

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

January 20, 2021

1. Call to Order

Chairman Zellmer called to order the January 20, 2021 remote meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:00 p.m. and read a statement regarding the electronic meeting and its protocol.

2. Roll Call

Present HPC: Chairman Zellmer; Commissioners Hartman*, McManus*, Salomon*, Stazin*, Warner*, Zinke*

Absent: None

Staff Present: Preservation Planner Michael Lambert, City Planner Chayton True

Others Present: Sean Gallagher* with Gallagher Associates Architects; Applicant Ben Hinds* with BGH Construction; Applicant Nancy Lorenz*

(*remote)

3. Approval of November 17, 2020 Minutes

Minutes of November 17, 2020 – **Motion by Commissioner Salomon to approve the minutes. Second by Commissioner Warner. Roll call:**

Aye: Hartman, McManus, Salomon, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7-0

4. Review of Building Permit Applications

A. 406 South River Lane (Case No. 2020-064). Applicant: Brian Hogan with Hogan Design + Construction – Developer/Contractor; Sean Gallagher with Gallagher Associates Architects. Application for Change of Approved Siding Materials and Details. Mr. Lambert located the property within the appropriate historic districts. The proposed project was previously reviewed by the HPC on March 18, 2020 for new construction, which was approved unanimously by the commission. The applicant, however, was now asking for approval of a modification to exterior materials due to the rising costs of materials. The majority of the stucco finish on the building facing the public street will be retained; however, the applicant is seeking approval of composite lap siding for portions of the north and south side walls, second floor dormers, west rear wall and the entire exterior of the attached garage. Mr. Lambert provide elevations of the house with the previously-approved materials (in March 2018) as compared to the materials being proposed. Again, the entire garage would have composite clapboard siding with the stucco removed. In one or two locations the coved bracket detail at the eave would be eliminated at the rear elevation and detached garage.

Mr. Sean Gallagher, the architect for the project, summarized that materials prices have not decreased and so adjustments were being made. Other than the cladding, the changes to the front façade included changes in the shed dormers and with staff's help a solution was found on how to terminate the siding into the project elements. Mr. Gallagher described in more detail the changes that were to occur. Because the house at 402 (River Lane) had beaded siding, the proposed home would have beaded siding at the base but no beading on the dormer piece. The siding in the dormers would be standard lap siding.

Commissioner Zinke believed that switching from stucco to lap siding added another design element which could be alleviated if the color was similar. She believed the design would be more homogenous if the lap siding and stucco were the same color. Mr. Gallagher believed that was the intent of the applicant – to use more earth tones – and to keep it a similar tone as the stucco.

Commissioner Stazin referenced that the project was described as Tudor Revival-inspired and asked whether there was another home in the district reflecting a similar material combination. Mr. Gallagher could not recall a specific home but said it was common to see sided dormers. In fact, very little stucco period architecture existed in the historic district. Mr. Lambert added that some examples of mixed material could be found on a Tudor-revival home located on Second Street which included brick and siding, as well as at 122 Campbell Street (Craftsman) with stucco and weatherboard at the base of the building.

Commissioner Stazin inquired whether there were concerns on how the homes would play off of each other given the changes were budget-driven rather than aesthetically-chosen, wherein Mr. Lambert shared a discussion he had with Mr. Brian Hogan on this matter, noting that the three homes did not have the broad yard seen 60 years ago and because the way the homes sat in close proximity with each other, someone would not see the rear façade in clapboard. Also, having dormers with a different material existed in this style of Tudor. In speaking with Mr. Hogan, the goal was to have the same stucco appearance from the street.

Commissioner Hartman, being in the business, indicated that the proposed modifications looked normal and most of the dormers he saw or worked on were done in siding. Chairman Zellmer supported the proposal and entertained a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Zinke to approve the proposed exterior material changes for 406 S. River Lane, as presented. Second by Commissioner Salomon. Roll call:

Aye: Hartman, McManus, Salomon, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7-0

B. 621 South Street (Case No. 2020-091). Applicant: Ben Hinds/BGH Construction-Contractor; Mike and Lynn Fehr, Owners. Application for Rear Porch Addition on Contributing Property, Visible from Front Yard. Preservation Planner Lambert located the property within the historic districts of the City and discussed the historical background of the home and its relocations over the years. He stated the property was renovated many times. In 2004, it was remodeled significantly. In July 2016, the Fehrs (owners of the home) came before the HPC requesting window, door, and railing modifications, but, according to the City's zoning regulations, the narrow side of the lot was considered the front yard. Therefore, the proposed open air porch was in the front yard and subject to HPC review. Plans and inspirational images for the proposed open porch were depicted. The new porch would attach to the 2004 garage addition and not to the historic home. Elevations of the project followed. Materials for the fireplace included a stone product with true cedar wood (smooth finish) to match the house. The outdoor porch was in character with the 2004 addition.

Mr. Ben Hinds, contractor, discussed that the owners removed the prior rotting pergola and decided to maximize their outdoor space. Due to the unique zoning, it was determined to attach the structure. All finishes, trim, soffit and fascia would be uniform with the existing house.

Commissioner Stazin asked whether the stone being proposed for the fireplace was located on any portion of the property or on any of the elevations. Mr. Lambert recalled the chimney was brick. However, Mr. Lambert explained that the commission normally encouraged materials that identify during their own time period and because the (proposed) element stood alone, it did not adversely impact any part of the historic building. Commissioner Stazin voiced concern about the stone material, the massing, and the size of the feature, but because he did not see the stone on the front or side elevations it was introducing a sizeable and recognizable element. Yet, if it was located toward the back, maybe it would not be as noticeable.

Mr. Hinds indicated the feature could be regarded as a landscaping feature since when viewing the property from Seventh Street, natural stone pillars were on the property and the proposed stone would be in similar character as the existing natural landscaping, clarifying the intent for the fireplace was to have natural stone/limestone.

Per Commissioner Zinke's question, Planner Chayton True explained that the reason the porch had to be attached to the garage was due to it being a permitted element by right within the zoning district and by allowing that, the applicant would not have to seek a variation. Per other commissioner questions, the fireplace would be a direct vent fireplace.

Hearing no further questions, the Chairman entertained a motion. **Motion made by Commissioner McManus to approve the rear front porch, as presented. Second by Commissioner Hartman. Roll call:**

Aye: Hartman, McManus, Salomon, Stazin, Warner, Zinke, Zellmer
Nay: None **MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7-0**

C. 615 James Street (Case No. 2020-092). Applicant: Mike Schmidt with Schmidt Exteriors, Contractor; Nancy Lorenz, Owner. Application for Replacement of Front Door at a Contributing Property. Preservation Planner Lambert located the property within the City's historic districts. The project was before the HPC in October for a door and windows request. The current request was to replace the existing wooden door with a fiberglass, two-paneled door with three top window lights. Mr. Lambert referenced a similar door that would have been used during the early 20th Century as builder packages. In his discussions with the contractor, the owner wanted to keep the new door streamlined and one that would work with the clean lines of the house. The door element was easily reversible.

Owner, Ms. Nancy Lorenz, summarized her proposal was to replace the door with a fiberglass door. She assumed the current wooden door was the original door.

Commissioner Warner referenced Page 33 of the agenda packet, noting the request was to change the door style from No. 31 to No. 351, which looked similar to the one she had. He questioned why Ms. Lorenz wanted to change it, wherein Ms. Lorenz stated she wanted more light in the house and for it to be more energy efficient with updated hardware. Commissioner Warner, however, discussed that the existing door was historic, and while he was not sure how the commission dealt with doors prior, he said the door was easily changeable.

Historic Planner Lambert proceeded to explain how the commission dealt with doors in the past, noting the commission had requested certain character-defining doors to be restored, or, to

consider whether a door was a reversible alteration. The struggle, he explained, was that post-World War II housing was in an era where items were mass produced and builder stock was what was available. In reviewing the proposal, Mr. Lambert pointed out that the original door was hidden by a storm door and he had no real opinion to offer the commissioners regarding the door replacement.

While Commissioner Zinke liked the windows that were replaced, she felt the proposed style of the door was early 1900s and did not fit the style of the home. She suggested a door style with a wooden bottom but with more glass above the handle. However, Ms. Lorenz stated the matter was a privacy issue and the house was very small.

Chairman Zellmer agreed the door was reversible and the home was a builder-grade style home with the existing Colonial door easily available at that time. He entertained a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Salomon to approve the front door replacement, as presented. Second by Commissioner Hartman. Roll call:

Aye: Hartman, McManus, Stazin, Solomon, Zinke, Zellmer

Nay: Warner

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-1

6. Secretary's Report

Mr. Lambert mentioned he was working on the historic district's survey and would contact the commissioners about holding a second meeting in the future to review the updated information.

7. 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 8:10 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Stazin. Second by Commissioner Salomon. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 7-0.