashing, which is currently white, will be a green color to match the existing canopy, but only if a matching green color can be found. The Commission supported this change.

**A motion was made by Mr. Norris and seconded by Mr. Withey with a unanimous voice vote to amend the COA to include the use of matching green flashing on the lower canopy.**

**10. COA: 403 S. 6<sup>th</sup> St. (re-roofing project).**

Chairman Smunt recused himself as the applicant. Vice Chairman Norris acted as chair.

Dr. Smunt described his proposal to re-roof his house with Certainteed Carriage House Shingles, with metal valleys and a cone shaped cap on the veranda peak. Soffit crown molding that is deteriorated beyond repair and gable crown molding that is damaged will be replaced with 4” PVC crown molding that will appear as wood and closely match the original molding profile. Hanging half round gutters will replace the existing hanging box gutters.

**A motion was made by Mr. Withey and seconded by Mr. Prestidge with a unanimous voice vote to approve the COA.**

**11. Additional Business**

There was none.

**12. Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, April 17, 2013 at 7:00pm in the Committee Room.**

**13. Adjournment:**

**A motion was made by Mr. Bobowiec and seconded by Mr. Withey, with a unanimous voice vote to adjourn the meeting.**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:46 pm.

Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes – April 3, 2013

Page 6

Respectfully submitted,  
Dr. Steven Smunt, Chairman  
St. Charles Historic Preservation Commission

/rc