

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES
109 James Street - Council Chambers
Geneva, Illinois 60134

May 20, 2014, 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Roy called the May 20, 2014 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission to order at 7:02 p.m. Roll call followed:

2. Roll Call

Present HPC: Chairman Roy, Commissioners Andersson, Hiller, Schock-Soderberg, Zinke

Absent: Commissioner Ploppert

Staff Present: Community Development Dir. Untch; Preservation Planner Lambert

Others Present: Dave Patzelt with Shodeen, Inc., Geneva; Donna and Kevin Greschuk, 25 Hunt Club, St. Charles; Glorianne Campbell, 18 S. Sixth St.; Liz Safanda, 1013 Dunstan; Alex Teipel, 427 W. State St.; Jim Bishop, 228 S. 5th St.; Ken Overstreet, 1120 E. Main St., St. Charles; Adam Gibbons, 33W777 Hill Rd.; Clyde and Sharon Jones, 521 Franklin St.; and Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

3. Approval of the April 15, 2014 Minutes

The April 15, 2014 minutes were approved, as presented, on motion by Commissioner Hiller, seconded by Commissioner Andersson. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

4. HPC Review of Building Permit Applications

A. 127 N. First Street (Case No. 2014-027); New Attached Garage; Applicant: W. Alex Teipel/Architect; Shodeen Management - Mr. Lambert reviewed a historical background of the property, noting few changes were made to the structure. The outbuilding (carriage house) had been moved/alterd over time. Proposed site plans were presented by Mr. Alex Teipel, architect for the project. Mr. Teipel explained that the site was very steep with the rear of the site being three stories. The Shodeens had asked him to design a garage to make the property more attractive to potential buyers. Materials for the garage will include stained cedar siding (reddish stain) with white trim and roof to match. The overhead garage door will be wood. Commissioners agreed that staff would approve the garage door details later.

Mr. Lambert reviewed each of the findings of fact for the petition, some of which included the home being potentially significant as it was one of the first five brick residences built in Geneva around 1845. Further finding details followed. In general, staff supported the petition but was concerned how the attached garage would be connected to the main structure. Mr. Teipel explained the garage would be attached to the structure using angles and foam insulation.

Questions followed on what would happen to the door that was being blocked wherein Mr. Teipel explained it would be removed and bricked in (compatible) with a wood window, which was his preference. A balcony over the garage was suggested but Mr. Teipel stated that after consideration, he and his client did not want it. A concern regarding the pitch of the roof on the south side of the garage going into the north wall of the structure was voiced, wherein Mr. Teipel said he would install a cricket. The last concern was how the garage would be attached and how the flashing would work, wherein Mr. Teipel explained he would soft cut it into the brick or use

another method of attachment. Andersson asked that to be staff-reviewed. She also suggested using a Hardi-board siding on the new addition since it was being attached to an existing structure and would be differentiated enough to reflect a different time period. **Commissioner Andersson moved to accept the proposal, as presented, with the following conditions: 1) the garage door be staff-approved at a later date; 2) the addition of a window on the door in-fill be staff-reviewed at a later date; 3) there will be a cricket at the juncture of the north wall of the main building and the south face of the garage roof; 4) the homeowner may choose to use cement fiberboard versus cedar siding; and 5) the flashing detail will be as unobtrusive, practical, and to be staff-reviewed. Seconded by Commissioner Zinke. Roll call:**

Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Shock-Soderberg, Zinke, Roy

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

B. 212 S. Fifth Street (Case No. 2014-032): Carriage Barn Relocation - Lot 1, Exterior Improvements to Residence - Lot 1; Applicant: Avondale Custom Homes, Ken Overstreet/Dave Myszka - Mr. Lambert recalled this petition was before the commissioners about two months ago, and, at that time, the carriage barn relocation was discussed and some other elements were pending, due to the petitioner having dialog with the neighbors to the south. To date, the site plan was submitted and drawings were to be reviewed. Petitioner, Mr. Ken Overstreet, stated he did meet with neighbor Jim Bishop with regard to the placement of the carriage barn and they decided to move it forward north another 10 feet so that Mr. Bishop could have a better backyard view and a nice buffer. The location was noted on the site plan with Mr. Overstreet adding that a new driveway will be proposed since the brick drive on Campbell Street would be removed.

Additional changes to the plans included: removing the screened porch, since it was not historic, and deciding, financially, whether to restore the original windows since some currently had significant rotting and were painted shut. Mr. Overstreet pointed out those windows that were a concern, noting he still had to evaluate them to see what could be salvaged. Mr. Lambert interjected that the information about the windows was new to him and that prior only a couple of windows had been discussed. Continuing, Mr. Overstreet stated the current vinyl shutters would be replaced with new wooden shutters. Staff and others emphasized that they be sized to the original historic shutters. Lastly, the petitioner stated the original stone patios would be lifted and re-laid to be more level. Some of the stone pavers being lifted out would also be used as a driveway border. Commissioner Andersson noted that the site plan did not reflect this.

Mr. Overstreet confirmed that the existing wooden steps on the front porch would be replaced with stone. However, Andersson voiced concern about connecting the stone with the wood fascia behind it and the overall water issues wherein Mr. Overstreet further explained how that portion would be addressed. Per another question, he stated the porch would be repaired and refinished and that he would add some decorative lattice at the base of the porch since the existing was rotted out. It was pointed out that the standard lattice was not appropriate to the house and could be more customized, however.

Mr. Lambert then raised the fact that the porch discussion was contrary to the prior concept discussion that took place, where previously, at the concept meeting, there was discussion that the wooden steps would be retained and not replaced with stone and that the historic character of the porch would be retained with wooden steps and the porch apron would be treated as in the historic photograph that was previously shown. Due to concerns, Lambert suggested excluding some of the items being discussed tonight and having them return to the HPC for review. **Commissioner Hiller moved to accept the proposal to move the garage at 212 S. Fifth Street and lay the driveway, as presented, with staff review of any new brick. Commissioner Zinke seconded the motion. Roll call:**

Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Shock-Soderberg, Zinke, Roy
Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

C. 204 S. Fifth Street (Case No. 2014-033); New Infill Residence - Lot 2; Applicant: Avondale Custom Homes, Ken Overstreet/Dave Myszka - Mr. Lambert indicated this was a concept review brought before the commissioners about two months ago. The new elevations basically remain unchanged. The lot sits north of the Merritt King house. Mr. Overstreet indicated there were no changes from the concept, except for the decorative headers and some shutters. A question was raised if staff had a site plan for all of the proposed houses, wherein Mr. Overstreet stated the commission did not have them but he did, as well as building footprints. Some commissioners asked to see a streetscape plan and a site plan of the entire project. Lambert explained there was a concept site plan that was previously submitted but it did not get into their packets at the last meeting; however, Mr. Lambert recalled that in the last site plan there was no room to move the house on the site based on the proposal that was submitted.

Mr. Lambert, however, was more concerned about not having the zoning compatibility worksheet for the site. Dir. Untch agreed and confirmed that the worksheet had to be submitted and reviewed by staff. If the commission wanted to move forward, it could require the worksheet as a condition in a motion and, if there were issues, it would return for review. Mr. Overstreet did confirm that the zoning compatibility worksheet still had to be completed. Other questions/comments followed regarding confirmation of the location of the front porch on the new home matching to the front of the porch of the Merritt King house; the overhead garage door being of composite material; and the reasoning for the wrought iron railing on the front porch. Minor dialog followed regarding refinements to the second garage; exploring ribbon driveways with staff; and whether the developer could leave some room for lot coverage so that an owner could install a patio. **Commissioner Zinke moved to accept the proposal, as presented, with the condition that the petitioner prepare the zoning compliance worksheet, to be approved by staff. Seconded by Commissioner Andersson. Roll call:**

Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Shock-Soderberg, Zinke, Roy
Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

D. 522 Campbell Street (Case No. 2014-002); New Infill Residence - Lot 4; Applicant: Avondale Custom Homes, Ken Overstreet/Dave Myszka - Mr. Lambert stated this proposal was before the HPC in February 2014 as a concept and was a new design by the developer with a street-facing garage (previously a snout-nose garage). Proposed was a shingle-type home (with Hardi-shingle and stone veneer), attached garage with wooden garage doors and covered porch, similar to a shingle-style four-square home. The roof ridge height was 28 feet because the roof had to be carried to the rear of the house while keeping nice slopes in front of the house and to stay within the floor area requirements. Again, no zoning compliance worksheet was provided by the petitioner. A brief review of the elevations and setbacks followed.

In reviewing the guidelines for historic preservation/new construction, Commissioner Andersson interpreted the architectural plans with the garage area being tucked under the house as a more modern massing and appropriate for the historic district. However, she strongly preferred the garage either placed further back or located in the rear entirely. In his argument, Mr. Overstreet stated there were lot width constraints, yet Andersson pointed out that he "chose" the lot widths and had to work within those constraints. Clarification followed by Dir. Untch that the developer was using the existing lots of record and the proposal was not a subdivision. Pros and cons of the garage location followed by commissioners, with Dir Untch reminding the commissioners that the intent of the design guidelines was to encourage designs where garages

were not dominate in the front facade either visually or by mass. The other argument was that garages were a reality. Mr. Overstreet offered to step back the garage a couple of feet.

Future owner of the home, Mr. Kevin Greschuk, 25 Hunt Club, St. Charles, explained that the home he was trying to design was to be livable for him and his wife. He was told that if the porch was aligned with the garage, the design should be fine. He also took into consideration the rear of the home and what the neighbors were looking at and did not have the ability to add an alley. Mr. Greschuk believed the home, as designed now, would fit into the neighborhood. He explained the materials that were being considered, the fact that the HPC was considered, and he was asking the commission to approve what was being presented. Mr. Lambert clarified that when the garage's design was being discussed with Dave Myszke, he (Lambert) thought it could be a reasonable compromise but that the details would be key. He also shared concerns about a heavy shadow on the porch but a light shadow on the garage doors, which he and Mr. Myszka did discuss. Commissioners provided further input/concerns regarding the front porch, the garage and roof massing (Zinke steps away). Mr. Overstreet offered to bring staff some detailed sketches (Zinke returns) and redraw the front roof lines to address the garage issues and to address roof massing on the east/west elevation.

After hearing the comments, Mr. Greschuk asked if the garage could be moved back two feet, would the HPC be satisfied. He confirmed that he did speak with Dave Myszke to break up the roof line but also added that when he and his wife drove around town, there were many front-loaded garages existing in the area. Dir. Untch summarized the issues being raised, which included not only breaking up the east elevation and how the two roofs merged on the west elevation, but also addressing the treatment of the front facade as it related to modifying the shadow lines, which were to be unified. The garage needed to be pushed back two feet back, the shingle siding against the shingled roof had to be considered or consider other roof forms, and the columns were thin. Dir. Untch also explained to the owner that it was not the role of the HPC to design the owner's home. Chairman Roy reiterated to the owners that he wanted the commission to be able to approve the project next month. Commissioner Andersson suggested that the owners review the design guidelines. However, Mr. Greschuk noted that the guidelines were suggestions, which is how he and his wife approached the project. Ms. Greschuk also pointed out that the guidelines state to not create a historic looking house because it is not historic. **Due to the concerns raised, Commissioner Zinke moved to continue the case, seconded by Schock-Soderberg. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 5-0.**

5. HPC Concept Review of Proposed Development Projects

A. 627 James Street, et al. (Case No. 2014-034); Proposed Redevelopment of Existing Commercial and Residential Sites at Seventh & James Streets; Applicant: Dave Patzelt/Shodeen Group - Mr. Lambert summarized the proposal for redevelopment at the corner of James and Seventh Streets. Mr. Dave Patzelt 77 N. First Street, Geneva, reviewed three proposals for the redevelopment, supporting Option 1 as the preferred proposal (6 townhomes). He confirmed that the Plan Commission did review the proposal and staff included those minutes in commissioners' packets. Proposed is six townhomes to face Seventh Street, with parking in the rear of the townhomes, and the removal of the mustard-colored house at the northwest corner of Seventh and James Streets, as well as the single-story brick commercial building to the north. Per Patzelt, the ideal access will be off of James Street, with the white house remaining as one looks north. Mr. Patzelt reviewed Option 2 and 3 in detail also. He asked for the commissioners' preference noting he would return to the commission with architectural elevations, etc.

Commissioner input included that the townhomes already set a precedent in the area but there was a concern that the demolition was an automatic assumption. Commissioner Hiller

wanted to know more about the mustard-colored house. Mr. Lambert clarified that the proposal was conceptual and demolition would not be automatic. A cost analysis would have to be provided by the applicant. In general, however, the commissioners preferred the six townhomes proposal because of the transition but also keeping the white house. Dir. Untch proceeded to share some of the staff discussions that took place regarding keeping the mustard-colored house. Mr. Lambert described the next steps for the project -- a history of the house.

Dir. Untch reported this site will be considered a PUD with multiple steps to follow before any approval can take place. Mr. Patzelt believed he could probably not meet the HPC criteria for the demolition of the white house, while he probably could with the mustard-colored house.

Resident, Mr. Colin Campbell, recalled that Shodeen petitioned to tear down both houses years ago with the white house being denied. He said the mustard-colored house had been allowed to deteriorate and had a number of different renters. However, Mr. Campbell asked that if the townhomes went up, he would be losing privacy in his backyard and asked that if any landscape was installed that it be evenly divided. Overall, he supported the townhomes.

Chairman Roy was pleased to see that Shodeen was keeping the white house because it was a nice transition to the single-family homes. He asked for consideration to the rear neighbors.

6. Secretary's Report

Preservation Month Recap - Mr. Lambert encouraged members to visit the web site to see the monthly activity that was taking place. At last night's City Council meeting the 2014 Historic Presentation awards were presented by the mayor. Preservation Month activities were also underway with reference to the walking tour. Dir. Untch commended Mr. Lambert's efforts in preparing the month's activities. All commissioners agreed that last night's council meeting was a very enthusiastic not only with owners showing up but also the various contractors who worked on their projects.

7. New Business

A. From the Commission - Commissioner Zinke mentioned only five individuals showed up for the May 18th walking tour. Therefore, Preservations Partners has asked that the HPC commissioners attend the next two waling tours. Andersson announced that IIT is hosting a town hall meeting for the Farnsworth House on May 29th for a proposal to have the house placed on hydraulic lifts in order to avoid flooding. The project will be paid by the National Trust.

B. From the Public - None.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Zinke, seconded by Commissioner Andersson. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote 5-0.