

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

August 20, 2019

1. Call to Order

Chairman Pro tem Hiller called to order the August 20, 2019 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present HPC: Chairman Pro tem Hiller; Commissioners Hamilton, Salomon, Stazin, Warner, Zinke

Absent: Chairman Zellmer

Others Present: Mike and Gloria Sweeney, 594 Gray St., Geneva; Dan Marshall, 812 E. Main St., St. Charles; Cara Mammoth, 21 N. 6th St., Geneva; Brad Saelens, 208 River Lane, Geneva; Deb and Edward Peterka, 208 S. River Lane, Geneva; Paul Cvek, 216 Campbell, Geneva; Craig Shodeen, 105 S. River Lane, Geneva; Alan Leahich, 211 Garfield St. Geneva; Brian Hogan, 311 S. 2nd St., Geneva; Drew and Rachel Grider, 760 Forest Ave., Glen Ellyn; John Mead, 3308 Ridge Point Dr., Geneva; Robert Chamberlain, 6N510 Rt. 31, St. Charles; and Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

3. Approval of July 16, 2019 Minutes

Minutes of July 16, 2019 - Motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Zinke to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed by voice vote of 3-0-3 (Commissioners Hamilton, Stazin, Warner abstain.)

4. Five Minute Field Guide

Preservation Planner, Michael Lambert walked through an introduction of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Co. maps, discussing that the maps were created to set insurance rates for the insurability of certain buildings within a town. Summaries followed on how the information for the maps were gathered by surveyors, how cartographers drew and tinted the maps, and what the various map abbreviations meant on the maps. Further details followed.

5. Review of Building Permit Applications

A. 208 S. River Street (Case No. 2019-039). Applicant: Edward and Deborah Peterka, Owners. Paul Cvek, VIP Home Services, Ltd. Contractor and Brad Saelens, BDS Architecture. Application for: Demolition of existing attached garage and construction of a new attached garage at a contributing property. Mr. Lambert recalled this property was a concept review that came before the commissioners a few months ago. The home was associated with Kate Raftery and the Beautification Project along River Lane. At the June meeting the concept proposal was to remove

an existing garage and art studio and replace them with a new two-car garage. Photos of the existing conditions followed.

Per Mr. Lambert, the owners were requesting to close in a door that would not be used and construct a new garage that would closely replicate the original garage façade, including the gable pitch. The art studio would be removed and replaced with a new two-car garage. Floor plans, construction area, a roof plan, and proposed elevations followed.

Mr. Brad Saelens, architect for the project, explained that nothing changed from the June presentation. The door was removed. Mr. Saelens offered to replace in kind or, as preferred, to infill the door with siding and match with surrounding siding. No concerns were voiced.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to approve as presented and according to commissioners' direction from the June meeting. Second by Commissioner Hamilton. Roll call:

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

MOTION PASSED: VOTE: 6-0

B. 77 N. First Street (Case No. 2019-070). Applicant: Craig Shodeen / Bill Warwick with Shodeen Group. Application for: Request to consider replacement of clad, replacement windows with new aluminum-clad windows at a contributing property. Mr. Lambert located the commercial property on the overhead map, explaining it served as an automobile repair shop/sales store originally. The 1928 building was renovated by Shodeen about 25 years ago using double-hung windows at that time. The applicant was asking to replace the former replacement windows with new aluminum-clad double hung windows with simulated divided lights, meeting the HPC's window policy.

Applicant, Mr. Craig Shodeen, stated the new windows would be Pella simulated divided light windows.

Commissioner Hiller commented about the irony of the former replacement windows falling apart after 25 years, reminding commissioners that the commission usually tells applicants to preserve their old growth windows. He confirmed with the applicant that the proposed windows will meet the size and openings of the existing windows, there will be no impact on the historic character of the building, and the proposal met the HPC's window policy. For the record, Commissioner Stazin commented that all windows are not created equal and just because of the nature of the age, does not in any means or method construe what the value or quality of the window is.

Motion by Commissioner Stazin, seconded by Commissioner Zinke to approve the replacement window proposal, as presented. Roll call:

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

MOTION PASSED: VOTE: 6-0

C. 10 N. Third Street and 301 W. State Street (Case No. 2019-072 and 073). Applicant: Drew and Rachel Grider, Owners. Dan Marshall with Marshall Architects and John Vendafreddo with Hogan Design and Construction. Application for: Request to rehabilitate exterior facades and replacement of existing windows and rehabilitation of historic wood windows at a significant property. Mr. Lambert explained the main focus for this building will be the 10 N.

Third Street side even though replacement windows were being proposed for 301 W. State Street. Both cases will be considered simultaneously. Historic photographs as well as historic backgrounds for both addresses followed, noting the storefront for 10 N. Third Street was renovated extensively in the 1960s into a Mid-Century Modern look and also in the 1980s with smaller windows and a larger canopy structure that exists currently. The proposal is to return the 10 N. Third Street facade back to its 1962 appearance and to restore the four top windows of that facade. The proposal also includes replacement of all second floor windows along Third Street.

Mr. Lambert explained that the second floor windows for the 10 N. Third Street address included a variety of wooden and vinyl windows with a variety of deterioration. The storefront windows on the first floor will be retained while the second floor windows will be replaced in-kind or with a clad unit with an 8 over 1 pane window. Brick will be painted again. The north façade will include a new roof-top deck with glass panel railings sympathetic to the 1962 storefront below. The north façade (facing parking lot) will include the installation of new windows and the removal two transom-type windows on the second floor to be replaced with a sliding glass door and glass rail. The long window will be replaced with two double-hung windows for the new kitchen. The building will be painted and the stucco parging will be retained. Floor plans for both addresses were reviewed.

Mr. Dan Marshall, with Marshall Architects, introduced Drew and Rachel Grider, the owners of the business moving in. Mr. Grider briefly summarized his professional background and how he acquired the property. Mr. Marshall explained the goal for his clients was to keep the character of the building, save the building, and bring in a new business. He believed the paint on the building covered the entire building and due to the expense of removing it entirely, his clients wanted to repaint it. And, rather than having a variety of windows to preserve versus replacing them, Mr. Marshall felt replacing them all would be better and would keep the original character of the building. Regarding the proposed roof deck, it would provide outdoor space. The glass railing would be simple while the glass panels would be a frosted glass.

Discussing the 1960s reinterpretation of the 10 N. State Street address (designed by architect Thomas Emma), Commissioner Zinke discussed the brick at the bottom of the windows was a very 1960s look which Mr. Marshall confirmed would remain. Asked if the original awning was under the current awning, Mr. Marshall indicated he would have to review its condition but he was proposing to fix it. Questions followed regarding a canopy detail on the permit plans. Per Stazin's questions regarding the existing siding on the north facade, Mr. Marshall explained his clients would like to replace the existing vinyl siding; however, it was a financial matter for the owners currently. Commissioner Hiller supported the 1960s portion since it met the commission's mission and it appeared to fit in with the period of significance. It also blended well with some of the nearby businesses. He cautioned Mr. Marshall to be sensitive to the 1960s look.

As for keeping the look, Mr. Marshall explained how he intended to obtain the 1960s look, i.e., the fascia materials would consist of a flush panel with flush seams rather than the scallop to bring it more to date. Commissioner Hiller pointed out the stacked brick area was a different color which defined the two buildings. He believed the applicants should try to maintain the lighter-faced brick look. However, Mrs. Grider pointed out that the brick was painted the same color currently. Mr. Marshall indicated his clients' intent was to paint the entire building one color; however, Commissioner Hiller suggested stripping the paint on the 1960's building to better delineate the two buildings. Commissioner Zinke asked that when the applicants get closer to painting the building to consider some of the options that were being discussed, emphasizing the history of the two buildings. Per Mr. Marshall, color renderings would be forthcoming.

Mr. Lambert added that if the stacked brick below the awning was left one color, it appeared in the 1960s as an attempt to unify the building along the first floor and it could be an option for the applicants to consider. He emphasized the history behind the building and what the guidelines of the Secretary of Interior Standards said. Commissioner Stazin also pointed out the canopy ran the entire length of the 1960s lower brick and to the bearing wall of the other building, which was a good start for separation, if that was the intent.

Some commissioners felt the canopy and the lower brick offered enough delineation between the buildings and paint could always be changed. However, Commissioner Hiller cited SOI Standards 3, 4, and 5 and their application to the proposal. Regarding the outdoor patio, Mr. Marshall explained the patio was set out from the building about four feet and the canopy hid it somewhat. Ms. Grider also pointed out the patio was removable. Regarding the original canopy, Mr. Marshall stated he planned to reuse the structure, if possible.

Focusing on the second floor windows on Third and State and their existing conditions, Commissioner Hiller noted photos were not included in the packet.

Mr. Brian Hogan distributed window estimate information from RWP & Sons (in DeKalb) for a total restoration cost of \$86,000 for the 22 windows, which included simulated divided lights. Referring to the four second-floor windows on State Street, Mr. Lambert noted the furthest window to the west was original while the three other windows to the east were replaced. Asked if there was a historic window with matching top and bottom sashes from the 1920s, Mr. Marshall could not tell.

Mr. Lambert offered that commissioners could seek a full window survey from the applicants. He relayed that mixing the windows on the State Street façade would not be ideal. Clarification of the estimate followed by Mr. Hogan. Proposed were 8 over 1 Marvin Integrity clad windows with SDL and a spacer in between the glass. Questions continued regarding the condition of the existing windows and the costs associated with removing and replacing the new windows. Commissioners appeared to be fine with the windows.

Discussion flowed back and forth regarding the differentiation in brick for 10 N. Third Street and whether the brick could be stripped or painted a different color. The applicants were asked if they were open to stripping the brick paint located under the canopy.

Ms. Cara Mamott with Haven Design Group, explained the various ideas she was working on for the building and the various inconsistencies of the brick and color. The goal was to bring back the integrity of the building and bring it back as a rebirth. Mr. Lambert reminded commissioners that paint was reversible. On the north elevation, the commissioners were fine with the proposed windows.

Again, discussion followed between staff and the commissioners regarding the differentiation of the 1962 building storefront renovation from the main building, and that the applicants consider that as a courtesy. Applicants voiced no objection to that suggestion. Commissioner Warner recalled a window survey was usually required and asked for the rationale on this case. Wherein, Mr. Lambert discussed that in previous cases where the commission dealt with commercial buildings where a uniform look of windows existed, when one window needed to be replaced, the commission usually replaced all of the windows.

Motion by Commissioner Stazin to approve the renovations for 10 N. Third Street and 301 W. State Street as presented with additional emphasis being recommended on the

differentiation of the 1962 building and elevation. Second by Commissioner Hamilton. Roll call:

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

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED: VOTE: 6-0

D. 327 S. Fourth Street – Larabee House (Case # 2019-083). Applicant: St. Mark's Church; Mike Sweeney. Application for: Request to consider Replacement of Historic Wood Siding with New siding at a Significant Property. Preservation Planner Michael Lambert recalled this case was before the commission over the past year. Tonight's request focused on replacing the wood siding on the building. A history of the building and historic photos followed. Proposed renderings were depicted as well as a breakdown of the project's timeline.

Mr. Lambert stated he walked the site on August 15, 2019 and took photographs of the exposed siding and exposed conditions. He pointed out the rot in the crown molding, separation at the eave, nail hole damage etc. He pointed out an area for potential siding material if salvage siding was needed to be repaired. There was concern as to how the decorative trim under the belly of the bay would be treated. Would the historic frieze and trim boards be replaced/repared, and whether the corbels and brackets would be replaced, etc. Other concerns included how the original east wing and its enclosure would be treated and how lead abatement would occur.

A list of six items not received from the applicant, were reviewed by Mr. Lambert.

Mr. Mike Sweeney, representing St. Mark's Church, referenced his report and reviewed those portions where the siding was removed on the various facades. He explained most of the existing siding was on the south façade. Other issues noted included the different reveal sizes, overhangs, separation of fascia boards, soffits, replacement of sub sheathing and some of the costs involved. Other examples of deterioration followed.

Mr. Sweeney distributed a proposal from Hines in Wheaton, IL for the repair and replacement of existing siding and trim (total \$78,342) and also a proposal to install new Hardi board siding (\$63,145.50). He stated some of the corbels will have to be taken down and repaired but he would keep as many of them on the building.

Mr. Rob Chamberlain, the siding contractor, explained the condition was beyond repair, due to the condition of the wood siding, nail holes, and the separation of soffits that occurred. A review of the two estimates followed. After that, two more quotes were submitted: one that included repair only with cedar wood (by Hines) and the other for the replacement of all siding in cedar wood (\$72,111). Asked if the wood siding that was already removed was salvaged, Mr. Sweeney stated it was not and the lead was not remediated when discarded. Mr. Sweeney explained that using the cedar provided a better match. Asked what percentage of the siding currently on the building could be repaired and painted, Mr. Chamberlain estimated it was about 50/50.

Another estimate provided by Mr. Sweeney proposed to side the entire home in cedar siding, which included a vapor barrier, as no current insulation existed. Regarding the corbels, they would be repaired and reused, and duplicating the former porch that used to be on the house with new and improved materials.

Commissioner Hamilton stated that to repair only using cedar totaled \$81,700 as compared to replacing with all cedar at \$72,100. Mr. Sweeney emphasized there was concern about removing the existing paint on the siding, the significant wear and tear it would take, and the texture would not be conforming, which was why the paint estimate was so high.

Discussion followed from Commissioner Hiller that more questions seemed to be asked and being raised to answer at the meeting and that the case should be continued in order to review the estimate information that was presented. After some dialog, Mr. Lambert summarized that the following concerns/questions needed to be addressed: what will be left that will be historic, quantify what is salvageable, and will the material be exactly replicated or will stock material be used to replicate. He emphasized to the applicant that the commission was a historic preservation commission, not a design commission. Other comments made by the presenters were also clarified by staff.

Discussion followed that the commissioners provide the applicants with a list of questions to answer for the next meeting. Commissioner Stazin explained that his questions focused on the fact that maybe a couple of facades could be salvaged while the other facades could be resided with new siding. Commissioners recalled a home on James Street that was done similarly. Mr. Sweeney believed that enough existing siding on the walls of the building could be used to repair/patch the entire front elevation (west) and possibly the south elevation.

Commissioners voiced the following questions:

- 1) What amount of siding is salvageable and what are the elevations that can be salvaged;
- 2) Can historic materials be removed and consolidated to specific elevations; and
- 3) What is the cost of removing the old siding, including environmental costs involved, as part of the cost of replacement.

Due to the late hour, Mr. Lambert suggested the commissioners submit any other questions to him by the close of business day next Monday (August 26, 2019).

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to table the discussion to September 17, 2019 and that commissioner questions be forwarded to Mr. Lambert by close of business day Monday, August 26, 2019. Mr. Lambert will forward the questions to the applicants. Second by Commissioner Warner. Roll call:

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

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

6. Secretary's Report - None

7. New Business

A. From the Commission: Commissioner Warner questioned a building on Campbell Street, which this commission approved previously. Commissioner Zinke inquired of staff as to why the Mill Race project would be coming before this commission, wherein Mr. Lambert explained it was due to the landmark status of the entire property. He could not provide details at this point but suggested she contact Community Development Director David DeGroot.

B. From the Public: None.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Historic Preservation Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:11 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Stazin. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 6-0.