

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES**

**City of Geneva - City Hall
109 James Street, Geneva, Illinois
November 17, 2009, 2009**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Roy called the Historic Preservation Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at Geneva City Hall, 109 James Street, Geneva, Illinois.

ROLL CALL

Present HPC: Chairman Roy, Commissioners Andersson, Gallagher, Hansen, Hiller
Absent: Commissioners Adams, Bruno
Others Present: HPC Planner Karla Kaulfuss; Community Development Dir. Dick Untch; Ms. Liz Safanda with Preservation Partners; Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

Chairman Roy acknowledged those commissioners in attendance and noted a quorum was established.

MINUTES

October 20, 2009 Minutes

Commissioner Gallagher moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Commissioner Hiller. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION REVIEWS

509 Peyton Street - John McMahon / Steve Case

Exterior Rehabilitation - enlarging of existing dormer

On behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Case explained his client would like to extend two walls (3 feet on each side) of an upper dormer to enlarge an existing second-floor bathroom (east façade). The knee wall would be raised up approximately three feet. The siding and other materials will match original design and the existing crown molding and fascia will remain identical. The pitch will remain the same as what already exists. Mr. Case explained that the owner would like to use the existing window and cedar trim, if possible. The bathroom ceiling will be raised. The dormer will be about six feet wide but he intends to not go above the ridge line, if possible. If he cannot, Mr. Case stated he will slightly change the pitch. Gallagher suggested holding the ridges to match, if possible. Mr. Case was hoping, to drop the pitch from 6/12 to 5/12, if necessary.

Dialog followed on where the existing window would be located. Mr. Case stated the owner asked for commissioner input on that matter. Comments included speaking with the building commissioner on whether the window may require tempered glass. Mr. Case explained his client wanted to replace the existing window with a similar looking wood window due to the poor condition of the current window. However, he did not know if he could find a similar looking storm window. Mr. Case further explained that the ceiling height would not be raised and the window height would not have to change. Andersson asked the petitioner to draw what he was discussing for better clarification.

Mr. Case understood that for code purposes, any new windows would have to be tempered glass. He believed for safety reasons and for utility reasons that it was best to replace the entire window but understood that aesthetics came first with this commission. However, Andersson pointed out that because the petition was on a secondary façade, safety was first in this case, over aesthetics. Additionally, Andersson expressed concern about the petitioner not having better drawings and what the end product would look like. Gallagher confirmed with Mr. Case that the ridge of the new dormer would be centered on the window. Kaulfuss offered to work with the petitioner on developing clearer drawings prior to the work starting.

Hillier moved to accept the proposal, as presented, with the condition that a tempered glass window be added, all wood, as required by code, and that the roof line remain at the ridge line. The pitch can be altered to accommodate. Plans will be drawn with staff. Seconded by Gallagher. Roll call:

Aye: Andersson, Gallagher, Hansen, Hiller, Roy

Nay: None

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-0

STAFF UPDATE & PROJECT LIST

Design Guidelines - Review of Draft Design Guidelines

Planner Karla Kaulfuss

Kaulfuss thanked the subcommittee (HPC Chairman Scott Roy and Commissioner Nanette Andersson) and Director Untch for their work and input on the guidelines. She discussed how the draft document was approached and created in a more user-friendly format. Because she did not know when the city's preservation ordinance would be updated, the terminology "Building Permit Application Review" would be used instead of the proposed change of "Certificate of Appropriateness". Andersson appreciated Kaulfuss' assistance on the document and concurred that the goal was to make the document user-friendly, specifically, using more positive pictures. Chairman Roy agreed also, commenting the goal was to have the document on the city's website and eventually at other satellite locations, such as the library.

Dir. Untch discussed his personal experience working with development applicants and the fact that having a set of design guidelines was very useful to the average lay person to the building professional. He believed the document sets forth the style and architecture of the historic district and reflects the values of the Historic Preservation Commission. He believed the real value of the document will

be working with a prospective applicant on a project. Dir. Untch emphasized that the document is a "coaching" tool and will not be codified. From here, Dir. Untch anticipates giving a presentation to the businesses community and seeking their input. He also expects that a presentation before the Committee of the Whole will take place, followed by public feedback, followed by final approval of the document before the City Council.

General discussion followed that there was nothing new added to the document and that it was, in fact, an accumulation of the commission's prior work and research of what it wanted in the guidelines.

Kaufuss reviewed Mr. Bruno's comments briefly, one of which was where the Zoning Board of Appeals fit into the flow chart. In general, commissioners liked the format. Hiller thought some items could be simplified for the untrained individual, while Gallagher saw some items being duplicated in areas. Dir. Untch added that ultimately he sees three separate documents coming out of the guidelines document, i.e., residential, commercial, and new construction. Gallagher suggested placing some of the up-front information into an Appendix. Hansen was pleased with the document. Kaufuss stated she liked the fact that she can send a link on a specific item to an applicant, if necessary, and that future changes can be made to the document without a readoption by City Council.

Hiller walked through his list of changes:

- Page 3 use a new "iconic" photograph versus the Strawflower Shop;
- Pages 4 & 5 recognize the preservation of character and that the commission is not the "Committee of No";
- Pages 6 & 7 consistency is needed when discussing landmarking designations;
- Page 15 use another picture as an example;
- Page 17 Martin House - list it as a Greek Revival or using another example;
- Page 27 Common Mistakes No. 6 - needs rewording.
- Page 30 Use the Niche doors as an example for "before/after picture;
- Page 38 Porches on "former" residences;
- Page 47 Awnings - clarification of incompatible materials; remove the term "Sunbrella".
- Page 58 use another picture to reflect the original door/entryway since the current example was not original to the home;
- Page 59 Common Mistakes No. 4 - Replacement Doors for "Commercial" Construction;
- Page 63 Common Mistakes - reword because it sounds too negative/restrictive;
- Page 72 Maintaining Patterns of Paved/Unpaved Areas -- use another photograph for the entrance since it was not the main entrance;
- Pages 82 & 83 confirm that commissioners are comfortable with "green" improvements;
- Page 89 reword the goal to make homes as modern/functional as possible;
- Pages 100 & 101 Goals and Mistakes - one side says to use a consistent theme and pattern while the other side says not to replicate styles. Liz Safanda suggests using the smaller buildings from Dodson Place as an example. Dialog followed on what owners want as far as historical elements versus replicating a structure exactly.

Returning to a general dialog, Kaufuss stated she had a discussion with Brenda Shorey regarding a future editorial she is writing in the Chronicle.

Discussion followed regarding the porch on 128 S. Sixth Street (contributing structure), which received administrative approval by Dir. Untch and Chairman Roy in Kaufuss' absence. Andersson thought such a petition should come before the HPC versus a staff review. Hanson raised dialog about the wooden shutters that were removed from the Olde Provincial House at James and Third Street and replaced with plastic shutters. Per staff, no permit was needed.

Dir. Untch closed by explaining that if the public uses the design guidelines to promote questions then it has worked. Conversation was raised that this commission's design guidelines were a combination of formats as compared to other municipalities.

Kaufuss announced that Dir. Untch, along with Commissioners Hansen and Bruno, and herself, will be meeting Monday, November 23, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. to discuss the Ordinance revision.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m. on motion by Andersson, seconded by Hansen. Motion carried unanimously.