

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES
FONA International – FONA Center
1900 Averill Road
Geneva, Illinois, 60134**

June 18, 2019

1. Call to Order

Chairman Zellmer called to order the June 18, 2019 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present HPC: Chairman Zellmer, Commissioners Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke

Absent: Commissioner Salomon

Staff Present: Historic Preservation Planner Michael Lambert; Community Development Director David DeGroot, City Atty. Michael Rachlis

Others Present: Mr. Sean Gallagher, 427 Anderson Blvd., Ms. Denise Ward, 418 Dodson; Ms. Debbie Peterson 208 S. River Lane; Mr. Brad Saelens, 208 S. River Lane; Bob Forslund, 428 Ford St.; Tom Simonian, 921 S. Batavia Avenue Mr. Ben Hinds, 25804 Bliss Rd., Batavia; Mr. Mike and Ms. Lisa Riebe, 227 Ford St.; Mr. Robert Akers, 427 W. State St.; Mr. Frank Giampoli, 201 N. Third St.; Hayden Crane with Solgen Power; Ms. Caitlyn Reimer, 112 N. Fifth St.; and Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

3. Approval of May 21 and May 28, 2019 Minutes

Minutes of May 21, 2019 - Motion by Commissioner Hamilton, second by Commissioner Warner to approve the minutes. Motion passed by voice vote of 5-0-1. (Hiller abstains.)

Minutes of May 28, 2019 – Motion by Commissioner Warner, second by Commissioner Hiller to approve the minutes. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0-1 (Stazin abstains.)

4. HPC Public Hearings (Commission Deliberation)

A. South Geneva Historic District (Case # 2018-205). Applicant: Karen Buckley, Bill and Amy Cook, Jill Leo, Gillian McNamara and Marsha Reinecke. Application for South Historic District Designation (previously closed public hearing). Chairman Zellmer invited the commissioners to provide their input on this case. A summary worksheet of prior discussions was provided to the commissioners.

Chairman Zellmer asked the commissioners to begin the discussion by considering the applicability of Standard 6f to the nominated and staff-recommended properties. Upon review of the summary, Commissioner Hiller believed that all of the nominated and staff-recommended properties met all of the requirements of Standard 6f, including the encroachment definition.

With regard to Standard 6g, Commission Hiller explained that he did believe 814 Batavia Avenue (open lot) met the standard not because it could or should be developed, but because it

was a historical site that should be developed with sensitivity. (Mr. Lambert noted that Standards 6f, 6g and 6h refer to a collective area of properties and not to a specific property.) City Attorney Rachlis provided further clarification/examples of threats to an area. Commissioners proceeded to discuss the concern of teardown/infill versus encroachment and whether Standard 6g should be considered or not for the nominated and staff-recommended properties. Mr. Lambert explained the distinction between Standards 6f and 6g. Some commissioners recommended including Standards 6f and 6g for the entire area based on the definitions received from Mr. Lambert.

Discussing 501 Peck Road as it relates to Standards 6a and 6c, Mr. Lambert disclosed that the owners provided written testimony that the property had been significantly altered in the 1990s and what was considered a 1960s structure was really more of a mid-1990s home, which was outside the stated Period of Significance, identified within the submitted nomination. Commissioners agreed to categorize the property as Non-contributing, and remove Standards 6a and 6c, but keep Standards 6f and 6g.

In regard to questions about the classification of 902 Batavia Avenue, Mr. Lambert explained the reason for the category change from Significant to Contributing was due to the testimony provided regarding the replacement of windows. However, after visiting the site, the windows appear to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for a window replacement project. Mr. Lambert stated it was the Commission's responsibility to determine the appropriate property categorization. The majority of the commissioners agreed to leave the property as Significant; however, Commissioner Hiller felt the category should be changed to Contributing.

For 814 Batavia Avenue (the lot with many mature oak trees recently subdivided from the Atwater House), Commissioner Zinke supported the lot being categorized as Significant due to a natural spring existing on the parcel and due to the character of the lot which included rolling terrain and a ravine as identified in the submitted nomination.

For 809 Batavia Avenue, Commissioner Zinke supported Standard 6a being applied to this site because it was part of the post-WWII infill development for the City.

For 932 Batavia Avenue, Commissioner Zinke stated that since the property was categorized as Non-contributing due to a home constructed after the stated Period of Significance, Standard 6a was a moot point. Mr. Lambert explained that, for Standard 6a to be applicable, the property should be identifiable/recognizable to the significant pioneer settler associated with the parcel. However, substantial redevelopment over time had occurred on the site, and it does not exist in the state of condition that was known to the pioneer Haskins family. Commissioners agreed not to include Standard 6a for this property.

Discussing Standard 6h, Commissioner Hiller explained his understanding of the definition. He recommended adding Standard 6h to all of the homes located on Batavia Avenue and for 316 and 398 Elizabeth Place and 406 Peck Road, due to their location the Lincoln Highway (the first, transcontinental, paved highway in the United States that was routed along present-day Route 31 and through Geneva). Furthermore, Commissioner Hiller identified a local tradition of relocating homes within the City for the repurposing and reuse of buildings, including several barns for homes and other functions. He believed 737 Forrest Avenue and 516 Peck Road should be included under Standard 6h. Commissioner Hiller noted the carriage barn at 425 Easton Avenue was relocated and repurposed, following the design of local architect Frank B. Gray.

Commissioner Hiller also suggested that the Commission consider the homes constructed by the Wilson Brothers as a Standard 6h group; commissioners concurred. The Chairman noted that all of the homes built by the Wilson Brothers were protected, also, under Standard 6d.

As to 715 Shady Avenue, Mr. Lambert explained that testimony had been provided that this building had been painted, leading to a claim that the paint greatly altered its character. Some commissioners felt it was reversible; however, Zinke pointed out that sometimes the paint does not come off. Although Commissioner Zinke recommended listing the building as Non-Contributing, the majority of the commissioners agreed to retain the categorization of 715 Shady Avenue as a Contributing property.

Further dialog followed on what other properties, if any, were to be excluded or included in the Commission's recommendation. The Chairman noted that the Commission had previously determined that 322 Cheever Avenue should be excluded because it was a Non-Contributing property, built after the stated Period of Significance and located on the edge of the district; Commissioners confirmed their prior determination. Commissioners did not identify any other properties to be excluded from the proposed Historic District. Asked if staff's recommendations should be included within the proposed Historic District, commissioners concurred with staff.

Commissioner Zinke expressed her appreciation to the applicants and to Mr. Lambert for their work. She explained that she included staff's recommendations for additions to the nominated district due to the wealth of history in the area, the distinct neighborhood feel, the stately size of the homes, and the majestic trees. Other commissioners extended their appreciation to staff and noted that staff's recommendations were a natural inclusion from the start, the homes that were added by staff were consistent in size, lot size, and in the spirit of what the district was intended to represent. The amended district appeared to answer many of the objections that had been identified through many hours of oral testimony as well as objections submitted in writing.

Chairman Zellmer reviewed Standards 1 through 6h on the commissioners' worksheet, confirming with the commissioners that the properties included in the nomination met those standards they discussed. For the record, Mr. Lambert reviewed each of the individual properties and those Standards the property satisfied for the recommended South Historic District (Summary tabulation attached as Exhibit 1).

Motion by Commissioner Zinke, seconded by Commissioner Warner to recommend to the Geneva City Council the designation of the South Geneva Historic District, comprised of the properties identified, and designation standards discussed, and as read aloud by Mr. Lambert. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer
Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

5. Review of Conceptual Projects

A. 208 S. River Lane (Case No. 2019-039). Applicant: Edward & Deborah Peterka; Brad Saelens, BDS Architecture. Application for: Demolition of Existing, Attached Garage and Construction of a new attached garage. Mr. Lambert located the property on the overhead map and explained that the property comprised of a number of buildings and additions over time and was part of the Kate Raftery's River Lane Beautification Project. The owners were proposing to demolish the existing, attached garages, workshop, and temporary art studio as well as enclose a door on the west side of the home. Mr. Lambert discussed the prior three changes made to the garage. Photos followed. A two-car garage was being proposed with carriage-style doors and period-style lighting and architectural grade roof shingles. The door being enclosed was located in an alcove and very difficult to see from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Brad Saeles, architect for the project, reiterated the that he was trying to remove iterations of the garage and replace it with something that fit the architectural style of the existing home. The new garage would align better with the front entry of the home. The western door to be enclosed was pointed out on the overhead. The front entry of the home would be maintained. All exterior materials would be matched to the existing.

Commissioner questions pertained to 1) what would happen with the space between the existing garage and the entry alcove from Campbell Street to which Mr. Saelens envisioned it would be re-landscaped; 2) when was the art studio added (1940s); and 3) the fact that the new garage would have same roof pitch and roof line of the existing garage and the cement slabs would be removed. Commissioners were appreciative of the applicant staying true to the size and character of the building and supported the demolition of the garage and temporary studio for this project.

Because this was a concept review, discussion followed on whether the garage details should match exactly or have a different approach. Commissioners agreed that since the studio was a temporary structure (two walls and a flat roof attached to the existing structures) with no foundation (built on the original driveway), it could not be preserved. The recreation of the art studio and the board-and-batten siding a false sense of historicism should not be created. While commissions had no issues matching what was there, they asked that the applicant return with photos of the current conditions of the garage/studio. Commissioners also agreed the door should be enclosed.

6. Review of Building Permit Applications

A. 201 N. Third Street (Case No. 2019-005). Applicant: Frank & Lori Giampoli, Owner; Sean Gallagher with Gallagher Associates. Application for Modifications to Approved Plans for a Significant Property based on Field Investigation. Per Mr. Lambert, commissioners saw this application previously but due to a recent field investigation, some significant structural changes were found that brought challenges to the project. The project was a tax-assessment freeze project.

Applicant, Mr. Frank Giampoli, reported that during investigative demolition, he found that the (limestone) foundation and first floor beams were compromised significantly, including termite damage. In speaking with a home mover, he explained the house could be lifted using L-beams on the side of the house which would allow the removal of the failing foundation and allow for a new foundation to be inserted. Mr. Giampoli summarized that the north wing porch was very compromised and, most likely, it would have to be constructed as new. He discussed the finances already invested in the project but believed such improvements would bring the home into the 21st Century.

Mr. Gallagher, architect for the project, referenced the documentation that the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office reviewed, and recalled for the commissioners that in the previous plans submitted, the porch located on the northwest corner would not be constructed and instead the north wing would be extended within the proposed footprint of the new addition. Per Gallagher, the State asked the owners to save all trim and replicate the trim on the elevation and match the gable end to what currently exists. The top of the first floor of the renovated home would be higher than the existing by approx. 3 to 5 inches since it was being lifted off its foundation and placed on a new foundation and new floor framing was being installed. The finished grade would be modified so that no more than the present foundation would be exposed when the project is completed. The front porch would include piers with square caps and would be concealed by a skirt. The north addition

will be the same width as the current wing. Per Mr. Giampoli, the siding was being replaced because it was being compromised. Originally, the home was stucco with siding over it. However, Mr. Gallagher stated the siding would be evaluated and salvaged, if possible, or be replaced in-kind. Mr. Lambert recalled the previous approval by the commissioners allowed the applicant to investigate if the siding could be salvaged. Per a question, the chimney, which was not original, will be removed and not replaced in accordance with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office review of the proposed modifications. Dialog followed regarding the relocation of the garage on-site; the State Historic Preservation Office approved its relocation.

Commendations went to the owners for saving the home.

Motion by Commissioner Hamilton, second by Commissioner Zinke to approve the alterations to the previously-approved plans for 201 N. Third Street, as presented. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED VOTE: 6-0

(Commissioners took a five minute break at 8:45 pm; reconvened at 8:50 p.m.)

B. 124 Stevens Street (Case No. 2019-035). Applicant: Kurt Beier, Owner; Collin Prisbrey & Krystene Allen with Solgen Power. Application for: Request to Install Solar Roof Panels at a Contributing Property. Mr. Lambert reviewed the background for this application and located the property on the overhead map. The applicant was seeking a solar panel installation and the request fell under a change in roofing. (Currently, the City was working on drafting guidelines for solar panels.) Mr. Lambert pointed out that most of the solar panels will be hidden from the street. However, those panel locations where they would be visible were highlighted in orange in the photographs. Mr. Lambert explained that the home had many small roofs which were a challenge for locating the panels. (Additional photographs of the property followed.)

Mr. Hayden Crane, with Solgen Power, was present to answer questions. Commissioner Stazin appreciated the drawings but would have appreciated photographs of some of the residential project installations done by the company to understand the character of what the project would look like, wherein Mr. Crane produced a large marketing piece depicting various photographs of projects that were completed by his company. Concern was raised about the panels being very reflective. Per questions, Mr. Crane explained the actual panels were about 3 inches thick and attached to the roof with another 3 to 4 inches between the panel and the roof. Commissioner Hiller pointed out the solar panels were removal.

Concern was voiced about the penetration to the roof shingles and changing the character of the home. Mr. Lambert produced documentation from several preservation agencies and organizations (including the National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the National Alliance of Historic Preservation Commissions) regarding the installation of solar collection devices on historic buildings.

The discussion regarding the aesthetic impact of solar panels; removability of the panels; and the potential damage or alteration of the roof structure/framing and finish material continued. (Samples were distributed by Mr. Crane). Dialog followed regarding general setbacks, an emergency shutoff meter, and the tilt plane of the panels according to the Secretary of Interior Standards. Commissioner Warner inquired about the space between the roof and the panel and the number of holes for each panel to which Mr. Crane noted that some penetrations of the roof are required and referred commissioners to the submitted engineered drawings.

Motion by Commissioner Stazin, second by Commissioner Hamilton to approve the solar panels for 124 Stevens Street, as presented. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED VOTE: 6-0

C. 112 N. Fifth Street (Case No. 2019-040). Applicant: Mike Holmes & Caitlyn Reimer, Owners; Ben Hinds/Brian Hinds with BGH Construction. Application for: Request to consider relocation and elimination of historic wood windows at a Contributing Property. Mr. Lambert explained this proposal involved window modifications due to an interior remodel. After review by staff, Mr. Lambert determined that Commission review was required for a few items. Mr. Lambert provided a brief history of the home, built for the Nelson family about 1890; Mr. Nelson and his son returned to Sweden after the death of Mrs. Nelson in 1909. The house went through a variety of owners and was converted to a two flat between 1923 and 1930, apparently, when the porch was enclosed.

Mr. Lambert explained that many windows were affected by the interior remodel but some windows were not original. At the south elevation, two windows at the first floor appear to be later additions when a front stairway was removed; those windows will be in conflict with the proposed new staircase. Additionally, two windows on the second floor needed to have tempered glass because of their proximity to a bathtub; only one of those windows falls under the jurisdiction of the Commission, and it is unclear whether or not the windows will be fitted, simply, with a tempered storm panel at the interior. Two historic openings at the first floor on the north elevation appeared to need modification for counter tops. Also, three windows at the second floor of the north elevation need clarification as to whether they are proposed to be removed, replaced or relocated. Additionally, the relocation or modification of windows and window openings may require consideration of appropriate siding repairs; currently, the exterior of the house is aluminum siding over historic siding (condition of historic siding is unknown).

Mr. Lambert produced photographs of the home, expressing concern about those windows that could be seen from the right-of-way. On the north elevation all of the windows could be viewed from the public sidewalk. Currently, there was aluminum siding on the house and it could require the windows to be patched in. Mr. Lambert noted that the front porch was glassed in between 1923 and 1930, noting the windows were nearly 100 years old. However, the question was whether or not alternations of the historic front wall (within the enclosed porch and somewhat visible from the public sidewalk) were appropriate or not. For this project, the owner was proposing to relocate the historic front door to another location and, then, modifying an existing triple window and remodeling it into a double window. Mr. Lambert presumed, based on its design and location, that the triple window was installed in the 1930s-era remodel of the home.

Mr. Ben Hinds, with BGH Construction, was present to answer questions. Chairman Zellmer inquired what the owners' plans were for those windows within the kitchen and pantry areas since they were most visible, wherein Mr. Hinds explained the kitchen window height would be changed to accommodate the kitchen cabinets. The pantry window would be eliminated but it would be up to the Commission. Because the window sash being discussed had metal banding, Mr. Hinds assumed they were not original to the home, although most of the window locations appear to be original. Mr. Lambert clarified the window locations, when aligned between the first and second floors, were original. However, Mr. Hinds indicated that only two windows remained with weights and pulleys; most of the window sash had been replaced or modified over the years. A discussion about the function, condition, location and modifications of the windows followed.

Commissioners proceeded to ask the applicant to provide elevations/drawings of what was actually being proposed at the exterior since the interior renovation was now resulting in exterior modifications. Clarification of the type of plans the HPC was looking for was explained by the Chairman to Mr. Hinds. Asked if the second-floor bathroom windows were changing in size, Mr. Hinds indicated they were not. The windows near the stairs (south elevation) would disappear. Commissioner Stazin asked to see plans for the south elevation and north elevation when more details were available. Commissioners also pointed out the window sills at the paired windows at the south elevation did not match the height of the other windows. Staff had no historic photos of the home.

For clarification and since the project was in for a permit, Mr. Lambert offered to speak to the building commissioner to allow the interior work to begin as long as proposed work that affected the historic windows was not installed. Also, Mr. Lambert asked how comfortable the Commission would be in having the applicant patch in the aluminum siding in fairly large amounts. Discussion followed on the difficulty of preserving the historic character of the home when windows were being removed. Dialog followed as to which windows would stay and which were proposed to be eliminated. Commissioners agreed the proposal for the north façade was somewhat problematic because it is a long flat elevation that is highly visible and because the windows were placed in a very regular and symmetrical pattern. Alteration of these design patterns would result in a loss of the historic, architectural character.

Applicant Ms. Reimer inquired of the commissioners to define the word “historical” and asked what “historic character” the commission was trying to preserve. She went on to explain her vision of bringing back the home to a single-family home. She asked the commission to provide some parameters for its vision. To avoid commissioners getting involved in the design process, Commissioner Warner encouraged Ms. Reimer to work with her architect and create her desired interior character within the context of the original home’s exterior, working around and with what exists. Mr. Lambert recommended that she pay attention to the strong vertical rhythm of the fenestration (windows and doors) and to work thru the design details between her and her architect. Details were explained.

Ms. Reimer asked if she could receive feedback on the three items that were at issue: the interior wall of the front porch, the south window, and the north elevation, versus reviewing them again next month. Mr. Lambert briefly reviewed the items that were being discussed and offered to work with the applicants so that in the interim the applicants could move along with their interior demolition. Chairman Zellmer concurred and directed Mr. Hinds to provide samples of the existing siding next month as well as what was being proposed, including dimensions. Mr. Lambert asked also that the applicants provide window cut sheets. Commissioner Zinke also asked for clarification of those windows that are proposed to be replaced. She acknowledged the north wall was very problematic but the styling of the home would require that the windows align above and below each other.

Mr. Lambert explained the tradeoffs of the design to Mr. Hinds. As voiced by Commissioner Stazin, the symmetry was to be maintained regardless of the final design of new window sash design for the existing openings. Mr. Lambert confirmed the application would return at the July 16th HPC meeting.

D. 316 Campbell Street (Case No. 2019-041). Applicant: Sue Hadley & Deb Hilton, Country Naturals; Alex Teipel with Architectural Resources. Application for: Request to modify an existing Entry Stoop and Overhang at a Contributing Property. Mr. Lambert reviewed the proposal and located the property on the overhead map. The home was a former residence. The front patio

and stoop have crumbled and inclement weather was deteriorating the front stoop. The proposed covering was a functional project

Mr. Robert Ackers, from Architectural Resources, explained the stoop and stairs will remain as they are and the proposed covering will be extended only to cover the stoop, steps and walkway from inclement weather. Commissioners commented that the gable end of the entry was a new element and may not be appropriate for the project, wherein Mr. Lambert believed the gable was introduced to better identify the entry and was not wholly out-of-character for the heavily-modified building. Mr. Ackers briefly explained some of the additions that were added to the home. Per a question, the new covering would cover about six feet and extend over the bay window. After discussing the matter, commissioner comments were that the covering changed the home's character a bit but the element was functional and could be removed in the future with little adverse affect on the original portion and historic additions to the 19th century building. No other objections were voiced. A brief dialog followed on how the applicant got around the ADA access.

Motion by Commissioner Hamilton, second by Commissioner Warner to approve the modifications for 316 Campbell, as presented. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED VOTE: 6-0

E. 227 Ford Street (Case No. 2019-042). Applicant: Mike and Lisa Riebe, Owners; Sean Gallagher with Gallagher Associates. Application for: Modifications to approved Plans for a Significant Property. Mr. Lambert located the property on the overhead and stated this case was before the commission one year ago, however, the item was before the commission tonight due to minor modifications that were made to the prior-approved plans.

Owner, Mr. Mike Riebe, 227 Ford Street, discussed how he and his wife purchased the home and referenced the home's previously-approved plans. He wanted to return the home to its original character.

Mr. Sean Gallagher, architect for the project, explained two changes were made from the last concept review, done a year ago: 1) more glass would be added in the door that exited from the mudroom towards Third Street, and 2) a slight differentiation would be created in the dormers facing Third Street which would now cause the dormers to match in size. (Elevations were provided.) The doorway from the mudroom will include a sidelight and a full-view French door. As for materials, Mr. Gallagher explained the original home currently had shingle siding and it would be patched/repared for any needed modifications. The trim on the dormers would be repaired in kind. The two new windows on the original portion of the home will be wood and the windows on the new addition will be Marvin Integrity windows. Also, the addition will have smooth side out Hardi (lap to match the shingle siding on the original house) and the shingles will be Serpentine Noir Black. The standing seam roof in the entry from the mudroom and on the canopy will be Matte Black Steel. The garage door on the detached garage will be full-face Coachman-style door. The upper replacement rail system will be Chippendale style. Per Mr. Gallagher, this was not a Tax Assessment Freeze project.

Regarding the roof over the front door, Mr. Gallagher explained the gable will be left open, tying it with a black powered coated tie rod. The front door will retain the historic transom above.

Commissioners voiced positive comments for the project.

Motion by Commissioner Zinke, second by Commissioner Hamilton to approve the revised plans for 227 Ford Street, as presented and discussed. Roll call:

Aye: Hamilton, Hiller, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED VOTE: 6-0

7. Secretary's Report (Staff Updates)

Mr. Lambert reminded the commissioners that the Mill Race Redevelopment charette would be taking place on June 24th at 7:00 p.m. at Riverside Receptions. He invited commissioners to attend. On June 26th, the charette will start at 5:30 p.m., and the last date -- June 27th -- the charette would start at 7:00 p.m. Details followed. Mr. Lambert did not know whether the charette would be recorded or not. A brief explanation of next steps followed.

6. New Business

A. From the Commission: None.

B. From the Public: None.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic Preservation Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Stazin, second by Commissioner Warner. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 6-0.