

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

**May 21, 2013, 7:00 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Roy called the May 21, 2013 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call followed:

**2. Roll Call**

Present HPC: Chairman Roy, Commissioners Andersson, Hiller, Zinke

Absent: Commissioner Wehrmeister

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

Others Present: Mike and Tiffany Douglass, 29W577 Newton Square, Geneva; Tom and Alison Wetmore, 418 Ford St., Geneva; Jason and Johanna Patterson, 522 James St., Geneva; Sean Gallagher with Gallagher Associates Architects, 427 Anderson Blvd., Geneva; Nancy Luyten \_\_\_\_\_; Terry Adams with Adams Design Group, 2243 Pepper Valley Dr., Geneva; resident Adam Gibbons, 33W777 Hill, Geneva; and Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

**3. Approval of the April 16, 2013 Minutes**

Minutes were approved on motion by Hiller, seconded by Andersson. Motion carried 3-0-1. (Zinke abstains.)

**4. HPC Review of Building Permit Applications**

**A. 418 W. Ford Street - Porch Rehabilitation, Siding, Windows - Applicants Tom & Alison Wetmore** - Preservation Planner, Michael Lambert, reminded the commissioners that the applicants were returning as requested by the commission. They did discover some new findings. Mr. and Mrs. Wetmore were present and discussed that after opening the front porch they had uncovered the original lattice and will keep it intact. The original stairs did go column to column and those will be retained and not be centered on the door. The original railings were found in the garage and will be sanded and returned to their original location. Because the stair railing is not graspable, Mr. Wetmore said he will make a minor adjustment to make it work or, as Commissioner Andersson suggested, create a smaller railing on the inside of the thicker railing. A newel post was depicted. Per Mr. Wetmore, the kitchen windows were ordered and they will be the casement windows that look like double-hung windows. The west side of the home will have large double-hung (Pella-Architectural Series) wood clad-aluminum windows. Mr. Wetmore also added that when he opens up the center bay he will be able to tell if there was a window in the center or not. As to the location of the newel post being located at the bottom of the stairs, Andersson suggested looking at some books to see what was common practice. Per a question, Mr. Wetmore said the old siding will be painted white with the aluminum taken back to the corner with hopes of him re-siding the house in the near future. Overall, commissioners were very pleased with the changes

and “treasures” that were found. **Commissioner Zinke made a motion to approve the permit application, as presented, seconded by Commissioner Andersson. Roll call:**

**Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Zinke, Roy**

**Nay: None**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

**B. 202 N. Third Street - Partial Demolition, Additions, Siding, Windows, New Garage, Applicant - Mike and Tiffany Douglass** - Planner Lambert reminded the commissioners that this application was presented last month and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency was also reviewing this application as it relates to the tax freeze. New revisions were incorporated.

Mr. Mike Douglass stated that he and his wife were still under contract to purchase the home and the plans have been formalized. The contract to purchase was contingent upon receiving approval from this commission. Recalling there were no specifics on the windows, Mr. Douglass indicated that all windows, except for the one in the addition area, would be Marvin fiberglass clad wood window with a 2 over 1 configuration. The addition would be sided with hardiboard material with smooth cedar trim. He intends to remove the aluminum siding on the existing home at some point and return it to the original clapboard, but budget was a concern.

Architect, Mr. Sean Gallagher, addressing the earlier massing concern, indicated that the plan was decreased and the addition was being pulled behind the existing chimney. However, there was a new fireplace shown on the north elevation of the family room. The new garage would include lap siding that was twice that of the lap for the existing house. The addition would be sided to match the original house (4 inch siding). Elevations were presented. Mr. Douglass stated that the reason he and his wife preferred the clapboard exterior on the chimney was that they did not want to compete with the masonry chimney and wanted it to be a focal point. Continuing, Mr. Gallagher stated the exterior trim profiles would match the existing.

Commissioner Zinke inquired about the owners choosing the 2 over 1 windows versus Mr. Rubano’s recommendation for 2 over 2 (most likely being more historical). The owners preferred the 2 over 1 window with simulated divided lights. Dialog followed regarding the state’s approval of the fiberglass material versus wood windows against the City of Geneva’s policy. Commissioner Andersson recalled that the policy stated that windows were to be replaced with in-kind material as in the original, and, in this case, wood. (A short dialog followed by staff regarding the state’s revised windows policy.) Mr. Douglass handed out an email from Mr. Rubano who discussed the fiberglass window replacements and, to the extent the profiles were similar to the aluminum clad windows, that the state would approve them. Per Mr. Douglass’ interpretation, the State would approve fiberglass as a material, but it was not officially approved by the State just yet. Commissioners voiced concern that the proposed windows did not follow the City’s window policy. It was pointed out that the six windows on the original house would be affected since they were on the primary facades.

Turning to the fiberboard siding, Mr. Douglass confirmed the material will be on the garage and the addition and the addition’s siding will match the original 4” inch reveal. An 8” inch reveal will be on the garage. Mr. Douglass discussed that the trim will be cedar and if he removes the aluminum siding he intends to repair or replace any damaged boards in-kind. Dialog followed regarding the roof elevations and the fact that the applicants were reroofing the entire house. Further dialog followed on the delineation of the addition from the original home, i.e., the chimney and the new parged concrete foundation will create the differentiation. Asked if the applicants needed to return to the commission for a material change on the chimney, Commissioner Andersson and Dir. Untch wanted to see the material and cut sheets.

Turning to the windows again, Dir. Untch discussed the idea of the commission matching its policy to the IHPA's window policy or continuing to have its own stricter standard. He reminded the commissioners that the subject property was being promoted and considered for a tax freeze in order to preserve such structures. Due to receiving the new information from the State, Andersson was not comfortable approving something she just received nor changing the policy now. And, for the record, Planner Lambert stated that staff was not recommending a policy change at this time. Other commissioners agreed the window policy had been the city's policy in the past, it worked, and the policy could be changed sometime in the future. Commissioner Andersson also understood, then, that the applicants did not have to change their windows, and in time, if the City's window policy was revised, the applicants could return with that portion of the permit, to which Dir. Untch concurred.

Other comments about the windows included: allowing wood windows for the two street sides, following the State's window policy, and the fact that it would have been nice having the State's window information sooner than tonight. Mr. Lambert discussed the conversations he had with Mr. Rubano at the state level whom he indicated was more concerned about the character of the window versus the material because all of the windows had been replaced prior. Mr. Lambert also raised dialog regarding the stability of the original chimney and the State wanting it either retained or restored. Mr. Douglass stated he and his wife wanted to save it, but from conversations with contractors it would probably not be able to be saved due to its current condition. However, Mr. Douglass explained that if the chimney came down, there would be a chimney rebuilt in its place no matter what because he preferred that element. Lambert, in speaking with Mr. Rubano, said the material on the proposed, new chimney may have to change to a hard material for the tax assessment freeze. Details followed.

Two chimney options were then proposed, with the applicant asking the commission to approve the petition with both chimney options. Mr. Gallagher reviewed the differences. Commissioners were fine with either option.

**Commissioner Andersson made a motion to approve the petition for 202 N. Third St. as presented, with the following exceptions: 1) the original chimney may be restored or replaced in-kind depending how the construction progresses (preference for restoration); 2) the new chimney is acceptable to be either Option 1 or 2, with the possibility of a change to a masonry chimney, or of similar material to the existing chimney, to be approved by staff; 3) the windows may be either 2 over 1 or 2 or 2, at the discretion of the homeowner; 4) the front door will be wood with design to be staff approved; 5) the existing siding may be repaired with in-kind materials; 6) the siding on the new addition and garage will be cementitious fiberboard; 7) the new addition's siding reveal will be the same as the existing house; 8) the garage siding reveal will be exactly double; 9) the windows on the new addition and garage may all be as presented, but the existing windows on the original house (east and south facades) are not part of this approval; 10) the roof material is as presented; 11) the cementitious fiberboard surface texture will be smooth; and 12) cedar trim is acceptable on the new addition and garage. Seconded by Commissioner Hiller. Roll call:**

**Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Zinke, Roy**

**Nay: None**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

**Commissioner Andersson made a motion to replace the existing windows, on the existing house's south and east facades, with wood windows that are either 2 over 2 or 2 over 1, of comparable quality, and consistent with the Historic Preservation Commission's**

**current window policy. Style, manufacturer, and cut sheets to be approved by staff (Policy Standard No. 6). Seconded by Commissioner Zinke. Roll call:**

**Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Zinke, Roy**  
**Nay: None** **MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

**C. 522 James Street - New Garage - Applicant Jason & Johanna Patterson** - Mr. Lambert stated the applicants would like to construct a new two-story garage. A background of the contributing property followed, noting the existing one-story garage had no noteworthy architectural character and was located in a very limited viewing area of the property.

Mr. Jason Patterson introduced his wife and his architect Tim Nelson. Mr. Patterson stated he wanted to keep the garage in the same footprint with materials to be the same as the home, which included 4" inch Hardiplank siding on the lower half of the garage and shake material on the upper level. The roof line would remain the same. Corbels would match what was on the house. The windows will be Pella wood windows and the steel stamped garage doors will face the alley and include windows near the top of the doors. The garage entrance door will also be steel. Concern was raised regarding the side yard setback measurements wherein Mr. Patterson stated the side yard setback was where the garage currently sat and he was adding to the current garage; not razing it. The garage would extend to the south about 10 feet from where it currently sat and would be within the rear setback. Mr. Nelson stated the garage was non-conforming on the alley side.

Because staff did not review the application in detail, Dir. Untch recommended to place a condition in the motion as it applies to the zoning. The garage height was confirmed to be lower than the house and the garage would not impact the neighbors. Discussing the plainness of the north elevation and dressing it up, Mr. Patterson explained he and his wife did discuss some ideas but decided that no one would really see that facade since the facade faced the yard and no one saw it. Commissioners appeared to be fine with the proposal. **Commissioner Hiller moved to approve the request, as presented, subject to zoning compliance review by zoning staff. Seconded by Commissioner Andersson. Roll call:**

**Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Zinke, Roy**  
**Nay: None** **MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

**D. 124 S. Second Street - Masonry Repair and Pointing, Windows, Roof Replacement - Applicant - Nancy Luyten** - Mr. Lambert explained that this petition was brought before the commissioners in two parts: the first pertaining to a permit review request for exterior rehabilitation for the roof, gutters, and masonry of the historic home. He briefly reviewed the history of the home, purportedly to be constructed in 1857 by George Patten, but felt the home could have been built sooner (possibly 1851). The home was listed as a significant structure in the 1999 Architectural Survey; however in the early 1960s/1970s the home's exterior was painted and then sandblasted off later, significantly damaging the historic brick of the home. The home has sat vacant for some time. At this point, under a special use permit, the applicant was seeking to rehabilitate the building's exterior.

Architect, Mr. Terry Adams, Adams Design Group, Geneva, IL discussed the steps he was taking to assess the overall damage to the structure before seeking the special use. Much damage existed at the northwest corner of the structure due to a leaking roof. A new roof would be added using the architectural laminated asphalt shingles (using the Dual Black or Charcoal Gray color) and any substrate underneath would be repaired. Where the original building and addition

met at the northwest corner, Mr. Adams said he was looking to repair the gutter system with like materials (wood) and to re-line all exterior gutters and include new flashing. Per a question, he stated the outside gutter was wood while the interior gutter was metal. The original wood windows would remain and be repaired, re-glazed, and painted with a gray color. The cornice and gutter would also be painted the same color as the windows.

The masonry, which was damaged by sandblasting in earlier years, will be tuck pointed and repaired as best possible. Any brick that has to be patched, the mason will use a soft hand-molded brick (8 inches long) along with a lime-based mortar. The limestone headers and sills will be cleaned with a limestone restorer. As to the holes in the brick from cable installation, they will be replugged; the shutters will be removed. Any brick to be cleaned will be used with an organic cleaner (Simple Clean). The one-story addition will remain and its sliding glass doors will be replaced with French doors at some future point. The pool will be demolished but a permit was needed, per Dir. Untch. Discussed was the type of bond of the masonry, i.e., possibly Flemish bond. Per staff's question, there was evidence of moisture in the walls at the northwest corner but not in the entire structure.

Mr. Lambert stated that he wanted it clear in the motion that no sealants were to be used on the brick whatsoever and that staff be provided a certain leeway to work with the applicant if additional replacement needed to occur on the gutter and cornices. Per Dir. Untch, any deviation from what was shown on the plans, should the scope of work have to expand, had to follow the same pattern, look, and include the same materials as to what was reflected in the plans.

Continuing, Mr. Adams stated the chimneys were in poor shape and they may have to rebuild portions of them. They were separated from the rest of the wall by the roof line. The middle chimney in the original structure, however, would be used for hot water heaters. Mr. Adams also added that the property was zoned for Business and the special use was for a restaurant. It was his and the applicant's hope to get the site demolition and the exterior rehabilitation approved at this time. Dir. Untch believed the pool was "reasonable" for the demolition, along with the removal of the fence, but recommended that the driveway be retained because it could be used. **Commissioner Zinke moved to approve the project at 124 S. Second Street, as presented, with the scope of work to include the demolition of the pool, deck, mechanicals, and fence. (Staff to incorporate a plan sheet that includes the pool.). Seconded by Commissioner Hiller. Roll call:**

**Aye: Andersson, Hiller, Zinke, Roy**  
**Nay: None**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

## **5. Concept Reviews**

**A. 124 S. Second Street - Porches, Decks, Exterior Improvements - Applicant - Nancy Luyten** - To put the Patten House into context, Mr. Lambert summarized that the two buildings along 127 & 128 N. First Street were homes of early settlers of Geneva and also relatives of Mr. Patten and his wife, and which were representative of the early brick vernacular style in the 1850s. A history of the structure's features followed. Mr. Adams, architect for the project, reviewed a footprint of the original home, noting where an original porch existed on the south elevation, and discussed the home's additions over the years. His client planned to open a restaurant with outside seating on the north side and dining in the interior. The east entrance would include a holding area off of the front with a porch and include a handicap ramp running up the north side of the entrance. A southern patio existed but would be extended a few more feet to include another seating area. However, a variance was necessary for that extension because it

would not be at ground level. Interior fire stairs would be re-created according to fire code and a raised landing on the west elevation would pick up the fire stair. The pool house structure would be maintained, reroofed and repainted. The changing room of that structure would become a bathroom and the kitchenette would become an outdoor service area/bar.

Details of the front porch plans were distributed by Mr. Adams who explained that a wood deck and wood trim boards, with built up wood columns, would be created on a poured concrete foundation with aluminum wrought iron-looking fencing between the posts. The same detail would be matched on the southern concrete patio. An exit door would be replacing an existing window on the northwest corner for exiting patrons and a small deck and stairs would be constructed from that door to get to the outdoor patio.

Regarding the variance Mr. Adams also added that there would be matching free-standing signs located on Second and Campbell Streets. Discussing the wrought iron feature, Ms. Luyten said she was open to using cedar wood in its place.

Commissioner Andersson stated she could not support the front porch and that it went against the Secretary of Interior Standards. She believed it was inappropriate for a house of such historical significance. She supported the construction of a front terrace in its place. Mr. Adams discussed the careful steps that would be taken adding the front porch with minimal attachment to the front facade.

Mr. Lambert noted that back in July 2012, the commission's concern was that the porch have minimal contact with the structure. He offered various ideas to consider and agreed that the less connection to the building was better and the fact that it gave a false sense of historicism and went against the City's design guidelines. As a compromise, he noted the historic photograph that was distributed depicting a "lacy-like" type of porch posts that were on the original building and suggested that the final design may interpret them in a new way. Mr. Adams offered his openness to change out the columns to match the original porch columns. However, Andersson still would not support the project with a full-width porch. Other examples of columns around Geneva were mentioned.

Conversation regarding the purpose of the covered porch followed, i.e., to offer protection from the elements while patrons waited to be seated. Asked if the owner considered building a separate structure in a corner area of the property, Mr. Adams stated he did not. Chairman Roy also agreed with Andersson in that a false sense of history was being created but any other solution would also detract from the building. However, he believed the porch made one focus on the building. Commissioner Zinke suggested using one of the smaller rooms as a waiting room. Other significant points made were that the ADA ramp was needed and so the deck was needed but the railings appeared "heavy". Mr. Adams pointed out that the deck would be located below the windows and only the railings would be obscuring the foundation.

## **6. Secretary's Report (Staff Update)**

**A. Historic Preservation Month Photo Contest (Status)** - Planner Lambert reported that 27 entries were in the photo contest and the public voting started tomorrow.

**B. Administrative Review of Permit (Update)** - Lambert quickly announced that on April 23, 2013, the Pure Oil building was officially listed in the National Register of Historic Places. In his new position, Mr. Lambert reported that his administrative reviews have been limited to signs, lighting, and fences and anything else was being directed to the commission. Commissioner Andersson voiced concern about not seeing the reviews, as she recalled last month that the

commissioners would be sent all administrative reviews. In response, Dir. Untch reported that much activity was taking place in the office and his goal was to keep Mr. Lambert focused on his responsibilities, but after the past month's workflow, he stated it became very clear that 19 hours per week was very limited and he did not have time to follow the process at this time. Dir. Untch walked through some of the administrative cases that took place and agreed he needed better guidance or boundaries of what the commission wanted to see in order to gain some organizational efficiency. Andersson believed it would have been appropriate if staff sent an email stating that the process was not working and to work on a solution. Going forward, Dir. Untch explained how he would handle administrative reviews in a list format to review and recommended that the commissioners review the list and develop a scope of what they wanted to see. Chairman Roy proceeded to explain the process that former HPC Planner Kaulfuss used while Commissioner Zinke suggested holding a separate meeting for such reviews. Mr. Lambert also added that in his annual report there would be a list of prior administrative review projects that were completed in which the commissioners could use as a starting point for their reviews. Mr. Lambert would email the commissioners his list of monthly administrative reviews for input but he reminded them that the monthly reports were also on the city's web site. (Chairman Roy steps away at 10:39 pm.)

**D. National Register Historic District Amendments - Progress Update** - Staff was working on a format for the spreadsheet to provide the updates.

**E. Statewide Preservation Conference (IAHPC-IHPA-LI) June 27-29, 2013, Evanston, Illinois** - Commissioners were asked to contact Lambert if they wanted to attend the conference. There was a maximum \$500 scholarship arrangement available to them.

**C. COG Window Policy Revision - Amendment Update** - Briefly, Mr. Lambert stated that, among CLG communities, the City of Geneva and the Village of Barrington have the most conservative window policies in Illinois. He further stated that Mr. Rubano would be speaking in Barrington about the State's window changes and has also invited members of this commission to attend that future meeting. (Chairman Roy returns at 10:44 p.m.) Lambert stated the State changed its window policy approximately five years ago. He will email the commissioners the date and time when Mr. Rubano will be in Barrington.

Discussion followed regarding the search for new HPC commissioners.

## 7. **New Business**

### **A. From the Commission**

1. Andersson: Legislative Update SB336/HB122 - Nothing to report.

### **B. From the Public: None**

## 8. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Roy, seconded by Commissioner Hiller. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 4-0.