

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
Geneva City Council – Council Chambers  
109 James Street, Geneva, Illinois**

**March 21, 2017**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Roy called to order the March 21, 2017 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Present HPC: Chairman Roy, Commissioners Collins, Hamilton, Hiller, Salomon Zellmer, Zinke

Staff Present: Historic Preservation Planner Michael Lambert; Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

Others Present: Sean Gallagher, Gallagher Architects, 427 Anderson Blvd.; Katie Francis, 22 Campbell St.; Tom and Jennifer Stras, 216 Peyton St.; Eric Severson, 130 W. State St.; James Weitl; 3N877 Bittersweet, St. Charles

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 21, 2017**

**Motion by Commissioner Zellmer, seconded by Commissioner Salomon to approve the February 21, 2017 minutes. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0-2 (Collins, Zinke abstain)**

**4. Review of Proposed Development Concepts:**

A. 216 Peyton Street (Case No. 2017-016). Applicant: Tom Stras /T-Square Construction, Owner; Architect: Christopher D. Rosati; Application for Exterior Rehabilitation including window and siding replacement. Preservation Planner Lambert referenced a photo of the home on the overhead noting it was an interesting home that was just purchased and he was trying to figure out the style and date of the home. After researching the home, Lambert explained the photo reflected a 1945-idea of what the home should look like but said it did not start out that way. Built for either the Nathaniel King or William Wakefield family, the house was sold to Mr. George Strong, who moved into the home around 1880. Based on research of census records, the house was listed with a Second Street address and not a Peyton Street address. Reviewing the 1869 Bird's Eye View of Geneva map, Mr. Lambert stated there was some probability that Mr. Strong may have relocated the home from Second Street to Peyton Street. A review of the home's changes from an 1891 and an 1897 Sanborn map followed. A historic photo, dating to ca. 1885-1890 provided by the Geneva Historic Museum, was placed on the overhead. Additional photographs followed.

Mr. Lambert reported the house—apparently—was moved again sometime between 1930 and 1945 to its current location set back from Peyton Street. The home served as the Geneva Inn from 1921 to 1924. Per Lambert, there were features on the home reminiscent from its earliest period, including—most notably, the frieze and cornice detail at the roof line—that still existed on a majority of the home.

However, major alterations have occurred since 1900. The front entranceway was from the 1940s and completed prior to the 1945 Sanborn Fire Insurance map. The windows, which reflected an Italianate appearance, actually were from the 1940s and were a mixture of old sash; newer sash; new jambs, and ca. 1870s-era interior casing. The double-hung windows appeared to have been set up to have rope/pulley and sash weight pockets, but no pulleys or sash weight pockets existed. The circular window and railings appeared to have been added after 1975.

Through the home's renovations, Lambert stated the siding had been patched and the entire west wall was resided with the new, rough-sawn, wood siding screwed into the wall, probably from the 1970s. The newer siding was an attempt to match the sandblasted, historic siding.

Lambert summarized where the original features of the home would have existed and identified the numerous changes over time, including the variety of siding that existed on the home. Again, he said a number of different types of windows existed and were of various ages. Many had heavy deterioration -- some with rotten bottom rails. Some of windows dated back to the 1850s with true mortise-and-tenon muntins.

Submitted plans for the home's current conditions followed in more detail. Interior plans were also submitted. Mr. Lambert stated the owners were proposing an Option A and an Option B and were seeking commissioners' feedback.

Option A for the north elevation was to mimic what the east elevation looked like with a full two-story entryway. Option B had a flat roof with a short railing detail at the roof lines, which came from the historic photo. The proposed east elevation would have some small additions on the second floor, front and rear. Historic windows (those with the mortise-and-tenon muntins) were identified on each of the elevations, as well as window presumed to be from the 1940s, 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. Lambert noted the four-over-four historic windows on the west elevation and identified the location of similar windows around the home. Lambert stated the commission would have to consider the significance of the windows in its discussion with the applicant. On the south elevation, the owners wanted to remove the rear deck.

Due to the confusing evolution of the home and his attempt to pinpoint the period of significance of the house and the significance of its alterations, Lambert said he did speak to representatives of the Preservation Services Division of the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). IHPA staff also had difficulty placing a "style" on the home; however, because the home was in the historic district and this commission considers the evolution of buildings throughout the period of significance for the district, IHPA staff indicated that the 1940s should not be dismissed. Lambert believed the owners were trying to be sensitive to the historical evolution of the house but were also trying to remove the "funkiness" from the 1970s.

Lambert elaborated on the many renovations the interior received and stated the home had been renovated so much that the owners wanted to receive input and direction from the commissioners before they continued forward.

Liz Safanda, 1013 Dunstan, inquired about the oldest date of the home and explained the 1940s additions were added by a doctor, recalling the addition on the front was an entrance for patients.

Per a question, Lambert explained that he determined the house was relocated using dates and census records. Asked where the largest proportion of original siding remained (near cornice and frieze), Lambert stated it was on east side and to the south side of the bay window.

Representing the applicants, Mr. Chris Rosati stated a restoration company did view the home's siding and windows and they determined that the existing siding was sandblasted from its original smoothness. The restoration company suggested to replace the siding (see bid from Historic Homes & Window Restoration). Mr. Rosati was proposing a smooth hardiboard siding with the same exposure. He stated the owners would like to replace the windows with new Castro brand clad windows, no light divisions. A sample was provided.) Lastly, the front entrance element on the north elevation would be removed since it was not proportionally correct for the home and was added at some later time.

Option A would add a full hipped roof with pitch break on it to match the rest of the home and would provide a better proportion to the home without changing the footprint. Option B would have the same element but with a flat roof to replicate the railing element that was currently around the flat portion of the hipped roof on the main portion of the house. Mr. Rosati discussed that the owners were looking for direction on the front entrance. Proposed were two different entrances -- one single door with sidelights and the other one without the sidelights.

Lambert stated that one of the confusing issues about the oldest windows (1850-1870) was that many of them had a "much later" Italianate casing" (1870-1890) around them. Lambert believed some of the original windows were moved and some may have been in their original location. Mr. Rosati mentioned that he did find early 1940s newspaper around the windows used for insulation which led him to believe the windows were modified at a later date. Per Zinke's question, Mr. Rosati estimated there were a total of ten 1850s windows on the structure. Mr. Lambert also pointed out that the windows did not meet city code and recommended that the owners speak to the Building Commissioner as soon as possible on whether the windows could be retained or not. However, Mr. Rosati stated he did speak to Building Commissioner Nelson who would allow the non-code compliant windows which was why he was going to replace the windows in their exact size.

Commissioner Zinke added that the commissioners attended a number of workshops on how 1860 windows could be renovated to be as energy-efficient as brand new windows.

Ms. Liz Safanda also shared positive comments about the window restoration company (Historic Home and Window Restoration) the owners contacted.

Mr. Tom Stras, owner, stated the window restoration representative (Frank Rojas) did come out to the home and determined the windows could be restored but at a significant cost (beyond \$40,000).

However, Mr. Rosati expressed his concern about the window restoration was that several historic windows had divisions in them, while the 1940s windows did not. Commissioner Zellmer suggested that the owners consider an area to salvage, for example, the historic bay windows (behind the chimney), while working with the owners on the remaining windows. While Commissioner Hiller agreed, he also noted the bay area was to the rear of the home which did not show much from the street.

Regarding the window bid (with storms), Commissioner Hiller confirmed that the owner would be eliminating all of the storm windows, wherein Mr. Stras confirmed he would like to have some consistency for the purpose of the home's resale value. However, Hiller also pointed out that if there was a section of the home that could be pointed out as original, it became appealing to potential buyers. On the other hand, Mr. Stras said some people could be concerned the windows were very old windows and not energy efficient. Storms windows would have to be added and it

was an extra “hassle.” Commissioner Hamilton asked Ms. Stras for clarification of the window bid. Hamilton said he preferred the historic windows being repaired; Zinke agreed. Mr. Lambert reminded the commissioners that according to the city’s window policy, windows that were determined to be “beyond repair” could be replaced and that windows behind the first architectural break along a building elevation were not held to the same standards. Chimneys were not counted as an architectural break.

Mr. Stras stated he would prefer to replace all of the windows for consistency but would be open to restoring the oldest windows if feasible. Mr. Rosati confirmed with his client which windows could be repaired and those that would be replaced. The applicant was not interested in leaving windows in their existing, random locations but would consider relocating them all to the bay window if it could be “done reasonably.” Asked if the home could qualify for a tax freeze, Lambert said, as a house in the historic district the house would be eligible for the freeze. However, because of the extensive alterations over time and the complete gutting of the interior, this property at this point in time would likely not qualify for the freeze.

Questions followed on the new, aluminum-clad, wood windows being proposed on the front façade, wherein Lambert explained what the revised window policy allowed in regard to replacement windows. Replacement windows must be similar to the details of the existing, historic windows; Lambert would need additional information and an opportunity to review the proposed windows to verify compatible dimensions of the stiles and rails of the historic window. This meeting is his first time seeing the proposed windows. Zellmer and Zinke pointed out to the owner that the new profile needed to match the exterior appearance of the original windows. Also, the spacer on the new window was shiny, which is not permitted at spacer bars of simulated muntins under the Geneva window policy. As for the non-historic window on the east bay, commissioners suggested reusing the historic windows from the other sides of the house, if similar in size. Zellmer and Hamilton noted that particular window was not noticeable because it was towards the rear and behind the 1940s chimney. Turning to the plan, Lambert stated the second floor bay window was being used as a bathing area which would require tempered glass (either as replacement glass or a glazed, interior panels).

Hamilton preferred that the owners refurbish the front windows (on Peyton), if possible. However, Lambert was not sure if those windows could be made operable if they were restored. After some dialog, commissioners agreed that if the windows could not be refurbished and operable, then they needed to be replaced. The historic windows could be set aside and saved if infeasible to re-install them in the bay window.

For the two side windows on the front foyer, Mr. Lambert asked for a consensus of the commission on whether the windows should be the smaller windows or should they match the same size windows as the front. Commissioners agreed to replace the small foyer windows with the same size and to match the height as the other windows on the home. Further dialog followed that it could be up to the owners to add windows on the upper floor and would review the details in the final drawings.

Commissioner Hiller preferred Option B because it paid homage to the historic photograph. Mr. Stras stated he and his wife preferred Option A because the east side of the home was the original front façade and creating two stories and a hipped roof would pay homage to the original facade. With Option B, the flat roof would only collect water off the hipped roof above it. Mr. Lambert explained the difficulty of creating the appearance of an 1850-1860s home while trying to respect some of its 1940s elements, especially on a home that had been remodeled at least three times during the interim. He believed the commissioners could “mix it up” if they were leaning toward that direction. Regarding the preference for the front door with or without the side

lights, the owners preferred Option A with no side lights; the commissioners were indifferent about a particular preference. The historic frieze and cornice were to remain. All existing siding on the entire home would be replaced with Hardi-board.

Ms. Liz Safanda, 1310 Dunstan Road, spoke regarding the commission's discussion about the oldest windows. She did not understand why the owner would be allowed to replace the historic windows on the front façade when the home had lost its integrity, but at the same time she pointed out that the home was listed as a "contributing property" in the historic district, but it would be wrapped with Hardboard siding, which was practical and would make the home unified in appearance. She pointed out that the only area retaining any historical significance from the earliest period was the east façade but even that had lost its integrity. She asked why restoring that façade with some of the historic windows would be a requirement of the commission. Mr. Stras then asked if the commission would consider replacing the windows in the bay window and also adding a small detailed railing element on top of the existing roof, similar to the historic photograph.

After some dialog between the owner, Mr. Rosati and Mr. Lambert, it became clear to the commissioners that none of the historic windows in the home functioned and Mr. Rosati could not confirm that if the windows in the bay area were refurbished that they would be operable. Commissioners agreed that if the windows could not become operable, then they could replace them with new windows. A report would be provided for the commissioners to confirm if the historic windows could be operable or not. Mr. Stras asked the commissioners what other window information needed to be provided regarding the replacement windows, wherein Lambert said cut sheets were needed, the bottom rail was to be heavier, and the windows had to look very similar to the originals.

B. 130 W. State Street (Case No. 2017-019). Applicant: Eric Severson / Geneva Cleaners, Owner; Application for Window Modification / Equipment Installation. Mr. Lambert discussed that the window on the Geneva Cleaners building was damaged last fall and has been boarded up since. Historic photos followed with Mr. Lambert explaining that the building was constructed in 1953 after a fire destroyed the original First National Bank of Geneva building on the site. The 1999 Architectural Survey listed the building as non-contributing because the commission had not adopted its 2016 updated survey; however the 2016 National Register update identified the building as Contributing because of its age. The building remained intact. Proposed was a two-component self-service dry-cleaning system. A mock-up rendering was referenced with Mr. Lambert confirming that the window opening would remain the same size. A photo of the self-serve kiosk followed.

Owner, Mr. Eric Severson, stated he has been in the building since he was born in 1970. He has tried to keep a few historical pieces of the building intact and does have the original blueprints for the building in his office. He noted that after the fire in the 1950s, what is called the "Car Hop" window at the back of the building was originally drawn as a drive-up door but during the last revisions of the plans, it changed to a walk-up teller window. While he initially wanted to add the kiosk into the car hop area, the space was too tight. After the corner window broke while an exchange of window decorations was taking place, Mr. Severson said he saw the opportunity for the proposed kiosk. He explained how the technology worked and believed the kiosk could be installed fairly easily with the frame to be intact, but he did not know the exact details of how the drop box would be positioned nor if glass could be installed below it.

Commissioners shared positive comments stating it was a nice and neat application and could be reversed, if necessary. Mr. Severson said he had a replacement piece of glass ready for the next technology.

Commissioner Zinke asked if the owner could consider another color versus the red kiosk, such as silver or white, because the red was so bold. Mr. Severson commented that white was used on the interior to purposely “fade away” the conveyors and the red color was used based on the result of a branding study done in the 1990s. Mr. Severson shared that the manufacturer that creates the drop box was different than the company that made the kiosk and that the boxes tended to rust quickly and did not appear to be ordered in anything other than painted steel. He felt the color red could help in that area with the aesthetics and overall maintenance, given that Marberry Cleaners currently had a white box and commissioners could view it. He also explained that he was considering tying in the conveyor with the outside red color as it would be a benefit aesthetically for the building and facade.

Overall, commissioners appeared supportive of the proposal. A short discussion followed on future window displays with the new kiosk.

C. 9 N. Third Street (Case No. 2017-020). Applicant: STC Capital Bank /James Weitzl, Tenant; Application for Wall Modification / Equipment Installation. Mr. Lambert referred to a historic photo (1930) of the building, stating that the commissioners will be discussing the arcade at the northwest corner of the building. A current photo of the building followed with Lambert noting the three stone arches with the center arch containing a recessed entry with two doors. The door on the left (north door) will remain locked; the door on the right (south door) will access the interior. Proposed is an ATM machine to be added to the left of the locked door so that the ATM will not be installed through the limestone facade. The project is visible from the street which is the reason the case was before the HPC.

Applicant, Mr. Jim Weitzl shared his professional and personal background. He stated he wants to retain what is currently there and wants to respect the historic doors. The proposed ATM will be inset into the current stucco wall with no impact on the stone and will be flush to the wall. The unit is approximately 30” deep (or less) and will not be visible from the Third Street windows. The machine will be a convenience for customers and citizens. There will be no additional sign advertising the ATM because of sufficient foot traffic along Third Street. The alcove is currently lit from above but Mr. Weitzl stated it may have to be reviewed for safety purposes, and he may have some lighting changes which would be drawn into the final plans that will be submitted for permit. He stated he filed for regulatory approval but had not received a response yet.

Positive consensus was received from the commissioners for the ATM proposal.

## **5. Review of Building Permit Applications**

A. 22 Campbell Street (Case No. 2016-139). Applicant: Katie & Mark Francis, Owners; Sean Gallagher, Gallagher Architects; Application for Roof Reconstruction. Preservation Planner Lambert reminded the commissioners they reviewed this case twice prior and the new plans were being submitted for permit which included the gable option discussed last month. As a last comment, Mr. Lambert stated the small roof that was proposed over the front door was removed from the proposal.

For the owners, Mr. Gallagher recalled he and clients were before the HPC twice and were now in for permit. He quickly reviewed the differences between the two schemes that were before the commissioners at the prior meeting, recalling that his clients preferred the gabled option. At last month’s meeting he recalled that he asked those present their thoughts on the proposal, which were provided, and with four commissioners indicating that either option would be acceptable. Tonight, he was seeking approval of the proposal as submitted. The hipped version was shown for Commissioner Zinke, since she was not at last month’s meeting. Mr. Gallagher described the

differences. Commissioner Zellmer stated he had no issue with the architecture, as proposed, on the gable but had a difficult time saying it had the same character as the original house.

Mr. Gallagher, referring to the front elevation of the gable, said the only real change – whether going with the hip or the gable – would be the roof line to the back. Chairman Roy liked the differentiation; Hiller thought it retained more of the original character of the house; and Commissioner Salomon supported the proposal.

**Motion by Commissioner Hiller to recommend approval of the design for 22 Campbell Street, as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Salomon . Roll call:**

**Ayes: Collins, Hamilton, Hiller, Salomon, Roy**  
**Nay: Zellmer, Zinke**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 5-2**

## **6. Historic Preservation Ordinance Text Amendments**

A. City-initiated amendments to Sections 10-6-6 (Historic Landmarks), 10-6-7 (Historic Districts), 10-6-10 (Demolition), and 10-6-12 (Economic Hardship) of the City of Geneva Historic Preservation Ordinance related to public hearing notification. Mr. Lambert reported that City Council has asked that all public hearings have greater notification to the community. The new requirement of notification of properties within 250 feet, plus right-of-way, will be revised to 500 feet. The City Council also asked staff to explore a second notice to all affected property owners for public hearings for all commissions, within 5 working days of an application being submitted. Challenges of the changes followed, including cases that may be withdrawn.

B. Minor text clarifications to Sections 10-6-10 (Demolition) and 10-6-12 (Economic Hardship) of the City of Geneva Historic Preservation Ordinance. Lambert stated he found a couple of text errors in Sections 10-6-10 and 10-6-12 which he read, and reminded the commissioners these changes were to be made parallel to the requirements that were being asked to be considered by the City Council.

Asked about the costs associated with the second notification, Mr. Lambert stated the costs would be absorbed by the applicant. One of Lambert's concern was that if an applicant was seeking relief due to economic hardship, the city just increased the applicant's costs. Discussion followed on what was the driving force behind the change in public notice.

**Commissioner Zellmer made a motion that the Historic Preservation Commission recommend the City Council approve the text amendments, as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Zinke. Roll call:**

**Ayes: Collins, Hamilton, Hiller, Salomon, Zellmer, Zinke, Roy**  
**Nay: None**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0**

## **7. Secretary's Report (Staff Updates)**

Mr. Lambert reported the consultant continues to work on the National Register survey update. However, one of Lambert's on-going concerns regards buildings does not have apparent architectural significance but have historic significance that surfaces? The surveys have been based on observed architecture without benefit of property research regarding the historic evolution of the property. He stated the city had such a case where the building is listed as non-

contributing, which means it will not qualify for a tax assessment freeze. However, in doing further research, much historical significance has been discovered. Lambert said he contacted the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency and because the National Park Service had not approve the corrections to the amendments of the National Register survey yet, he said the surveyor reviewed the property with the history he provided, an—now—the building was being listed as a contributing building within the district. Lambert explained that this will become the process that staff will have to go through moving forward when other properties are found to have historical significance but no architectural significance. Although such application will not have to go before the City Council, the commission and/or applicant will have to go through the National Register process which could be 6 to 9 months before the amendment is made.

Lastly, Mr. Lambert reported he has had a steady amount of permits being processed, and, as part of the Certificate Local Government, he will be receiving his training in Section 106/707 when he visits Springfield for an upcoming matter. He is also busy assisting with several pending tax assessment freeze projects. He shared an update on a prior tax assessment freeze project for Commissioner Zinke.

**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 8:50 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Salomon, seconded by Commissioner Zellmer. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 7-0.