

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2015  
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM**

**Members Present:** Vice Chairman Norris, Malay, Pretz, Bobowiec

**Members Absent:** Chairman Smunt, Withey, Gibson

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

---

**1. Call to order**

Vice Chair Norris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Roll call**

Vice Chair Norris called roll with four members present. There was a quorum.

**3. Approval of the agenda**

Mr. Pretz added a discussion item regarding 416 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Item was added under Additional Business (Item C).

**4. Presentation of minutes of the October 21, 2015 meeting.**

**A motion was made by Ms. Malay and seconded by Mr. Bobowiec with a unanimous voice vote to approve the minutes.**

**MEETING**

Item 7 was moved up on the agenda to accommodate petitioners in attendance.

**7. Preliminary Review: 203 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave.**

Chris Rosati, architect, was present.

Mr. Colby stated the proposal is for consideration to replace an existing enclosed porch with a two-story porch.

Mr. Rosati said the current porch is in disrepair and needs to be renovated. He said the homeowners would also like to expand the second floor living space. Through researching options, they found the structure to be inadequate to support a second story. He said it would

need to be torn down and reconstructed. To assist them in planning the next steps, he is looking for the Commission's opinion on their concept.

Vice Chair Norris showed photo examples of Italianate houses with two-story porches. Mr. Rosati said the second picture was most like their current situation, but none of them are enclosed. He said what they are leaning towards doing would be considered an addition. Vice Chair Norris questioned whether a full foundation would be needed if they decided to do an enclosed space. He said if that is the case, they would be going beyond the setback space, and would then need to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variation.

Ms. Malay asked if they are permitted to stay within the boundaries already in place, or would they now need to conform. Mr. Colby said if the porch was torn off, it could not be reconstructed at the same location because it is in violation of the setback. He said if the structure was completely torn down and rebuilt in the same location, it would still require a variance.

Mr. Bobowiec asked if there was any opportunity to go off the back of the house to increase the square footage. Mr. Rosati said there is, and they are looking into it. Mr. Bobowiec said he would hate to see them lose the Italianate appeal by adding a big addition on the front of the house.

Vice Chair Norris said the Commission would support an open one or two-story porch, but they would not be on board with a full foundation for an addition at this time.

Ms. Malay stated an addition would really alter the front of the house and lose its original element. She said the Commission is there to help keep those elements in place.

Ms. Malay noted the house is currently not conforming in square footage coverage and may need to apply for a variance for the coverage also. Mr. Rosati asked for clarification if he has to apply if they were not adding to the footprint. Mr. Colby stated that tearing down the porch would trigger a setback issue and a variance would be needed to replace the porch in its current location due to the non-conforming setback. A variance would also be needed if the porch was to be enclosed due to exceeding the maximum building coverage; however a variance to building coverage would not be needed if the porch was left open, as an unenclosed porch does not count as part of the building coverage limitation.

Mr. Pretz mentioned a possible tax benefit/freeze the homeowner might be able to receive. He noted it might be worth considering this while working on the plans.

Mr. John Stockman, homeowner, said the house would lend itself to a wraparound porch. Ms. Malay said that would be something the Commission would support.

Mr. Stockman asked if they would be approved if they removed the existing porch, but came up with a plan for an enclosed area that conformed to the setback. Vice Chair Norris advised him if it's heated, he would need a full foundation, in which case it would be considered an addition. Ms. Malay said that would count against the square footage. Mr. Colby noted the front of the house is at the required building setback.

**5. COA: 307 W. Main St. (sign)**

Mr. Colby stated this is a sign for the gas station. The sign is essentially the same sign the Commission previously approved, but it was shorter. He said the Zoning Board approved a variance for the setback, and is requiring that the sign be raised up to the maximum height allowed, which is 12 feet.

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

**6. COA: 521 W. Main St. (sign)**

Mr. Colby said this sign was previously reviewed by the Commission. However, at that time, the property was not landmarked. They thought the sign was going to be permitted before it was landmarked, but it wasn't. They have now come in for a permit and a COA is required.

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

**8. Additional Business from Commissioners or Staff**

**a. Discussion Regarding COA process**

No updates.

**b. Landmarks research**

No updates.

**c. 416 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave.**

Mr. Pretz showed pictures of the house showing multiple windows covered up with wood. Mr. Bobowiec asked if they had any options to advise homeowner that can't be done. Mr. Colby said he needs to communicate with the building department to determine what this falls under in terms of the work that was done.

**9. Meeting Announcements: Historic Preservation Commission meeting Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at 7:00 P.M. in the Committee Room.**

**10. Public Comment**

**11. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.