

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

City of Geneva
109 James Street - City Council Chambers
January 18, 2023

Call to Order

Chairman Zellmer called to order January 18, 2023, meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:01 pm.

1. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Zellmer, and Commissioners Hartman, Salomon, Zinke, McManus

Absent: Commissioners Jensen and Stazin

Quorum present.

Staff Present:

Michael A. Lambert - Preservation Planner

Matt Buesing - Assistant Planner

Others Present:

David DeGroot - Director of Community Development

Ron Sandack – City Attorney

Kristin Sabatino - Recording Secretary

Theresa A. Vorkapik (Planet Depos) - Court Reporter

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Minutes of 12/20/22:

Motion by Commissioner Mc Manus to approve the minutes as presented. Second by Commissioner Hartman. A voice vote followed, and the motion passed: (3-0). Commissioners Salomon and Zinke abstained.

3. Public Hearing

3A. 4 East State Street CASE 2022-079 & 2022-080

Applicant: David A. Patzelt, Authorized Representative

Shodeen Family Foundation

Application for: Demolition of a Historic Landmark and

De-designation of the Property

Commissioner Zinke recused herself.

Chairman Zellmer noted the agenda includes three other applications; therefore, all commissioners agreed that the public hearing would not go past 8:30 pm.

Motion by Commissioner- Salomon to open the public hearing. Second, by Commissioner Hartman. Motion passed by a unanimous, voice vote of 4-0.

Michael Lambert, Preservation Planner, provided background information about the case; followed by David A. Patzelt, representative for the applicant, who provided lengthy testimony regarding items he perceived to be considered inappropriately by City staff. Testimony was provided by Alan Leahigh, John McCormick, Kendra Parsons (Director of Advocacy for Landmarks Illinois), Al Watts (Preservation Partners of the Fox Valley), Marty O'Connor, and Dave Armbrust before the hearing was continued.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to continue the public hearing to March 14, 2023 to allow staff time to seek an independent analysis of the submitted pro forma provided by the applicant. Seconded by Commissioner Hartman. Motion passed by a unanimous, voice vote: 4-0.

5 min recess

Chairman Zellmer called the meeting to order again at 8:41. Commissioner Zinke returned to City Council Chambers.

4. Review of Building Permit Applications (Certificate of Appropriateness)

4A. 414 South River Lane CASE 2022-056

Applicant: Matthew McKnight, Owner
Sean Gallagher – Gallagher Associates, Architect

Application for: Additions and Renovations at a Contributing property.

Preservation Planner Lambert presented a brief overview of the subject property's history and proposed work, which includes extensive additions presented to the Commission as a Concept Review in August of 2022, which included four concept elevations for the River Lane facade of the historic residence. The site plans were reviewed, noting the yellow highlighted areas are portions of the original residence that will be retained. Concept A was the elevation the Commission favored on August 16, 2022. The elevations and plans submitted for review on January 18, 2023 are substantially consistent with the elevations and plans presented at the Concept Review. Plans show the yellow-highlighted historic residence that will be maintained. The applicant proposes adding a front vestibule and additions to the north and south; the proposed south addition closely replicates the original footprint of the historic one-story

being removed. The commission will not review the addition in the rear of the property. The second-floor concept from August and January were presented to compare, noting some minor differences and allowing the applicants to explain differences.

Sean Gallagher and Matthew McKnight introduced themselves and presented an overview of the projects as it has evolved since August. They reviewed the request by Commissioner Zinke to review the windows above the kitchen, a second-story bedroom. The previous version was a pair of casements. They consolidated that into a smaller unit making the shed dormer smaller and ensuring that the window met size standards. In the prior meeting, Commissioner Stazin mentioned the possibility of framing the original house. In the previous proposal, they had board and batten on the left side of the elevation on the ride side was horizontal lap siding. The siding has been changed to board and batten per Commissioner Stazin's recommendation. The updates address the primary components that the Commissioners ask to be considered to modify and revisit. Added a fence to the concept. Preservation Planner Lambert confirmed that the Commission wouldn't review fences that staff would review. Mr. Gallagher explained as you view the front elevation, the piece on the north is all board and batten vertical siding (not horizontal siding as shown on the overhead screens). The window above the kitchen is a single casement with a smaller shed dormer above it reduced to a smaller dimension. Mr. Gallagher brought a sample of a garage door panel to review the profile of the door. The intention is to have a solid color beaded recessed panel. The door style is the same as the concept, with glass lights in a horizontal row.

Clarifying that the onscreen elevation was the August conceptual elevation, Preservation Planner Lambert stated that the correct front elevation was included in the packet provided to Commissioners.

Chairman Zellmer commented that the window above the kitchen was still large Mr. Gallagher confirmed the size was necessary for light, vent, and egress. Chairman Zellmer asked if the window was a casement, and Mr. Gallagher confirmed. Chairman Zellmer asked if the window above the garage is also an egress window. Mr. Gallagher confirmed and noted that on the southside, all awing units. Chairman Zellmer asked if Mr. Gallagher had a 3D version of the proposal. Mr. Gallagher confirmed that he did not.

Commissioner McManus noted that when it comes to additions, they are looking for the ability to recognize the original structure. Commissioner McManus also noted that the addition is very large. Mr. Gallagher responded that this site allows a structure is 35 feet, and the ridge of this is 22 foot 7". He matched the ridge height to the piece over the garage and stepped down as the link between the original house and the addition above the garage.

Commissioner Zinke questioned the offset between the front wall of the historic house and those of the north and south additions. Mr. Gallagher responded that the north addition is 6 ft 4 in back. The addition to the south is about 5 ½ feet at the kitchen peak, and the garage steps forward about one foot. Commissioner Zinke asked when walking/driving by if it is possible to understand what portion of the original house, and Mr. Gallagher confirmed.

Chairman Zellmer asked if the windows on the north and south sides mirror each other. Mr. Gallagher confirmed that they lined up with each other. Chairman Zellmer questioned the size of the master bedroom windows. Commissioner Zinke suggested if

the windows above the garage door did not have shutters on either side, it might make the window look smaller.

Chairman Zellmer asked if the shutters were in the purview of the Commission. Preservation Planner Lambert confirmed that shutters do not require a permit; however, the entire concept is being requested for approval (Certificate of Appropriateness). He suggested that the Commissioners look at all elements and how they fit together.

Commissioner Hartman asked Mr. Gallagher if the window could be made smaller and still meet the requirements. Mr. Gallagher could not answer that without further review.

Preservation Planner Lambert asked Mr. Gallagher if the egress window could be on the south side of the house. Mr. Gallagher responded that the roof line would need to be cut into in order to do that. Mr. McKnight noted that it could be an eye sore since it's viewable from the street.

Chairman Zellmer asked if the awnings were all across the south side. Mr. Gallagher confirmed that this is correct.

Commissioner Hartman commented that he likes the balance that allows the original house to be seen.

Commissioner McManus noted that she doesn't have an issue with the window.

Motion by Commissioner Hartman to approve the submission of the proposal for additions and renovations of 414 South River Lane be approved as submitted. Seconded by Commissioner Salomon. Motion passes by a unanimous, voice vote: 5-0.

4B. 317 West State Street CASE 2023-001

Applicant: Ferguson Glass, LLC, Contractor

Application for: Installation of a New Storefront System at a Significant property.

Assistant Planner Matt Buesing presented a brief overview of the property history, dates, and details of the prior remodel in 1947, and the proposed work, including installing a new storefront system. He noted the deterioration and existing condition at the property, specifically the window sill.

Applicants Nicole Ferguson, owner of Ferguson Glass, and brother Tim Ferguson (lead installer). Ms. Ferguson is presenting on behalf of Murray Properties, owner of the property, and tenant. Ms. Ferguson outlined the proposal to replace the existing storefront to manage heat control and freshen up the storefront to match adjacent storefronts. Ms. Ferguson proposes installing a product from Pittco Architectural Metals of Elk Grove Village. The product that will be installed is the aluminum TMS 114 T System, dark bronze anodized finish, with Low-E glass to reduce heat and cool air loss. The storefront entry door will not be changed to keep the historic look. Ms. Ferguson believes the storefront is deteriorating and in disrepair, and this change would refresh the storefront's appearance and allow for customers' comfort.

Chairman Zellmer noted that the pictures appear to have a 2-inch profile and match the adjacent storefront. He asked if this is a standard box storefront system that doesn't have a profile relief. Tim Ferguson confirmed that a shim space is included, allowing for expansion. Chairman Zellmer asked if this would match the other tenants' storefronts. Mr. Ferguson confirmed that and added the owner would like to keep the door and sidelight to match the historical look.

Preservation Planner Lambert noted that the door and sidelight were installed in 1947 as a unit. He stated that the 1947 remodel also altered the storefront by providing the recessed entry and new stone bulkhead (which differs from other storefronts at the former theater building).

Commissioner Zinke asked why the applicants were not replacing the door and the glass to the left of the door. Mr. Ferguson replied that the owner wanted to keep the historical look of the property. Commissioner Zinke asked about the color of the glass. Mr. Ferguson replied that the glass utilizes a clear, Low E coating/film that has a slight tint that would harmonize with the glass to the left of the door.

Chairman Zellmer asked if the 315 property has the original storefront. Preservation Planner Lambert confirmed that it did and it was the only surviving, original storefront at the building.

Motion by Commissioner McManus to approve the installation of the new storefront system at 317 West State Street as proposed. Seconded by Commissioner Hartman. Motion passed by a unanimous, voice vote: 5-0.

4C. 120 North Second Street CASE 2023-002

Applicant: Victor & Natalie Barron, Owners
Aman Singh – A+ Home Improvement Co., Contractor

Application for: Removal of Historic Material and Replacement with Alternative Material at a Significant Property

The applicant was not present.

Preservation Planner Lambert stated that, per policy, the Commission does not hear a case without a representative present. He stated it's up to the Commission to deliberate the case without representation or postpone until a representative is available.

Commissioner Zinke would like the applicant to be present, and Commissioner Salomon suggested that there are many moving parts to discuss, including different materials. Chairman Zellmer agreed and asked Preservation Planner Lambert to confirm how many estimates were provided by the applicant. Preservation Planner Lambert stated that they received two estimates: the asphalt shingle option and the wood shingle option. Information can be found on page 5 of the Commissioners' packet.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to table the case regarding the proposal for 120 North Second Street until the February meeting. Seconded by Commissioner McManus. Motion passed by a unanimous, voice vote: 5-0.

5. Secretary's Report (Staff Updates)

Preservation Planner Lambert hoped all Commissioners received a notice about the Landmarks Illinois Suburban Preservation Alliance meeting this Saturday. The Suburban Preservation Alliance is an informal group that Landmarks Illinois sponsors. They sponsor about four meetings a year. A zoom meeting will be held Saturday, January 21, from 9:00-11:00 am. He has been invited and will participate in at least one of the sessions sponsored by the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office. The IL-SHPO strategic plan will guide the state agency through the next decade. In-person meetings are scheduled in Bloomington and Chicago. If any Commissioners are interested in participating in either opportunity, please contact Preservation Planner Lambert to register.

Chairman Zellmer asked for an update on the in-progress, intensive-level survey; survey coming in for commissioners. Preservation Planner Lambert confirmed that it is moving forward.

6. New Business

A. From the Commission:

Commissioner Salomon is looking forward to the next 5 Minute Field Guide. Preservation Planner Lambert will report in February.

B. From the Public:

Al Watts from Preservation Partners stated that if Preservation Planner Lambert wants to reach out to him or Kendra Parzen (Landmarks Illinois), they may be able to find an appropriate, independent, professional firm to provide an analysis of the *pro forma* statement submitted for agenda item 3A (HPC Case 2022-079).

7. Adjournment

At 9:35 pm., Commissioner Salomon made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Commissioner McManus. Motion passed by a unanimous, voice vote: 5-0.