

December 8, 2022

Michael A. Lambert
Preservation Planner
City of Geneva, Illinois

Re: Proposed Demolition application of the Historic Landmark
4 East State Street
Geneva, IL 60134
HPC Case 2022-079

Dear Michael,

As you are aware, the above referenced demolition application has been submitted along with the supporting cost estimate and building evaluation documentation, that was prepared by professional, licensed architects and structural engineers, who have extensive experience in historic restoration, all in accordance the guidelines set forth in the City of Geneva (the "City") Ordinances for demolition of historic landmarked structures. We understand that although this application may not be unanimously supported, years have passed, discussion have occurred, yet, there has been no viable option with sufficient funding brought forward by any group, individual or City staff member to restore the deteriorated remnant structure since it was uncovered so long ago. In accordance with the City Ordinances, the process must move forward and the next step of approval of the demolition permit needs to be favorably processed.

On behalf of the applicant ("Shodeen"), this correspondence provides a response to the City letter dated October 25, 2022 with regard to the above referenced Demolition Request. Attached you will find a revised Historic Property Demolition Request which was presented to the City on or about October 31, 2022. Below, we provide you with the comments from the October 25, 2022 City correspondence, and our response.

Comment: Historic Landmark Demolition-Part Two, Section 1. Property Identification. The legal description should properly identify that portion of the property currently designated as a Historic Landmark.

Response: The legal description has been corrected on the attached forms.

Comment: Historic Landmark Demolition-Part Two, Section 3. Significant Dates. Please amend to reflect the dates that have been identified in prior research documents and the 2018 and 2022 designation documents.

Response: The dates have been amended as you have required.

SHODEEN

SHODEEN HOMES, LLC
77 N. First Street
Suite 77
Geneva, Illinois 60134

phone 630.232.8181
facsimile 888.317.1943

www.shodeenhomes.com

Comment: Historic Landmark Demolition-Part Two, Section 4. Property Recognition. Please amend to reflect the historic significance classification identified in the 2018 and 2022 designation Findings of Fact and Ordinance.

Response: The property recognition boxes have been checked as you have required.

Comment: Historic Landmark Demolition-Part Two, Section 5. Property Description-Primary Building Function. Please amend to reflect the historic building function as identified in prior research documents and the 2018 and 2022 designation documents.

Response: The building functions have been amended as you have required to show that it is consistent with the prior independent verification research documents and the 2018 and 2022 designation documents. Please note that we have no knowledge if the prior research documents are accurate or correct.

Comment: Historic Landmark Demolition-Part Two, Section 5. Property Description-Roof Features. Please amend to reflect the roof material.

Response: The roof materials have been amended to reflect the current roof materials.

On October 6, 2022, Shodeen sent an email with 4 questions. Those 4 questions, along with the City response to those 4 questions, were incorporated into the staff review letter dated October 25, 2022. We offer our response to those 4 questions and the City responses below:

1. **Shodeen question to the City on 10-6-22:** Please provide me (Shodeen) with the section of the ordinance and paragraph number that requires “that a complete proforma statement would include alternate findings based on utilizing all funding sources.”

City response on 10-25-22: Additional information that will assist staff and the Historic Preservation Commission in its evaluation of your request are set forth in the Geneva City Code 10-6-10 (A.2.o): “Other reasonable information required by city ordinance or that may be required by staff”. Typically, proforma statements associated with the rehabilitation of a historic property include the costs and available funding applicable to the adaptive use of the property. Staff believes that this requirement for additional information is reasonable.

Shodeen response 12-8-22:

Shodeen understood the Preservation Planner was seeking ideas and thoughts as to how the applicant could obtain financial assistance due to the exorbitant costs to restore the dilapidated structure and how to close the financial gap that exists pursuant to the submitted proforma. Understanding the timing, Shodeen immediately responded to the City Economic Development Director as requested by the Preservation Planner on 10-25-22. Specifically, Shodeen contacted Cathleen Tymoszenko, City of Geneva Economic Development Director to determine the funding that the city has available as a resource for closing financial gaps or shortfalls in the financial proforma that was provided. Having some experience closing such financial gaps, Shodeen was aware that grants, tax credits and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) are tools that the City may have available to them.

City staff did not offer any grant funding; Staff did not even mention that as an option. Grant funding is typically less than \$10,000 for such projects, for this reason, we do not believe that any potential grant would close much of the financial gap.

With regard to tax credits, the applicant has never used a tax credit program to assist in financing development projects, while the applicant did review the potential availability and process. The Illinois Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program provides a state income tax credit equal to 25% of a projects' "Qualified Rehabilitation Expenditures" ("QRE's"), to owners of certified historic structures. The owner of the property is a 501.c.3 that does not pay any income tax. Consequently, the Tax Credit would be of no value to the owner. The Tax Credit, if awarded (as these are competitive applications), could only cover 25% of the QRE's. The competitive projects are based on such factors as the number of jobs created, and what significant, positive, stimulation it would bring to the local economy. It's unknown if this project would rate highly at all on these factors as we do not anticipate the restoration of the remnant structure generating any long-term jobs or driving tourism traffic or generating sales tax revenue. If the Tax Credit application for the restoration did achieve these factors and *was* awarded financing, we have no idea what costs would meet the requirements of QRE's. **IF** costs were identified as QRE's and were approved, the 25% tax credit is not nearly close enough to close the gap as we need more than 75% of all costs, regardless of QRE's, to close the financial gap.

This was all discussed with City staff at the 10/28/22 meeting at which time Preservation Planner Michael Lambert said, "they have consultants to do this Tax Credit work". Shodeen replied that the City should then employ the Tax Credit consultant and obtain the funds to close the financial gap. The City Preservation Planner replied, "the City will not do that".

The remaining option was to determine if the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) would provide enough funding. Therefore, the following questions were raised by Shodeen in it's 10/25/22 email to Cathleen Tymoszenko:

- a. What, if any, Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Funds for restoration of the remnant stone structure are available, and if the project costs identified in the provided proforma are eligible for TIF funding.
- b. If the City staff and/or the City's TIF consultant would identify all items within the provided detailed Construction Budget that are TIF eligible.
- c. If the City of Geneva Economic Development Department and City Council are willing to provide the necessary funding that the City of Geneva Preservation Planner Mr. Lambert identified in the October 25, 2022 correspondence.

On 10-28-22 the undersigned Shodeen representative met with David DeGroot, City of Geneva Director of Development, Cathleen Tymoszenko, Director of Economic Development and Michael Lambert, Preservation Planner to discuss these questions and any financial assistance or funding options that may be available for this project. At that meeting, City staff was going to review the options and respond back to Shodeen.

On 11-5-22 Shodeen had not received any response from the City, so Shodeen reached out again to the City staff via email requesting status of their review.

On 11-9-22 Shodeen still had not received any response from the City, so Shodeen placed a phone call to The Economic Development Director wherein a discussion was had that the City reiterated that they would be getting back to Shodeen with a response to the requests.

On 11-22-22 Shodeen still had not received any response from the City so Shodeen again reached out to City staff via email for a response.

On 11-23-22 City staff provided a response to Shodeen wherein it stated:

Per discussion at our 10/28 meeting and our 11/9 phone conversation; I am not certain how you wish to proceed.

As I understand, you are inquiring about TIF funds to respond to comments related to a demolition request.

Presently, you have a demolition request pending AND you are requesting TIF funds to preserve the structure?

These requests are incongruent.

To pursue a TIF request to preserve the structure, the first step would be to withdraw the demolition request.

Please let me know how you wish to proceed.

Based on this response on 11-23-22, from the City of Geneva, it is clear to Shodeen that one or all of the following are true:

- a. No funding is currently available for the restoration of the remnant structure.
- b. The City was unsuccessful in obtaining a response from their TIF consultant as to if the funds could be used.
- c. The City Staff did not approach the City Council with any request for funding options.

2. **Shodeen question on 10-6-22:** The section of the ordinance and paragraph that REQUIRES a property owner to comply with the Geneva Fox River Redevelopment plan goals.

City response on 10-25-22: Per Geneva City code 10-6-10 (A.2.o): Other reasonable information required by City ordinance or that may be required by city staff. Municipal planning documents that have been adopted by City Council are the guiding documents which staff follows in its review and recommendation of development projects. Staff believes that this request for additional information is reasonable.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

This Demolition Application is NOT a “development project” application. It is simply a demolition permit application in accordance with Ordinance 10-6-10.

Irrespective of staff erroneously identifying this as a “development project”, Shodeen has reviewed the document entitled “Geneva Fox River Redevelopment Project Area (TIF#3) and finds the following:

In March of 2014, SB Friedman Development Advisors (SB Friedman) was engaged by the City of Geneva to conduct a formal TIF Eligibility Study and to prepare a Redevelopment Plan and Project Report (the “Report). This Report details the eligibility factors found within the Geneva Fox River Redevelopment Project Area (RPA or TIF #3) in support of its designation as a “conservation area” all in accordance with the TIF Allocation Redevelopment Act (Act). The subject site is within the RPA Conservation Area and was used to determine eligibility for the TIF because the age of the structure is over 35 years old, it lacks growth in Equalized Assessed Value, has deterioration, is vacant and has inadequate utilities. Per the Report, “The overall goal of this RPA is to reduce or eliminate the conditions that qualify the RPA as a conservation area”. The Shodeen application for demolition is entirely in compliance with this Report.

The RPA goes on to provide “Objectives”, specifically:

“Facilitate redevelopment of vacant or underutilized properties by providing resources for site assembly and preparation, including DEMOLITION (emphasis added) ...where necessary...of vacant and underutilized sites...”

The Shodeen application for demolition is in compliance with these Objectives.

The RPA goes on to provide “Strategies” specifically:

“Facilitate Property Assembly, DEMOLITION (emphasis added) and Site Preparation...Site preparation may include such preparatory work as demolition of existing improvements...”

The Shodeen application for demolition is in compliance with this Strategy.

The RPA goes on to provide “Findings and Tests” specifically:

“First, the equalized assessed value (EAV) of the RPA has declined over all five of the last five year-to-year periods and has not kept pace with the Consumer Price Index...On the whole, the RPA has not been subject to side spread growth and development through widespread development by private enterprise. Building permit activity over the past five years indicates some investment in commercial remodels. However, the level of investment has not been significant enough to reverse the trends of declining property values.”

The Shodeen application for demolition is in compliance with this Finding and Test.

The RPA further references One Factor Test under which there are multiple factors this application complies with. These include, without limitation:

“The area...is subject to chronic flooding that adversely impacts on real property”

And the area qualified as “*blighted prior to becoming vacant*”.

The Shodeen application for demolition is in compliance with this One-Factor Test.

The RPA goes on to provide Map 5: *Proposed Future Land Use for the subject site which it included: Mixed use, including Commercial, Residential, Park/Open Space, Public Institutional.*

The Shodeen application for demolition follows this Map.

3. **Shodeen question on 10-6-22:** The City controls the TIF. Does the City have \$2.0 million to contribute in TIF funds at the time of construction, NOT on a pay as the property generates the increment?

City response on 10-25-22: City staff reviews and City Council determines TIF funding based on submitted requests of applicants. Please contact Cathleen Tymoszenko, Economic Development Director, for information about TIF funds and eligibility requirements if you choose to pursue a TIF funding request.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

Shodeen contacted Cathleen Tymoszenko as directed. The information we obtained from Cathleen Tymoszenko is noted in item 1 above. Cathleen Tymoszenko provided no positive information as to ANY funding available for the restoration of the structure.

4. **Shodeen question on 10-6-22:** Has the City’s TIF consultant identified all items within the detailed Construction Budget that are TIF eligible costs?

City response on 10-25-22: The award of TIF fund contributions to eligible projects is based on submitted request of applicants. Please contact Cathleen Tymoszenko, Economic Development Director, for information about TIF funds and eligibility requirements. Once TIF-eligible costs for a specific project have been identified and evaluated, the request will be forwarded to City Council for Consideration. All TIF-eligible contributions should then be incorporated into the proforma statement associated with your demolition request, submitted for review by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

Shodeen contacted Cathleen Tymoszenko as directed. The information we obtained from Cathleen Tymoszenko is noted in item 1 above. You will note that NO funding was identified for the restoration of the stone remnant structure and NONE of the detailed cost estimates were identified as TIF eligible expenses. Therefore, no amendment to the pro-forma is required. You should also note that although you provided this directive for us to contact Cathleen Tymoszenko, Cathleen stated in her email response that the request for funding was somehow “incongruent” with the demolition request.

Clearly, the City understands the excessive work and cost required to restore the remnant structure and has not questioned any of the detailed cost estimate or the validity or accuracy of the submitted proforma. The question is, how do you fund such an expensive project that does

not generate enough jobs, sales tax, property tax, or revenue for the municipality to justify such a significant contribution and use of taxpayer money. Thus, the financial calculations provided in accordance with the City ordinance, leaves the only viable option for the remnant structure which is demolition.

5. **Shodeen question on 10-6-22:** Written confirmation that the City of Geneva Economic Development Department and City Council are willing to provide the necessary funding.

City response on 10-25-22: The award of TIF fund contributions to eligible projects is based on submitted request of applicants. Please contact Cathleen Tymoszenko, Economic Development Director, for information about TIF funds and eligibility requirements. Once TIF-eligible costs for a specific project have been identified and evaluated, the request will be forwarded to City Council for Consideration.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

Shodeen contacted Cathleen Tymoszenko as directed. The information we obtained from Cathleen Tymoszenko is noted in item 1 above. You will note that NO funding has been identified or offered for the restoration of the stone remnant structure. NO written confirmation that the City Council agreed to provide any funding for the restoration as specifically asked in our question.

City Comment on 10-25-22: “The Geneva Historic Preservation Ordinance -Demolition of Designated Properties specifically identifies that “Demolition shall be considered only when all of other redevelopment options for a building, structure, object, improvement or site have been exhausted...staff believes that a sincere investigation that explores all reasonable re-purposing and redevelopment alternatives, in situ, should be incorporated into a submittal of a demolition request.”

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

Shodeen and the members of the Shodeen Family Foundation have extensive experience with the restoration and/or repurposing of historic structures specifically within the City of Geneva. These restorations and/or repurposing not only include the design and construction, but also the financing of the work associated with them. They include such projects as the following:

Geneva on the Dam	Shodeen Corporate offices (aka Republic building)
The Herrington Inn	Eastview House
The Pump House	Dodson Place
Foxfire Restaurant	127 North First Street

Clearly if it was physically and financially feasible to restore the stone remnant structure, Shodeen has the creativity, knowledge, experience, and financial strength to accomplish the task. Unfortunately, this stone remnant structure is beyond restoration.

During the public hearings on the Historic Landmarking of the subject structure there was public testimony from Collin Campbell who pleaded with the Council, under oath, to “just give us time”

to find funding and a use for the remnant structure. Significant time has passed and no qualified users or viable funding options have surfaced from this group or any other group.

The City of Geneva has no known options available as the City of Geneva themselves conducted a Charette process wherein independent professionals analyzed the structures' integrity, financial opportunities associated with this structure, and the architectural ability to incorporate it into a proposed structure. The findings were rejected by the Geneva City Council.

The City of Geneva staff has been involved with potential tenants such as a beer garden for the structure who have also determined that they have no interest in being involved with the restoration or use of the structure.

The structure has been sitting vacant for years with absolutely no viable interest from anyone who has the financial resources and/or professional capability to realistically pursue the restoration and re-use of the existing deteriorated stone remnant structure.

Simply stated and proven with the independent cost estimate for restoration, it is not feasibly possible to restore and use the existing structure and it is not structurally possible to add on the height of the existing structure. Thus, all redevelopment options for a building, structure, object, improvement or site have been exhausted. We have no known financially feasible options that remain other than demolition.

City Comment on 10-25-22: "Furthermore, the unique character and size of the development site affords numerous opportunities for incorporation of the Historic Landmark into a number of creative concepts for the property aside from the solitary, "stand alone" project that has been presented for evaluation".

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

Staff continues to make these repeated comments and allegations of numerous opportunities for incorporation into a number of creative concepts for the property. Unfortunately, despite years of effort, this statement has proven to be factually inaccurate. The structure continues to deteriorate with no one coming forward with the "creative concept". Each potentially viable "opportunity" brought to the attention of Shodeen has been evaluated openly with the City of Geneva staff and the opportunities have proven fruitless. This application is not for a new development, but simply for a demolition permit. The Historic Preservation staff is reminded that the City of Geneva's very own Charette process evaluated opportunities and concluded with using the stone to construct entry features along the path of a proposed development. That option was rejected by the City Council. The inevitable demolition is the only option that remains.

City Comment on 10-25-22: Finally, please provide an applicant's statement that identifies the cost of relocating the structure, as a single entity as well as relocation by means of dis-assembly and accurate reconstruction of the structure at another location.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

There is no known organization that can move the structure as a single entity or in pieces. Therefore, the cost to disassemble, move the elements and "accurately reconstruct" the structure

cannot be determined. If the City of Geneva knows of an organization that will relocate the structure in its entirety and will “accurately reconstruct” the structure, please provide us with the name and contact information so that we may contact that organization. To date, no such organization has proposed any such plan, despite having years to do so.

Secondly one must assume that the cost to relocate the dis-assembled structure would be significantly higher than the cost to restore the structure in place as the cost estimate provided by the professionals to restore the structure does not include dismantling, packaging, loading, transporting, protecting and unloading all of the heavy materials to any proposed site. Lastly, the total final cost to transport the materials cannot be determined until such time as a location for the relocated structure is known as transportation cost is also based upon the mileage to the destination site.

City Comment on 10-25-22: Also, provide a list of potential sites to which the historic structure could be relocated. If based on identified alternatives to the historic site the relocation of the historic structure is deemed, in your opinion, to be cost-prohibitive, please provide a statement to that effect.

Shodeen response on 12-8-22:

The above comment contradicts ordinance 10-6-10 (4.A.2.1) wherein it states:

*“A summary of potential sites, if any to which the resource could be relocated **within the historic district** (emphasis added).”*

Based on the ordinance, the site is to be within the historic district. Staff has requested sites but has failed to select as required by the ordinance that the potential site be within the historic district.

Shodeen knows of no known potential sites to which the historic structure could be relocated. At one point in time, many years ago, there was a resident of the City of Geneva who had an interest in relocating the remnant structure to a vacant lot on East Side Drive in Geneva. That resident interviewed a house mover who advised them that the structure could not be moved.


Secondly, the cost to dismantle the structure and reconstruct the structure would be equal to or more than the cost to restore the structure in place. Thus, based on the estimated cost of the licensed professional, it is cost prohibitive as it would cost more than the value of the finished structure.

Lastly, it is our understanding that the City of Geneva Development and Historic Preservation staff has no known potential sites to which the historic structure could be relocated to.

As is clear from the above recitals, all reasonable efforts have been made to comply with the City’s demands to date whether required by the applicable ordinance or not. In light of the above, demolition of the deteriorated remains is the most appropriate and reasonable approach. Therefore, the pending application for demolition should be approved.

We look forward to your approval of the demolition permit application or the denial of the permit with specific, factual reasons why it is being denied.

Sincerely,


David A. Patzelt
President

Cc: Kate McCracken, Esq.



HISTORIC PROPERTY DEMOLITION REQUEST

PART TWO - PROPERTY INFORMATION

Community Development Department
22 South First Street
Geneva, Illinois 60134

Michael A. Lambert, Preservation Planner
630-938-4541
mlambert@geneva.il.us

1. PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION

Common Name: N.A.

Historic Name: N.A.

Street Address: 4 E. State Street, Geneva, IL 60134

Tax Assessor's Parcel Identification Number (P.I.N.): - - -

Tax Assessor's Parcel Identification Number (P.I.N.): - - -

Attach additional PINs on a separate sheet of paper, if necessary

Description of Property Boundaries or Legal Description (use an additional page, if needed):

COMMENCING AT THE POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF EAST STATE STREET AND THE WESTERLY LINE OF BENNETT STREET AS ESTABLISHED BY PROCEEDINGS IN THE COUNTY COURT OF KANE COUNTY ENTERED JANUARY 18, 1927, AS CASE NO. 6348; THENCE NORTH 80 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 59 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE 172.31 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTH 10 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST, 51.36 FEET; THENCE NORTH 79 DEGREES 49 MINUTES 24 SECONDS WEST, 31.84 FEET; THENCE NORTH 09 DEGREES 36 MINUTES 01 SECOND EAST, 52.47 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 78 DEGREES 59 MINUTES 56 SECONDS EAST, 32.42 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 10 DEGREES 13 MINUTES 35 SECONDS WEST, 0.64 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING

Attach a map indicating the property location and the boundaries of the property proposed for demolition. For properties located within a Historic District, please identify the boundaries of the Historic District on the submitted location map.

2. PROPERTY CLASSIFICATION

Building Structure Object Landscape Site

3. SIGNIFICANT DATES

Original Date of Construction: 1843-1846(per HPC research doc) *1846 **1843

*per 2018 app. by F. Zinke **per Altusworks report dated 8/17/2022

Date(s) of Major Alteration(s): C1868-77, C1886-98, 1932-33,2016 per 2018 App by F. Zinke

Period of Significance (may be a single date or range): *1846-1945

*The period of significance per the HPC research doc is 1846-1945

4. PROPERTY RECOGNITION

Is the subject property and/or landmark to be nominated (or any portion of it) listed in or nominated to either the Geneva, Kane County, Illinois or National Register of Historic Places?

Yes No

If yes, in which of the following:

Geneva Kane County Illinois National

Please attach a copy of the nomination form(s) for any property which has been granted landmark status at the County, State and/or National levels.

Is the nominated property Significant or Contributing within the Geneva Historic District?

Significant Contributing Non-Contributing because less than 30 years old or due to reversible loss of integrity
See remarks below

5. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Provide photographs of all exterior sides of the building and photographs of all significant architectural features or details. Photographs should clearly depict the existing character, condition and integrity of the subject property. **Historic photographs and/or plans of the property to be demolished are encouraged.** Provide photographs in print and digital format (jpeg/300dpi).

To the extent possible, provide a sketch plan of each level of the building(s), structure(s) and/or object(s) associated with the subject property. If the subject property contains a significant landscape that is proposed for demolition, or will be affected by the proposed demolition of a building, structure or object, please provide a sketch plan of the historic landscape plan and its significant components.

*The period of significance per the HPC research doc is 1846-1945. If built prior to 1846 it may not be significant.

** Per 2018 F. Zinke app. it was NOT marked significant as the box was NOT checked

*** We have checked the box as required by city staff per letter dated October 25, 2022 over our objection.

Primary Building Function

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic / Residential | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational / Cultural |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commercial / Office per 2018 F. Zinke appl. | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social / Fraternal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Industrial per the 2018 and 2022 documents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Religious | <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Funerary | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Restaurant</u> |
- The nominated property is a natural or purposefully-designed landscape.

Architectural Style (check all that apply)

Recommended reference: ***A Field Guide to American Houses*** by Virginia & Lee McAlester

* This is a reference to residential structures and this has never been used as a residential structure

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Classic Revival (1843-1868) | <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish Colonial Revival (1920-1930) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Late Classical Revival (1889-1960) | <input type="checkbox"/> Prairie (1905-1930) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regency (1849) | <input type="checkbox"/> American Foursquare (1895-1945) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greek Revival (1840-1865) | <input type="checkbox"/> Craftsman (1910-1930) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gothic Revival (1855-1910) | <input type="checkbox"/> Bungalow (1915-1930) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carpenter Gothic | <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal Traditional (1940-1955) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Italianate (1848-1890) | <input type="checkbox"/> Cape Cod (1930-1960) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stick Style (1853-1895) | <input type="checkbox"/> Ranch (1950-1970) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Queen Anne (1869-1930) | <input type="checkbox"/> Split-Level (1955-1965) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shingle (1890-1905) | <input type="checkbox"/> Mid-Century Modern (1945-1970) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Romanesque Revival (1872-1892) | <input type="checkbox"/> Contemporary (1950-2000) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colonial Revival (1869-1945) | <input type="checkbox"/> Mansard (1930-1970) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dutch Colonial (1895-1930) | <input type="checkbox"/> Styled Ranch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neoclassical (1905-1930) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Traditional (1955-Present) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tudor Revival (1905-1935) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Utilitarian, Vernacular Industrial</u>
see footnote below |

Per pg. 34 in the HPC 2018, 2022 research document, it states that early settlement era properties are often Utilitarian, Vernacular structures of little to no architectural style. The Altusworks report dated 08.17.2022 also states that this structure is of little to no architectural style.

Number of Stories (check one)

- Basement
- Single Story
- 1.5 Stories

- 2 Stories
- 3 Stories
- Other: _____

Foundation (check all that apply)

- Limestone
- Brick
- Concrete

- Uncertain
- Other: _____

Siding/ Exterior (check all that apply)

- Wood
- Brick
- Stucco

- Vinyl/ Aluminum
- Other: Stone _____

Windows

Operation (check all that apply)

- Double Hung
- Casement
- Fixed / Picture

- Awning
- Hopper
- Other: _____

Frame / Sash Material (check all that apply)

- Historic Wood
- Historic Metal
- Other: _____

- Replacement Clad
- Replacement Vinyl

Glazing (check all that apply)

- Clear
- Colored
- Obscure / Pattern

- Beveled / Prismatic
- Art / Stained
- Other: _____

Status (check all that apply)

- Original
- Replacement

Provide a photograph of each window type at the nominated property. If the nominated property includes more than one building or structure, attach photographs for the windows at each building. Use additional pages, if necessary.

Architectural Details (check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Porch or Porches | <input type="checkbox"/> Eave Brackets |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Street-facing Door(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Gable Returns / Broken Pediment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transom(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Dormer(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sidelight(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Belvedere / Lantern / Cupola |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Shutters | <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Fencing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Columns / Pilasters | <input type="checkbox"/> Pergola / Arbor / Trellis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Porte Cochere / Car Port | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>One Story Utilitarian</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Balcony or Balconies | |

Roof Features

Form

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flat / Shed | <input type="checkbox"/> Gable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hipped | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

If an attic gable is present, which way does it face?

- Visible to street
 Visible to the side

Material

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wood Deteriorated wood, and burned wood | <input type="checkbox"/> Tile |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt | <input type="checkbox"/> Metal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Tarp, Polyethelene</u> | |

Chimney

Is the chimney visible from the street?

- Yes No

Does the chimney have a distinctive shape?

- Yes No

Is the chimney an integral part of the building wall?

- Yes No

Provide a photograph of each chimney that is visible from the street.

6. APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I certify that I have received a copy of the submittal requirements and review procedures related to this request for demolition of a property designated as either an individual Historic Landmark or as part of a Historic District within the City of Geneva, Illinois. I understand that I must attend the public hearing/meeting, once scheduled, and present my case for designation before the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission and, if required, before the Geneva City Council.

I have reviewed the Geneva City Code requirements which relate to this application, and I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, this application submittal is in conformance with applicable ordinances.

I further certify that all the information provided above and that the information contained within any documents submitted herewith is true and accurate, to the best of my knowledge.



Signature of Applicant

10/27/2022
Date

If Applicant is not the Owner of the property proposed for demolition, please include the Owner's acknowledgement of the demolition request:



Signature of Property Owner

10/27/2022
Date

Historic Preservation Commission Staff Use Only

Case Number: _____

HPC Meeting Date: _____

Application Complete: Yes No

HPC Distribution Date: _____

Date Received: _____

City Council Distribution Date: _____

Staff Acknowledgement: _____

Action: _____ HPC _____ City Council