

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
Geneva Fire Department – Lower Level Training Room
200 East Side Drive
Geneva, Illinois, 60134**

January 21, 2020

1. Call to Order

Vice Chairman Hiller called to order the January 21, 2020 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present HPC: Vice Chairman Hiller; Commissioners Hamilton, Salomon, Warner, Zinke
Absent: Chairman Zellmer, Stazin
Staff Present: Preservation Planner Michael Lambert; Community Development Dir. David DeGroot
Others Present: Applicants Mike and Lisa Riebe, 227 Ford Street; Robert Akers and Joe Stanton for 101 Hamilton Street; Mr. Nick Smith; Mr. Jeff Smith, 5N815 Castle Drive, St. Charles

3. Approval of December 17, 2019 Minutes

Minutes of December 17, 2019 – Motion by Commissioner Salomon, to approve the minutes, as presented. Second by Commissioner Warner. Motion passed by voice vote of 5-0.

4. Review of Conceptual Development Applications

A. 101 Hamilton Street (Case #2020-002) – Robert Akers/Robert M. Akers Architecture, Architect; Joe Stanton/Hamilton Homes, LLC, Representative; Application for Construction of In-fill Townhomes at a Significant Property. Preservation Planner Michael Lambert located the project site on the overhead for the commissioners and presented photographs of the Miller-LeBaron House, constructed in 1837. The historic building would be discussed at a future meeting. Tonight's meeting would focus on the adjacent properties. Surrounding homes were depicted with Mr. Lambert noting similar characteristics of the surrounding homes, such as the dropped eaves, gabled front form, and shingle material. The proposed building will be a three-unit townhome building circling around the historic building.

Floor plans and elevations were depicted on the overhead. Per Mr. Lambert, the applicant and staff will be working on some zoning issues; height is compliant, and the west property line should be a 10-foot setback versus the current five-foot setback. Mr. Lambert reminded the commissioners that the proposal was a concept review and the applicant was looking for feedback.

Mr. Robert Akers, architect for the project, stated he was working on construction drawings for permit but looking for feedback tonight. Characteristics from the surrounding buildings in the area were being considered for the townhomes.

Commissioner Zinke inquired about the zoning wherein Mr. Stanton, developer of the project, explained that the zoning for the property was changed to allow for such project. No

variances were being requested. Discussing the height, Mr. Akers said the proposed buildings were higher than the Miller-LaBaron House and the homes looked tall because the historic home was sunk into the grade and had a lower pitched roof. Mr. Stanton explained the existing home was below grade and it had a water system to move water away from the building.

Mr. Stanton confirmed the building would have to be raised to the height of the proposed townhomes. Additionally, while he discussed that more townhomes could be constructed on the land if it were vacant, he was only constructing three units to complement the historic home. Mr. Akers also pointed out that he purposely did not have a consistent ridge height for the three units because they would not line up with the existing home. Also, it broke up the massing. For the future, Commissioner Warner asked the applicant to have the plans reflect the original home as it relates to the proposed townhomes. The proposed lot coverage (65%) for the project was significantly under the allowable 85%, per Director DeGroot.

Commissioner Hiller was pleased to see the lower lot coverage being used, the details used from nearby homes, and the proposed height not being overpowering.

Mr. Stanton briefly explained some of the investigation he has done on the historic home and the steps he has taken to keep the home, with the additions, while he constructs the new townhomes.

Commissioner Hamilton asked that when the applicant returns and reveals the siding underneath the historic home that the size of the reveal match on the new homes or the window configurations in order to tie the project together. Per Mr. Stanton, the section of siding that was removed recently contained only a layer of painting and did not appear to be very old.

Per Commissioner Zinke's question, Mr. Stanton said the driveway would be concrete and would be reflected in the final plans. Zinke believed stamped concrete may look nice. Mr. Stanton felt too much detail could be unnecessary and stated his reasons why.

Vice Chairman Hiller invited the public to speak.

Mr. Jeff Smith, 5N815 Castle Drive, St. Charles, asked about the north side setback which Mr. Akers indicated stayed the same.

5. Review of Building Permit Applications

A. 227 Ford Street (Case # 2019-042) – Mike and Lisa Riebe Owners; Request for Window Replacement. Mr. Lambert located the subject property on the overhead map and recalled this application came before the commission last month. This request was to replace the windows on the east and south elevations. The commissioners agreed prior to eliminate some windows on the north elevation. Also removed were the windows that were previously approved in June 2019. Historic photographs were depicted with Mr. Lambert providing an additional history of the building and its owners in order for commissioners to answer some prior questions. Mr. Lambert estimated the home's windows were probably installed during the Warford years, i.e., 1945 to 1954. Mr. Lambert further reviewed an extensive history on Mr. Warford and the W.H. Warford Construction Company.

Continuing, Mr. Lambert drafted some outstanding questions the commissioners had previously, such as the period of significance, whether Mr. Warford was a notable person associated with the Geneva property, were the Warford-era windows historic or distinct, were the construction methods of the existing windows proposed for replacement valuable for study or

preservation, were the proposed replacement windows any less character-defining than the Warford-era replacements, and did the project consider the technical and economical feasibility.

Per Mr. Lambert, tonight's meeting focused on 7 windows on the first floor of the east and south elevations, as well as 5 windows on the east and south elevations, second floor. The applicant was proposing to replace those windows with aluminum clad Pella Iron Ore Color with a thinner muntin. Duo tone colored windows were being proposed.

Commissioner Warner inquired of staff whether the commission was to respond to the applicant's request to restore, rehabilitate or dictate what. Staff indicated the commission discussion was to focus on the applicant's request to replace the windows.

Applicant, Mr. Mike Riebe, walked through the interior and exterior work that was completed to date, mentioning that about \$45,000 was spent. Personally, he did not believe Mr. Warford was a notable Genevean because his legacy was created in Aurora. Following, Mr. Riebe reviewed the Quote Summary for the 12 replacement windows. In reviewing the new window specs, Mr. Riebe explained the windows would be custom; not standard Pella windows. The glass dimensions would be exact and built to the specs of the current windows. The new windows would create consistency across all interior and exterior muntins, all being 5/8" inch in size.

Commissioner Zinke recalled the applicant was to return with photos of the condition of each window wherein Mr. Riebe explained he could only reach two vendors during the holiday season in a three-week period of time. Following, Mr. Riebe reviewed a list of vendor pricing figures for the project scope which included the following vendors: TMC Windows, Just Sashes and Pell & Derrico Builders. A revised pricing list was also explained. Mr. Riebe did not believe it was economically feasible to restore the windows. He asked the commissioners for approval to replace the windows with the Pella windows.

Asked if the Warford windows were one-to-one replacements for the 1850s windows, Mr. Gallagher explained that there appeared no evidence of changed openings or changes in the headers, etc. Asked what the period of significance he was trying to obtain, Mr. Riebe explained it would have been the mid-1800s. Commissioner Warner believed the period of significance would have been its original construction since he did not believe the Warfords were as historically significant and did not live in the home very long. He considered the following as historically significant: the pitch of the roof, roof line with returns, the Greek Revival style, the fact that the second floor windows were smaller than the first floor windows, and the front door with transom. Warner favored replacing a wood window with a wood window and did not support aluminum.

Commissioner Hamilton disagreed with the period of significance and believed enough work was done while the Warfords lived in the home and they contributed to the history and character of the home. However, in reviewing the quotes, he would support the replacement of the windows due to the reasonableness of the window costs. Commissioner Salomon appreciated the window information that was presented and was fine with either period of significance.

Mr. Riebe believed he would be honoring the period of significance from the 1850s. That said, Commissioner Zinke felt that the windows should not be encased in aluminum.

Commissioner Hiller discussed the challenges of the City's window and siding policies and what the commission could and could not do. He did not believe the home was significant to Geneva's history, but it did add to the historic district and character of the City. Commissioner Hiller believed it was beneficial for the commission to evaluate non-traditional/non-original materials on a case by case basis, i.e., evaluating the windows on the basis of their visual

qualities, how they matched the old, and whether they maintained the historic character of the building rather than the composition of the makeup.

Hiller further reviewed the window policy from the Williamsburg preservation district, which allowed clad windows. He proceeded to compare the policy to the project, summarizing he would allow for the replacement windows because the existing windows were not original, the continuity of the project, and they met visual design qualities and maintained the character of a historic building. Mr. Lambert also provided clarification of how the National Park Service and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency viewed cladding. Further commissioner dialog was raised regarding the fact that the preference for wood or for clad was a personal choice.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to approve the new window replacement request in like and kind to the period of the house (as depicted in the slide presentation “New Windows Specs vs. Existing Windows”), according to the measurements depicted on the page, and to the period of the home (1850’s), along with Duo Tone clad windows with black sash with white jambs on the historic windows. Second by Commissioner Hamilton. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Salomon, Warner, Zinke
Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

(The commission took a five-minute break at 8:24 p.m.; returned at 8:27 p.m.)

B. 101 W. State Street (Case #2020-003) Applicant: Nick Smith – Old Republic Kitchen & Bar, Owner: Nicholas Manheim with Manheim Architecture, Architect: Application for Exterior Rehabilitation including Storefront and Entry Renovation at the Wrate Block. Mr. Lambert located the 1853 plaqued building on the overhead map at the northwest corner of First and State Streets. Historic photos followed, reflecting the facade and storefront being altered at least three different times. Details followed. Mr. Lambert recollected that the last time this property came before the HPC was in 2006. Today’s proposal was to eliminate the storefront portal and renovate the east wing. Because a central door would now be the main entrance to the restaurant and the sidewalk sloped near the entrance, the proposal was to modify the entrance with a step down to the public sidewalk. The proposal included the following: storefront windows to be fixed, the cast iron storefront lintel to be retained, addition of new fixed windows with new square pilasters and muntins sympathetic to the original details of those uncovered in the historic photographs, and a new recessed panel bulkhead on both sides to replicate those in the 1906 image. Details of the mullions, bulkhead and pilasters followed.

Photos of existing storefront sill conditions were shown for 105 W. State Street and 101 W. State Street, with Mr. Lambert indicating the bulkhead details would have to be clarified. Proposed for this project was a storefront with wood elements and an aluminum storefront. Lambert presented photos of storefronts the commissioners approved prior, including the former Sandra Webster storefront at 205-207 W. State Street. Lambert wanted the consistency to continue of what was approved in the past. For the Sandra Webster storefront, he relayed that the commission approved a historic paneled bulkhead to be installed and required an aluminum storefront system that pushed the glass to the front of the aluminum system versus the traditional center-square aluminum shape. Details of the storefront system followed.

Mr. Lambert pointed out the proposal was being done in phases. He reviewed Phase 1 which included the new accessible entry and new guard rail. The brick arch and existing transoms would remain and the door would be set back in the jamb. (The signage and exterior lighting would be reviewed administratively.) The entry doors would be a high definition two-paneled embossed

door made by ASSA ABLOY. Phase 2 would include cornice/pediment repair and painting, repair and repainting of the existing second floor windows, and masonry restoration. The building commissioner did have concern about the limestone deterioration at the east corner wall near the steps to the street.

Architect for the project, Mr. Nick Manheim, explained the main focus will be replacing the store front, returning to the same period, and bringing the entry to ADA compliance along with creating a main store front.

Owner, Mr. Nick Smith, explained his family's background in the restaurant business, working with the City's building commissioner and fire chief to bring the building up to code, and to create one entire space within the restaurant, basically going back to an authentic experience. Details were shared.

Discussion followed regarding the last bulkhead on the bridal shop and the fact that it was the last historic storefront that was intact. Reviewing the entrances that existed prior, staff confirmed there was a central entrance to each side of the units. Lambert discussed how the changes to the doors occurred over time. Commissioner Zinke believed the 1903 photograph reflected one solid piece of glass and inquired why the owner chose to insert smaller windows. Wherein Mr. Nick Smith provided a photograph from his phone explaining he was trying to replicate something he found. Hamilton asked commissioners if this proposal was consistent with another restaurant project further up State Street, wherein Commissioner Salomon explained the differences in the proposal as compared to the other restaurant. Asked if the thick horizontal mullion (7-1/2 inches) being proposed bothered the commissioners, Commissioner Hiller indicated it was not a deal breaker for him. As far as the bulkhead, Hiller encouraged a dimensional quality to the bulkhead.

Commissioner Zinke asked her fellow commissioners how they felt about replacing the six-panel windows with three solid glass windows. Commissioners preferred what was being proposed. Staff noted that what was being proposed actually replicated the door.

Items to address included: 1) lighten up the mullion; 2) give the bulkhead more definition (using the Sandra Webster bulkhead as inspiration); and 3) let staff work with the applicant regarding the corner of the building.

A brief dialog followed by Mr. Smith as to when he anticipated starting the Phase 2 work.

Conversation was raised regarding the entry door, which would be a composite door with a glass panel, as used in other projects in the historic district. Mr. Smith added that the menu glass on the building's exterior would be removed and replaced with a sign board.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to approve the proposal for 101 W. State Street, as presented, with requested modifications to minimize the mullion widths on the front windows, increase the definition on the bulkhead, staff to review the proposed front door and the repairs to the southeast corner, as directed by the Building Commissioner. The Sandra Webster bulkhead to be used for inspiration. Second by Commissioner Warner. Roll call:

**Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Salomon, Warner, Zinke
Nay: None**

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-0

6. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Review & Comment

A. Staff is seeking Commission input re: proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendments pertaining to Chapter 2, Section 11-2-2 (Definitions of Word and Terms); Chapter 3, Section 11-3-3 (Accessory Buildings and Uses); and Chapter 15, Section 11-15-19 (Zoning Illustrations-Accessory Structures). Mr. Lambert indicated that the text amendments were before the HPC for their review and comment and to define some of the accessory structures that appear before the HPC and Planning and Zoning Commission. Definitions for accessory structures (attached and detached) were reviewed. Mr. Lambert asked that commissioners provide their input.

Regarding detached trellises, Director DeGroot said the maximum width would have to be reviewed. He further stated that staff will have to review pergolas to be subject to permit review and brought to the HPC, if necessary. Lambert would take back tonight's comments to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

7. Secretary's Report - None

8. New Business

A. From the Commission: None.

B. From the Public: None.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic Preservation Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Warner. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 5-0.