

MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL APPEARANCE COMMISSION MEETING
October 12, 2022

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Architectural Appearance Commission (AAC) Chairperson Susan Jacobson, who gave background on the Commission's role and function and outlined public input procedures, saying comments will be recorded. Absent: Also present were Village personnel Sr. Planner Atrian Fard, Associate Planner Taylor Gendel, Planning Intern Brad Iwicki and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton-Thomas. Roll was called. Present: Chairperson Jacobson and Commissioners Albrecht, Goronov, Mees, Rahn, Sallwasser and Smith.

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

None.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion to accept the minutes of August 10, 2022 was made by Commissioner Mees and seconded by Commissioner Goronov. The motion passed by voice vote.

Exterior Appearance Review: 411 N. Main St.

Staff Presentation

Intern Iwicki related that the Petitioner, Brick and Mortar, requests an Exterior Appearance Review to accommodate the façade remodel of the existing building at 411 N. Main St. The subject site is improved with a two-story building constructed in 1927, he stated. The gross floor area of the building is 5,350SF, with two one-bedroom apartments on the second story and the former restaurant and bar, McMae's, on the ground floor. McMae's closed in 2019, continued Mr. Iwicki. The building's Tudor style façade features natural brick, timber, and stone of the colors red, buff and cream, and matches the architecture of adjacent buildings in style, texture and color, he said. The subject property is in the South Historic District and located on the east side of Main Street between Duane Street and Hillside Avenue in the C5A Central Retail Core Subdistrict. The Petitioner, related Mr. Iwicki, is proposing the complete remodel of the building's west, south and east elevations while maintaining the building's Tudor style. The modifications, he said, include resurfacing the façade, expanding the front entry, adding new lighting fixtures, and replacing shingles at the front roof section as well as all windows and doors. The Petitioner proposes replacing the façade with timber and Hardie panels in light gray with darker gray accents. The masonry fenestration at the building partition is specified to remain. The updated trim and the extruded box window will be black. The *Appearance Review Guidelines (ARG)* references "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings," which directs that the historic character and distinctive features should not be replaced, covered or destroyed. When replacement is necessary, the new feature shall match the old design in color, texture and, where possible, materials. Per the *ARG*, brick and stone with natural and earth tone colors are preferred wall materials for their durability and quality while trim and panel systems are not recommended.

The Petitioner proposes expanding the storefront vestibule, continued Mr. Iwicki, who said that the existing doorway features distinctive red paint, while the proposed vestibule features a dark bronze door with large glass pane extending to the ground and a side window with a grid design glass extending to the ground. He noted that the ARG supports a readily identifiable entrance highlighted by the building structure, awnings, canopies, lighting and/or architectural detailing. The existing ground-floor features picture windows on both sides of the door, explained the Intern, adding that the current second-floor façade is characterized by an extruded box window with a grid design. The renderings for the first floor propose changing the proportion and style of the original openings by vertically extending the windows towards the ground, said Mr. Iwicki. The Petitioner will cover the existing window opening near the exit door to blend with the proposed façade, continued the Intern, who added that all windows on the front façade will feature a grid design and dark bronze aluminum frames. According to Mr. Iwicki, the ARG specifies that materials and finishes not recommended include rustic-finished wood, aluminum siding, trim or panel systems and glass storefront wall systems that extend to the ground.

The proposal calls for removal of the five existing gooseneck light fixtures on the front façade of the building and installing new recessed LED light fixtures with adjustable white color, related Mr. Iwicki. These light fixtures are to be located with four on the second-floor overhang, three under the extruded box window to illuminate the business signage, three above the storefront vestibule, and two above the exit door, he elaborated. The existing gooseneck light fixtures could be considered architectural elements that would articulate the building's entrance and are in context with the Downtown historic character, said Mr. Iwicki, who also related that the east and south courtyard elevations consist of cinderblock and brick that is proposed to be cemented over and painted, matching the front façade in color. (Currently, he noted, all the structures adjacent to the courtyard feature brick in the colors buff, red and cream.) The AAG, he stated, directs that original building materials not be covered, and new construction should use the same or similar materials on the original building in terms of type, texture and color; particularly inappropriate are veneers of artificial stone, metal panels, vinyl siding, rough-sawn wood, and stucco applied over brick surfaces. The existing openings in the courtyard elevation, he added, will be improved with new picture windows and doors matching the building's frontage. The Petitioner proposes new shingles on the west elevation's roof pitch (front). Other improvements to the roof will not be visible from Main Street and include the new roof structure and membrane on the rear portions of the buildings, explained Mr. Iwicki. The interior of the building will be renovated as part of the project to prepare the space for a new co-working office. A building permit has been applied for by the Petitioner. There are no additions or new structures are proposed for the property, stated Intern Iwicki, who outlined Commission action.

Commissioner Albrecht remarked that while it's great the building is being renovated, given that the 2001 *Comprehensive Plan* spells out protections for downtown buildings (and a 2008 study identified the subject property as a "Notable Historic Structure") she advised care be taken. She said she couldn't imagine replacing the façade with Hardie board, and while expressing some flexibility over windows, identified the proposed colors as an issue. Agreeing, Commissioner Goronov stressed even more concern over proposed alterations to the building's "distinct" Tudor Style, describing these as between Tudor and Modern. He said that while the building needs updating, a refresh can be done easily at probably less expense. Given the ordinance for preservation, he said

the proposed is unacceptable and he wouldn't recommend it for approval. He added that the entry door in its current configuration is "lost in translation," suggesting that the floor plan could be designed to accommodate it. Referencing Brick and Mortar's branding, Commissioner Mees suggested that the Petitioner might find a way to work its white-and-black motif into the façade while preserving building details (and perhaps garnering award recognition). To illustrate this idea, she presented renderings, including one depicting the "Liberty of London" building featuring the store's name atop iconic Tudor Style expression. She remarked that a center entrance is more appropriate. While voicing agreement with the previous comments, Commissioner Rahn, said he didn't have as large an issue with the modern approach to the street level, but would like to see a closer relationship with the original upper floor. He pronounced the elimination of brick a "missed opportunity" to link to the community's heritage.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Sallwasser questioned the historic significance of the Gooseneck lighting. Mr. Iwicki said they were installed in 2001. A brief discussion of awnings ensued. Citing a May 2021 ordinance specifying that in this historic district the façade could not be disturbed, Commissioner Albrecht asked if renovation work on it has started. Mr. Iwicki replied affirmatively re: the façade and Sr. Planner Fard interjected that the Petitioner, who she said she thinks wasn't aware of the exterior review process, started the work (mostly for interiors), but *has* been told by Staff of the architectural review requirement. Commissioner Goronov asked if work started without a permit, to which Sr. Planner Fard said the Petitioner had a permit in process for interiors but not for exterior, a sequence Commissioner Goronov termed "unusual." He asked if the intent is to keep the original roof, to which Petitioner Adam Clabaugh said the slate is to be preserved. Commissioner Albrecht averred for careful permitting, saying change is "sometimes something you can't put back."

Petitioner Presentation

Adam Clabaugh, who introduced his partner Andrew Nast, responded to a request from Commissioner Smith to speak to the condition of the existing brick on the second-floor façade and in the courtyard and why the plan is to replace rather than repair it. Mr. Clabaugh responded that the façade brick is neither structural or in good shape. The rear brick is fair but doesn't flow with the cinderblock, he said, but indicated he is open to suggestions regarding treatment. Commissioner Goronov, who called the brick pattern/texture "unique," wondered if the brick might be tuck-pointed and painted. From a branding perspective, Commissioner Sallwasser asked if the Petitioners could keep the brick in the front and not cover it up. Mr. Clabaugh replied that it's faux brick not in good shape, and that it has to be replaced with something. Complimenting Commissioner Mees' renderings, he reiterated that the Petitioners are open to suggestions. "We're not hanging our hats super hard on anything," he said, expressing the hope of a solution that would accommodate both brand and environment. Commissioner Sallwasser asked how the sign is to be illuminated, to which Mr. Clabaugh replied that recessed can lighting is envisioned. In response to a suggestion from Commissioner Mees to keeping or replicating the window box detail, Mr. Clabaugh said he's open to the idea though everything on the front of the building has to be replaced, as it is "in bad shape." Commissioner Goronov asked if the street-level floor plan would allow keeping the symmetrical entrance, to which Mr. Clabaugh replied, "Unfortunately not," a situation the Commissioner called "unfortunate."

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Albrecht said she loves the idea of the can lights, which she called a “modern touch that provides light to this great space.” She suggested leaving the side brick exposed and focusing on trying to copy it in the cinderblock portion. She said she would hate to see the window box go, but conceded that Hardee board could work if used judiciously. Chairperson Jacobson said she liked the comments offered, and said that Commissioner Mees’ “doodle” captures the look desired. She said a “strictly” black-and-white approach is not going to fit with the other façades on the street, but said she doesn’t have a problem with the entryway being off-center. She also wishes to see some brick. Commissioner Smith suggested a warm gray be used (Mr. Clabaugh sounded amenable to a cream and brown combination), though said it’s not so much the color choices that matter as much as their tone, but expressed that she doesn’t think replacing one faux material with another adds charm. Commissioner Albrecht said she’d like to a door treatment that corresponds with mullions.

Sr. Planner Fard clarified that interior work can proceed, but no changes are to be made to the exterior without approval. Saying she would like to see a revised concept, Commissioner Albrecht moved that the Petitioner have the option of putting some of these comments and questions in place and come back and have us take a look at them. Seconded by Commissioner Goronov, the motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Exterior Appearance Review: 1186 Roosevelt Rd.

Staff Presentation

Associate Planner Gendel related that the Petitioner is Amanda Conway, Senior Project Coordinator at CESO, on behalf of the property owners proposing the remodel of an existing 3,704SF office building into an outpatient, Neuragenex medical treatment center. Neuragenex, she explained, is a pain management facility providing non-invasive procedures and is classified as a medical use under the Village of Glen Ellyn Code. Ms. Gendel stated that the current architectural style will remain as is with a few changes proposed, including the removal of a door from the east elevation and infilling the brick in its place, the addition of four windows on the east wall to allow for more natural light into the building, and painting of the brick walls, soffit, fascia, and wood and metal panel systems to present a modern look to the façade.

Brick and siding will be painted “Pure White,” and the brick accent and the canopy’s metal panel system will be “Grizzle Gray,” continued the Associate Planner, who related that the Village’s ARG states that “brick and stone with natural and earth tone colors are preferred wall materials for their durability and quality.” She said, however, the white painted brick façade *will* match the property to the west of the building. All existing exterior finishes to remain shall be restored to like new conditions and re-painted to match existing finishes, including the doors, said Ms. Gendel, who noted that roofing will be painted according to the specs provided. The existing gutter and downspout will be painted “Grizzle Gray,” and any damaged, failing or eroding conditions on the exterior elevations will be repaired or replaced with like-kind materials to match what’s existing, she explained. The existing trash enclosure is in disrepair and will be replaced with like-kind to match the building with brick and paint in compliance with Code, related Ms. Gendel. The brick veneer will be “Glen Gray” to match the building color, and the gate will be primed and painted a dark bronze color complying with ARG regulation, she continued. The submitted Planting Plan does

not propose any trees or plants listed on the *ARG* Recommended Plant List, she reported, but said it appears that most proposed plantings are comparable in type and size. Ms. Gendel provided direction for AAC deliberation.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Albrecht wondered if the Petitioner might incorporate items from the recommended plant list into the landscape at the site – which she called “stark.” Sr. Planner Fard said that while any variations would need to come before the Plan Commission, the AAC is welcome to provide input into landscape plans.

Commissioner Goronov asked if the scope of work included work to the parking lot, to which Ms. Gendel responded affirmatively, saying that the Petitioner will have to meet accessibility and parking code provisions. Commissioner Goronov noted an alley in the back, which he described as being “in very bad shape.” The Associate Planner said the Petitioner could address this, adding that she thinks there are plans for resurfacing the parking lot.

Petitioner Presentation

Owner Representative Tom Libelich said he had no formal presentation but would be glad to answer questions.

Commissioner Comments

Calling the proposed “a nice refresh,” Commissioner Albrecht reiterated the need for landscape accents, which she said would be “frosting on the cake.” The Petitioner offered assurance that the lot won’t be left in disrepair. Commissioner Goronov congratulated the Petitioner on the effort, saying the proposed will be “a great addition to the streetscape of Roosevelt Road.” He added that landscaping would help “soften the big, hard surface” of the parking lot. Mr. Libelich said he was happy to take any recommendations from the Commission, and that The Petitioner is “not married to the Landscape Plan. Commissioner Rhan said the plan represents a “wonderful refresh,” though wondered if, given that the corridor is predominantly white, whether the Petitioner had any thoughts about changing the color to differentiate the building. Mr. Libelich replied that the design represents the aesthetic the Petitioner uses across the country, and that it is “their look,” though indicated the Petitioner could consider “toning it down.” Citing concerns over plants specified in the Landscape Plan, Chairperson Jacobson recommended selecting alternatives.

Commissioner Sallwasser moved for the following:

After conducting a public meeting and deliberating on the request of the petitioner, Amanda Conway of CESO, Inc., for approval of an exterior appearance review for 1186 Roosevelt Road in the C3 Service Commercial District, the Architectural Appearance Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Architectural Appearance Commission public meeting on October 12, 2022, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this meeting and kept on file as part of the permanent records of the Village. The Architectural Appearance Commission makes this recommendation of approval with the following conditions:

1. The project shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans and drawings as submitted and the testimony presented, with a consideration for a softer white color palette, at the October 12, 2022 Architectural Appearance Commission meeting and before the Village Board of Trustees.
2. That the proposed landscaping on the site shall be installed in compliance with the approved landscape plan with the suggested landscape changes, and be continuously maintained in perpetuity.
3. The photometric plan and the parking lot alterations shall conform to the Village Zoning, Building, and Accessibility Codes as well as stormwater regulations, and a building permit shall be issued for the exterior alterations.

Seconded by Commissioner Smith, the motion passed unanimously by roll call vote of all the AAC Commissioners.

Exterior Appearance Review: 504 Crescent Blvd.

Staff Presentation

Sr. Planner Fard related that the Petitioner, Sylvia Xim'enez, representing Five-0-Four Kitchen, is requesting approval of the exterior appearance review to accommodate the renovation of the existing building at 504 Crescent Blvd. The subject property is located on the north side of Crescent Blvd. between Main St. and Glenwood Ave. in the C5A Central Business District, in the North Downtown Historic District, explained Ms. Fard, who added that the subject unit was formerly occupied by Rue Restaurant and has been used primarily as a retail core use. The existing building was constructed in 1918 and is improved with a one-story building, she noted.

The Petitioner plans to renovate the southern, western and northern elevations of the building, said the Sr. Planner. On the south elevation, she elaborated, the Petitioner plans on replacing brick with natural stone marble featuring cream-white hues with a textured finish. The proposal, she stated, also calls for the renovation of the entrance vestibule with full-height glass door and windows, and the replacement of storefront windows with bi-fold glass doors and windows, to the right and left of the entrance, respectively. All windows and doors will feature dark bronze aluminum framing. Ms. Fard said that the *ARG* states that, "Materials and finishes not recommended include...aluminum siding, trim or panel systems; glass storefront wall systems that extend to the ground." The proposed storefront includes aluminum framing and panels, as well as the glass storefront portion that extends to the ground. Also, she said the *ARG* states that "windows and doors should be inset behind the plane of the wall, clearly defined by wood or masonry trim." Additional changes include removal of existing awnings, new air curtains atop new doors, and new light fixtures. The *ARG* supports a readily identifiable entrance highlighted by the building structure, awnings, canopies, lighting, and/or architectural detailing. Also, she said, the guidelines encourage awnings providing protection from wind, rain, and hot sun to the benefit of pedestrians and protection of window displays.

The brick is currently painted on the western elevation, continued the Sr. Planner, who said that it will be washed, sandblasted and tuck-pointed to restore the underlying cream brick tone. Broken bricks will be replaced, and the surface will be UV varnished for further protection. A similar

treatment, she said, is to be applied to the northern elevation. The *ARG*, she related, states that, "Original masonry wall surfaces should not be cleaned with abrasive methods such as sandblasting ... unless the building has no distinctive historic or architectural character." The rooftop equipment is currently screened by a 2- to 3-ft.-high parapet wall on three sides of the building, said Ms. Fard. The screen is made of light beige/gray Rolex Aluminum panels with flashing caps. As part of the renovation project, explained Ms. Fard, adding that the Petitioner intends to replace parts of the screen wall which are currently in disrepair, including metal studs and pressure-treated blocking, while maintaining the existing metal paneling, perhaps moving them a little. No changes to the color and materials are proposed, and the screen will match the building. The interior of the building will be renovated as part of the project to prepare the space for the new restaurant. A building permit has been applied for and is in process. Sr. Planner Fard provided a list of considerations the Commissioner might discuss.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Rahn asked if extending the storefront to the ground is acceptable by the Village. Ms. Fard said the guideline discourages it, but it's not law. Commissioner Goronov asked if the proposed included cleaning up the original brick on the south elevation. Ms. Fard replied it is to instead be replaced with "marble stone." The Commissioner requested further information about this material and about the window configuration envisioned, to which Ms. Fard deferred to the Petitioner. Remarking that the palette is contemporary overall, Commissioner Smith wondered about the vision for the south elevation. Commissioner Albrecht said she wants to see a front elevation illustration and a depiction of material colors.

Commissioner Goronov asked if the Petitioner would be seeking approval for a terrace in the street, such as the previous restaurant in the space had. Associate Planner Gendel said the terrace was part of a pilot program. Ms. Fard explained that outdoor dining/seating is a special use to be sought separately after the new use moves in, and said she hasn't heard anything about plans for such use.

Petitioner Presentation

Petitioner Sylvia Xim'enez related that her family has been operating the Santa Fe restaurant for almost 42 years, originally occupying the subject site before transferring over to 426 Main. The Crescent Blvd. space, she said, was rented first to Vittorio's and later to Rue, before a fire damaged the building a few years ago. Five-0-Four Kitchen, she said, will feature a renowned chef, with the goal of offering breakfast and lunch and three days of service for dinner. She said changes to the exterior will involve the addition of bi-fold windows and clean-up of the brick in a revocation of the existing architecture. Sandblasting to remove layers of paint, she said, will be followed by a UV coat.

She said the floor-to-ceiling bi-fold windows are only envisioned for one side of the front, as the floor of the other side slopes 9 inches to the alley. She said there is no proposal for outdoor seating as of yet, pending sidewalk improvements (though a delay in the streetscape could prompt the Petitioner to apply for a Special Use Permit). Ms. Xim'enez explained that the front and west façades of the building are original brick, and said that while her concept is to renovate the front one to marble stone to match the adjacent former bank building, she is not opposed to displaying the original brick. She also expressed flexibility in light fixtures, expressing a desire to maintain the "beauty of Glen Ellyn."

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Albrecht said that given the topography the window arrangement makes sense, and favors the idea of fixing the brick on the alley wall. Sr. Planner Fard said she could inquire of the Building Department about less abrasive methods to remove paint. The Petitioner said there isn't much brick on the front, but isn't opposed to keeping it. Commissioner Goronov said he likes the idea of what appears to be limestone, and favored the idea of continuing it along the base of the west elevation as an accent, cleaning the brick above. Ms. Xim'enez said she isn't sure how aesthetically pleasing this treatment would be. Not knowing the streetscape specification for a tree in front of the building, the Petitioner expressed ambivalence about leaving an awning, given her experience replacing several because of sap damage. Commissioner Goronov recommended looking at the whole elevation. Commissioner Mees said it would be great to see a rendering without the awning, as losing it would be a "big change," and asked about signage. In lieu of a printed awning, Ms. Xim'enez described a concept for an LED-illuminated, carved faux limestone feature. Commissioner Mees said she would like to see an illustration of this. Commissioner Rahn suggested painting the brick of the west façade a bold color, maybe with graphics or a mural.

Expressing the goal of improving the building and the downtown, the Petitioner indicated she is flexible, and that she could provide renderings. Commissioner Smith said that, after viewing an online illustration of the type of limestone-type material described by the Petitioner, she preferred to keep the existing brick rather than replace it with "cultured stone," which, she said, does not fit in with the context. She further said she likes the awning windows, but is concerned about the palette, and said the light fixtures specified are too contemporary for a "very charming" brick building. Ms. Xim'enez conveyed that she has "no problem" keeping the brick. Commissioner Smith asked the Petitioner's construction contractor (Chris) his thoughts about limestone on the west façade. He said he thinks limestone is too prone to winter damage from snowplowing and salt. Ms. Xim'enez declared, "I think we're keeping the brick." Citing the lack of a rendering as an obstacle to making a decision, Chairperson Jacobson expressed a preference for keeping the brick, a dislike for the mural idea, and the view the AAC is "a little bit on the fence" about the stone vs. brick. She said it's difficult to visualize the front without the awning and how the signage would fit. Renderings with and without the awning and a depiction of the limestone were requested. The discussion was tabled.

Staff Report

Sr. Planner Fard related that a request to legalize a canopy at Tutto Bene is in process.

Commissioner Goronov said he wants to see a floor plan for 411 N. Main, which he called "a jewel," adding that it would be easy to make the building "true to itself and be fresh." Ms. Fard said she can add this to requirement for everyone, though it's not under AAC purview to request changes to it.

Adjournment

Chairperson Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m., following a voice vote on a motion by Commissioner Albrecht and seconded by Commissioner Goronov.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton-Thomas
Recording Secretary