



MINUTES

MEETING OF VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

December 21, 2022 – VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
432 W. NEBRASKA STREET

- Call to Order:** Chair Steward called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.
- Commissioners Present:** Chair Marcia Steward, Vice-Chair Chester Szmurlo, Secretary Stephanie Kush, Patricia Tutko, David Toepper
- Commissioners Absent:** None
- Staff Present:** Planner Drew Duffin, Senior Planner Chris Gruba, Director of Community and Economic Development Mike Schwarz
- Elected Officials Present:** None

A. Approval of the Minutes from November 16, 2022

Motion (#1): Approval of the November 16, 2022 minutes, as amended.

Motion by: Kush

Seconded by: Szmurlo

Approved: (5 to 0)

B. New Business

1. Certificate of Appropriateness: 6-24 Elwood Street/Frankfort Grainery (new signage)

Drew Duffin gave a brief overview of the application.

Applicant Sadim Memishi briefly explained his proposal, noting that the sign design was appropriate when it was constructed in 1988, but now appears dated. He wished to mimic some design characteristics of the arched metal sign for the Old Plank Road Trail sign just south of the building. He also noted that the individual sign panels on the existing sign had probably been switched out over the years, likely without approval by the HPC, which had led to a “hodgepodge” appearance of the entire sign. He noted that the proposed sign panel for the Wine Thief would be smaller than what it is today.

Chair Steward asked if the new panel layout on the sign would have enough space for 8

tenants in the building. The applicant responded that it would. He also noted that some tenants occupy two or more units. He also noted that the proposed sign panels would correspond to the size of each tenant.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked if there would be framing between the individual tenant panels. The applicant responded that there would be framing, but that the dividers between the tenant panels could be removed to create larger panels.

Commissioner Toepper asked if each tenant would have its own row. The applicant responded yes.

Chair Steward asked if the existing cornice and roof accent could be preserved, while upgrading the tenant panels within. She felt that the proposed black metal top had a modern look and not a historic look. Commissioner Szmurlo noted that the existing cornice and roof accent were showing signs of decay and that the top may need to be removed and replaced. Chair Steward asked if the stone piers would remain. The applicant responded yes.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked if the sign panels would be see-through (cut out letters). The applicant replied that they would be non-transparent, double-sided signs. Commissioner Szmurlo asked how the sign would be illuminated. Planner Duffin noted that there are existing floodlights that would remain directed at the sign.

Commissioner Toepper noted that the freestanding sign is currently an existing, non-conforming sign, as freestanding signs aren't permitted in the H-1 zone district. He noted that the applicant is not increasing the level of non-conformity.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked if the letters on the metal sign top would be white. The applicant responded yes, they would be white reflective vinyl.

Motion (#2): Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed changes to the existing freestanding sign for the property located at 6-24 Elwood Street, in accordance with the scope of work as listed in the Design Review Application, the submitted plans, and additional testimony.

Motion by: Szmurlo Seconded by: Tutko

Approved: (5 to 0)

C. New Business

2. Certificate of Appropriateness: 229 N. White Street (new windows)

Drew Duffin gave a brief overview of the application.

The applicant, Mr. Douglas Heathcock, was in attendance.

Commissioner Tutko noted that they would be replacing the mid-century windows with casement windows, which is desirable.

Commissioner Toepper asked if the transom windows would be tucked underneath the awnings. The applicant replied yes and that they would not be visible from the sidewalk.

Motion (#3): Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed exterior changes for the property located at 229 N. White Street, in accordance with the scope of work as listed in the Design Review Application, the submitted plans, and additional testimony.

Motion by: Szmurlo

Seconded by: Toepper

Approved: (5 to 0)

D. New Business

3. Certificate of Appropriateness: 15 Ash/Olde Frankfort Mall (building addition)

Chris Gruba gave a brief overview of the application.

One of the architects, Chris Tokarz, provided a project overview accompanied by images on the projection screen. He reviewed several past projects that the Linden Group had completed for Frankfort and in the surrounding area. He understood that Frankfort expects high-quality design and materials for new development. Architect Grant Currier noted that the proposed building is a blending of different architectural styles, while drawing inspiration from other existing buildings within downtown Frankfort. The building has some Italianate features, but also “turn of the century” styles from other downtowns.

Chris Tokarz noted that there was a need to renovate the existing building with the proposed building addition, due to the age and maintenance required for the existing older building. He noted that more plantings and streetscape improvements would be added and that on-street loading would be provided for the building. He noted that the elevation drawings contained the desired locations for future tenant wall signage, but the materials and content of each sign had not been decided upon.

Chair Steward asked if the entrance of the building along Kansas Street would serve as the main entrance for both the commercial tenants and the residents. Chris Tokarz responded yes. He also noted that as a recommendation from the Plan Commission workshops, they decided to soften the visual transition of the building addition to the existing building along the Ash Street frontage.

Chair Steward asked if the brick design on the second floor of the existing building facing Ash Street was existing or proposed. Chris Tokarz responded that the brick detail is existing and would be preserved and repaired. However, additional building details would be added to the southernmost portion of the existing façade facing Ash Street. He also noted that there would be some repair work performed, including removing the existing wall A/C units and patching the holes with brick. He explained that a small amount of EIFS would be used on the building addition exterior, on the south elevation adjacent to the rooftop deck over the existing bowling alley. This south elevation of the addition adjacent to the existing building would not support the weight of heavy building materials such as brick and that EIFS is lighter. The south side of the building addition with EIFS would not be highly visible to anyone at ground level. He also noted that all of the proposed lights would be LED and could be brightened or dimmed through the use of a “driver” mechanism on the lights.

Chair Steward asked if there was an entrance for tenants on White Street. Chris Tokarz responded that there is an entrance for loading on White Street.

Chris Tokarz provided some physical building materials and paint samples for the Commission to view.

Chair Steward noted that she liked the design and colors, which are appropriate for the downtown. She asked, as a member of the Frankfort Area Historical Society, that the applicant donate any materials of historic value instead of discarding them.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for general comments.

Commissioner Toepper noted that the proposal clearly matches the design of other buildings in town and did not have any initial comments.

Commissioner Szmurlo noted that the building at 28 W. Nebraska has stone that is crumbling and to make sure that any materials used on the building addition do not also deteriorate prematurely. He asked if the cornice and parapet colors would match the colors for the window frames in each section. Chris Tokarz responded that these colors would be different for variation. Commissioner Szmurlo asked if the color differentiation is illustrated on the elevation drawings. Chris Tokarz responded that the elevation drawings do not include specific colors, but that they have colors selected and can provide those to staff. Commissioner Szmurlo asked if the applicant has a Uniform Sign Plan. Chris Tokarz responded that the proposed signage is a work in progress, and that they will have to return to the HPC for approval once future tenants are selected. Commissioner Szmurlo asked why signage was being proposed on both the first and second floors of the façade facing Ash Street. Chris Tokarz responded that there is an existing canopy on the first-floor façade facing Ash Street and that signage would be placed above it instead to maintain some of the existing architectural details.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked about the proposed landscape planters. Grant Currier asked staff to elaborate on the landscaping requirements. Chris Gruba explained that the applicant would be planting several trees within the rights-of-way of Ash, Kansas and White streets to bring the site into compliance with the Landscaping Ordinance. He also noted that the Zoning Ordinance requires in-ground landscaping between the building and the property lines adjacent to right-of-way. The proposed building addition would be placed within 1'-6' of property lines and that the applicant was proposing to install landscape planters instead of in-ground landscaping. Although the absence of in-ground landscaping would require an exception to be granted as part of the PUD approval process, the applicant is striving to meet the intent of the ordinance by installing planters. Chris Tokarz noted that in-ground landscaping that is this narrow in downtown areas adjacent to buildings tends to get trampled by pedestrians and accumulates pet waste. The landscape planters would be filled with living annual plants.

Commissioner Kush asked if a shadow study was performed for the building and surrounding buildings, considering the height of the proposed 3-story building. Staff noted that a shadow study was not performed and although it could provide some educational benefit, such a study is not required per code. Commissioner Kush expressed concern that Trail's Edge and the Trolley Barn would be shaded at certain times.

Commissioner Tutko said that she liked the style and colors of the building but was concerned about the height.

Chair Steward also said that she had concerns about the proposed height of the building. She thought that a 3-story building would be more appropriate if adjacent to a 4-lane street, whereas all adjacent streets are 2-lanes. She was also concerned about the proposed balconies, which don't seem to blend in with the building and would extend over public sidewalks.

Commissioner Kush also expressed concern regarding the balconies.

Commissioner Toepper noted that other balconies in the downtown blend in with the building, but the balconies as proposed for 15 Ash Street do not. Chris Tokarz asked if the Commission was referring to the balconies on Oak Street that pedestrians walk beneath. Commissioner Kush responded yes, and also the balconies along Kansas Street for Fat Rosie's and Francesca's.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding the building materials. Commissioner Tutko said that she liked the materials and that they blended well with the look of other buildings along Kansas Street. Commissioner Kush also said she liked the building materials and that they complemented the buildings on Kansas Street but did not blend with the buildings along Ash and White streets. Commissioners Szmurlo and Toepper both said that they liked the materials. Chair Steward asked the applicant to

explain the finish of the window frames. Chris Tokarz noted that the window frames would have an applied manufacturer bronze finish; they would not be painted.

Commissioner Szmurlo said that the proposed building architecture and materials on the building exterior are excellent, but that the balconies don't appear "organic" to the building. Chris Tokarz explained that the 3-dimensional renderings make the balconies look more appropriate than the 2-dimensional elevation drawings. They did explore the idea of recessed balconies but that they would have broken up the repetition of windows and would not look as good. Chair Steward asked the architect if they could consider the design without balconies. Chris Tokarz responded that they intend to keep the balconies as part of the design.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding the building colors. Commissioners Tutko and Kush said that the colors work well together. Commissioner Szmurlo expressed concern about the gray color along the Ash Street façade. Chris Tokarz explained that there are two different types of brick on the existing building. He provided proposed brick samples to the Commission for inspection. Commissioner Szmurlo noted that the brick samples looked better than as illustrated on the colored elevation drawing.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding the exterior lighting. Commissioner Szmurlo expressed concern about the brightness of some of the lights and asked why the acorn-style lights were selected. Chris Tokarz replied that the acorn-style lights were proposed next to the service entrance along White Street and that the building code requires some illumination at service entrances. He thought that acorn-style lights would be visually more appealing than standard wall-pack lights. He also noted that because of the LED technology used, all lights could be dimmed if needed. Commissioner Szmurlo said that he thought that 600-watt, 9,000 lumen output lights seemed very bright. He thought that the service entrance lights could be fitted with different fixtures to shield the direct light source and aim lighting down. Although acorn-style lights are attractive, they disburse light in all directions. Commissioner Szmurlo reiterated that the lights should not be overly bright, as there have been bright light issues with other properties in the downtown. Chris Tokarz noted that during the Lighting of the Green event at Breidert Green, he heard from a lot of people in attendance that the downtown area was not very well lit. Chair Steward agreed with Commissioner Szmurlo that the acorn-style lights tend to cast light in all directions and preferred a more directed light fixture. Commissioner Kush said that she liked the variation in the types of light fixtures proposed. However, they should make sure that the lights are not too bright and asked if gooseneck style lights or something similar would be more appropriate near the service area. Chris Tokarz responded noting that they did consider gooseneck style lights but because they wanted some variation in styles, they decided against them.

Chris Gruba noted that the Zoning Ordinance permits up to 0.5 foot-candles of light along

each property line, but because the building itself would be set back approximately 1'-6' from each property line, that it would be nearly impossible to not exceed this amount with additional building-mounted lights. He noted that the PC/ZBA could grant an exception from this requirement as part of the PUD approval for the project. He noted that, if the HPC would recommend approval of the project, that a condition for the lighting either include reference to the brightness of the lights measured in lumens or a condition that lighting must be dimmed as requested by staff. If the plans referenced the light type and lumen output per manufacturer specifications, staff could verify that the correct type of light was installed during a building inspection. He stated that staff does not have the equipment needed to measure foot candles at property lines and recommended against a condition of approval that referenced foot-candles. Referring to an earlier comment made by the architect, he noted that the Public Works Department did not have an opinion regarding the brightness of the lights.

Commissioner Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding signage.

Commissioner Tutko asked if signage would be determined at a later date. Chris Tokarz responded yes. Chair Steward noted that signage is typically located along a common centerline that runs horizontally across the building façade, whereas the proposed wall sign locations vary in height across the building façades. Chris Gruba asked Chris Tokarz if at least the sign locations were final, knowing that the sign content, materials, colors and illumination have not been decided. Chris Tokarz responded that the signage as proposed on the elevation drawings are suggested locations. Chair Steward asked if the applicant would return to the HPC for a Certificate of Appropriateness just for the signage. Chris Tokarz responded yes.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding landscaping. Commissioner Kush said that the proposed landscaping would soften the impact of the building height. Commissioners Toepper, Szmurlo and Tutko agreed. Chair Steward expressed concern that the landscape planters would have artificial landscaping. Chris Tokarz responded that the landscape planters would use live, annual plants.

Architect Grant Currier asked staff to elaborate on the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations regarding building height. Chris Gruba explained that the Comprehensive Plan specifically calls out this property for redevelopment and contains language that downtown buildings should be no taller than 3 stories, implying that a 3-story building is acceptable.

Chair Steward asked the applicant for details regarding the outdoor seating area and fencing. Chris Tokarz said that they were working with staff regarding the design. Chris Gruba noted that historically, the Village has required that outdoor seating within the right-of-way be removable during the wintertime, as is done for Fat Rosie's, Francesca's and Trail's Edge. He suggested that a condition for approval that the outdoor seating

fencing match the other restaurants along Kansas with respect to materials, height, design and be removable. Chair Steward asked if there were 2 outdoor seating areas. Chris Tokarz responded yes, on Kansas and Ash streets.

Grant Currier stated that they were seeking to construct a building that looked like it had been there for longer than it actually has. He said that the balconies help add to the impression that the building has been added to over time.

Commissioner Kush said that she didn't think that the building as proposed fits well in the context of the downtown area, primarily because of the height.

Commissioner Szmurlo said that he liked the brick infill on the ADA ramp facing Kansas Street and that it improves the design. He raised the topic of rooftop mechanical units. Chris Tokarz replied that the rooftop units would be screened by parapet walls or with metal louvered panels. He said that part of the reason for the building height exception was in part a response to the PC/ZBA's request to raise parapet walls to screen rooftop mechanical units.

Chris Gruba summarized that the HPC has three options: to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions if desired, table the item or deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. Conditions of approval could also pertain to lighting.

Chair Steward said she was concerned about introducing the first 3-story building to the downtown. Owner Michael Shideler noted that there is already a 3-story building, housing La Dolce Vida. Chair Steward clarified that she was referring to the historic downtown area, not the entirety of properties zoned H-1 (Historic District). Grant Currier noted that the proposed building addition would be adjacent to a public park. They had also researched other downtowns where 3-story buildings are located adjacent to shorter buildings and can provide examples to the HPC if desired. Chair Steward asked if the buildings Mr. Currier referred to are located adjacent to 2-lane streets. Mr. Currier responded that he could provide examples of 3-story buildings adjacent to both 2-lane and 3-lane wide streets.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked the architects if they needed the building to be 3 stories tall. Chris Tokarz suggested that the HPC should focus less on the number of stories and instead on the overall building height. He noted that the upper floors are less tall because they would be serving residential uses and not commercial and therefore would need less height. He also noted that the Trolley Barn building on the east side of White Street is 2 stories tall and has exposed rooftop mechanical units that are not screened.

Chair Steward asked the Commission if they felt comfortable approving the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions or preferred to table the project. Commissioners Szmurlo noted that he would deny the project as proposed and would prefer to table it.

All other commissioners said they'd prefer to table the item, providing them time to think about the discussion from the evening. Chris Gruba asked if each commissioner could briefly summarize their main concerns. Commissioner Toepper had no major concerns. Commissioner Szmurlo was most concerned about the balconies. Chair Steward and Commissioner Kush were most concerned about lighting, building height and the balconies. Commissioner Tutko was most concerned about noise from tenants on balconies.

Mr. Shideler noted that the project needs to move forward quickly because the existing building is in dire need of maintenance and the project would address those concerns as well as make it economically feasible.

Motion (#4): To table the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed building addition at 15 Ash Street until the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on January 18th, 2023.

Motion by: Kush

Seconded by: Toepper

Approved: (5 to 0)

E. New Business

4. Certificate of Appropriateness: 7 N. White Street (new construction)

Chris Gruba gave a brief overview of the application. The applicant, Dan Elliot, was in attendance. The applicant's architect provided some physical building material samples to the Commission.

Chair Steward asked the Commission for comments regarding the architecture. Commissioner Toepper stated that he had concerns about using a metal roof. He also believed that the east building elevation (rear) was lacking in architectural detail. Commissioner Szmurlo noted that window treatments, small roof dormers and a wood pergola were added since the first workshop, which greatly helped the aesthetics. He liked the wood pergola better than the former metal pergola.

Chair Steward directed the conversation to building materials. She asked what roof materials would be used over the added dormer windows. The architect responded that they would be shingled. Chair Steward noted that the proposed building would block the existing view of Prairie Park and asked if the wood pergola could be stained with a finish to give it a "natural look". She felt that as proposed, the building didn't seem "soft".

Commissioner Toepper asked the applicant if the building foundation would be built higher to match the elevation of the existing sidewalk along White Street. Currently, the parking lot is a few feet lower than White Street. The architect responded yes.

Commissioner Szmurlo noted that the subject property is in the heart of downtown. He noted that there are more modern structures further north on White Street, but less so in the historic downtown area. He noted that a metal roof has a more modern look and would not be appropriate in the downtown. He said that he had voted against the use of a metal roof for the property at 1 N. White Street.

Commissioner Toepper asked if the roof materials would have a “slate style”. The project architect responded yes. The architect also noted that the use of metal roofs predates the use of shingle roofs, particularly in Europe. As such, he argued that metal is a more appropriate roofing material in the historic downtown than asphalt shingles. Regarding the loss of view of Prairie Park from White Street, he said that they had tried to incorporate a softer appearance by adding the wood pergola adjacent to the bike path.

The applicant explained the location of the building in relation to the future property lines should the property be subdivided as proposed. He noted that the building is approximately 6” away from the future north property line, but that there is a little more space on the front and back (west and east) sides of the building and the future property lines. Dan Elliot noted that their only option was to place the pergola against the building and that the pergola would match other proposed building materials. He also noted that the building would be screened with landscape materials adjacent to the outdoor seating area. The project architect noted that the outdoor seating area would be fully enclosed and have a gate.

The architect said that he could investigate using a softer color for the pergola. He then distributed physical color samples and brick samples for the Commission to view. The architect listed various changes to the plans since the first workshop. He noted that the size of the signs had been decreased, they had reduced the window size, replaced double doors with single doors, added a knee wall below all storefront windows, added a gable to the south elevation and added the wood pergola.

Chair Steward noted that the wording on some of the signs would be too small to read and recommended rearranging signage composition to be more legible, without increasing the size of the sign.

The architect explained the proposed building-mounted gooseneck lighting and said that the light levels were very low. Commissioner Szmurlo liked how the proposed gooseneck style lights shield the light source and are aimed down toward the building. He asked about any proposed lighting around the patio. Mr. Elliot responded that there are a couple light fixtures adjacent to the outdoor patio. The architect noted that there are some existing street lights along White Street that will help illuminate the site but that additional lighting would probably be needed for the outdoor seating area.

The architect noted that the southwest corner of the building would be “angled” and that

there wouldn't be any vestibule at this entrance. Staff asked if there would be an inclement weather "air lock" if there were no vestibule. The architect stated that this would be a discussion with the restaurant.

Commissioner Szmurlo asked why there was no wainscot on the north side of the building when the other three sides have it. The architect noted that this was an error on the color building elevations and renderings and these would be corrected to add wainscot.

The applicant noted that space between the front of the building and the front property line along White Street (the sidewalk) may have brick pavers instead of poured concrete. Commissioner Szmurlo said that the front of the building along White Street could use some landscaping adjacent to the building, such as planter boxes similar to the planter boxes proposed for the bowling alley addition project.

Outdoor seating was discussed in the areas south of the building and west of the building. Staff noted that the Zoning Ordinance requires that any area used for outdoor seating for a restaurant must be enclosed by a fence at least 3' tall. However, since this project would be a Major Change to an existing PUD, this requirement could be granted an exception. The Commission noted that it may look better if the west side of the building facing White Street did not have a fence around the outdoor seating. Staff did note that if alcohol is served, that fencing would be required by state law. The applicant noted that they likely would want to serve liquor for the sushi restaurant for the southern tenant space but that the other restaurant spaces likely would not serve alcohol.

The applicant noted that they wanted to connect the outdoor seating area to the Old Plank Road trail with a paved pedestrian connection, which would also contain a bike rack. Chris Gruba noted that this site plan design aspect is more applicable to review by the Plan Commission than the HPC. Regardless, he noted that if the paved pedestrian connection was installed as depicted on the site plan, it would necessitate the removal of a mature tree on Village property and that this could be avoided if the proposed connection was relocated.

Chair Steward noted that the proposed warmer building colors were an improvement from the first workshop. Chris Gruba noted that if the Commission wished to recommend approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness, that a condition could be added regarding the brightness of the lights. Otherwise, if the Commission were comfortable with the lighting as proposed, a condition would not be needed.

Chair Steward asked the applicant to elaborate on the proposed signage. The architect noted that the wall signage would be "layered" to provide depth and dimension to the signs. He also confirmed that all signs would be gray, black and white. Chair Steward asked if the proposed bronze window framing would have a metallic finish. The architect noted that the window frames would be aluminum and that they would be a non-shiny

bronze color.

Chair Steward asked if there was consensus among the Commission that the fencing used for the outdoor seating must match the fencing used for Fat Rosie's and Francesca's. There was a consensus.

Commissioner Tutko said that she liked the proposed colors of the building.

Commissioner Kush said that she has concerns about the metal roof, especially when viewed from White Street, driving north or south. She felt that metal is a more "agricultural" roof material, whereas the downtown is more of a commercial area.

Chair Steward said that she felt that the building elevations did not have the charm of the historic downtown district. However, she thought that the revised plans before the Commission were a great improvement over the initial plans.

Commissioner Toepper asked if the building could be improved on the north elevation and on the south elevation adjacent to the trail. The architect replied that additional landscaping could be added between the north side of the building and the drive aisle. Commissioner Szmurlo asked if the eastern portion of the north elevation could be embellished.

Chair Steward asked the Commission if they wanted to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions or table the project pending further revisions. There was consensus that the project should be tabled until the first regularly scheduled HPC meeting in January.

Motion (#5): To table the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed building at 7 N. White Street until the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on January 18th, 2023.

Motion by: Toepper Seconded by: Tutko

Approved: (5 to 0)

F. Other Business

There was no other business.

G. Staff Updates

1. Historic Buildings Survey

Mike Schwarz noted that staff had yet to select a firm and was still reviewing the responses.

H. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

I. Adjournment

Motion (#6): Adjournment (9:14 PM)

Motion by: Kush

Seconded by: Szmurlo

Unanimously approved by voice vote.

Approved January 5th, 2022

As Presented X

As Amended _____

Marcia Steward /s/Marcia Steward, Chair

Stephanie Kush /s/Stephanie Kush, Secretary