

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

**August 18, 2020**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Zellmer called to order the August 18, 2020 meeting of the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Present HPC: Chairman Zellmer; Commissioners Hamilton, Salomon, Stazin

Absent: Commissioners Warner, Zinke

Staff Present: Preservation Planner Michael Lambert

Others Present: Applicants Emily and Bob Rogers, 312 S. Fifth St., Geneva; Gregory Jones with Renewal by Anderson, 33 E. Moseley Rd., Palatine; Applicant Kevin Burg, 415 Peyton St., Geneva

Chairman Zellmer announced that protective masks were not present due to being spaced six feet apart.

**3. Approval of July 21, 2020 Minutes**

Minutes of July 21, 2020 – Motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Hamilton to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed by voice vote of 3-0. (Commissioner Stazin abstains).

**4. Five Minute Field Guide**

Geneva Modern Kitchens – Preservation Planner Lambert discussed the historical background of some of the Fox Valley companies that produced Mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century steel cabinetry found in many residential kitchens and bathrooms in Geneva, specifically Elgin Steel Cabinetry in Elgin, the Modern Steel Equipment Company in Geneva, and St. Charles Kitchens by the St. Charles Manufacturing Company, to name a few. Homeowners still seek such cabinetry for the their Mid-Century Modern homes.

**5. Review of Building Permit Applications**

A. 312 S. Fifth Street (Case No. 2020-053). Applicant: Bob and Emily Rogers, Owners; Contractor Gregory Jones with Renewal by Anderson. Application for installation of a new front door to replace a non-historic front door at a Significant Property. Mr. Lambert located the home on the overhead map and explained the application is for a new front door. The property is significant for its architecture. The home has been restored and a previous two-story front porch on the home was removed at some point and replaced with a front stoop with railings. No historic photographs of the porch exist. Per Lambert, the owner wishes to replace the front door that is not original to the home with an embossed six-panel, weather-proof fiberglass door and painted to match the existing door. The commission previously approved such doors in the past.

Renewal by Anderson contractor, Mr. Gregory Jones, explained that his understanding was the current door was not historical to the home and the door was not repairable. He was not removing the transom nor the outside trim work. Painters would paint the door after installation. Because the current hardware is very old it will be replaced with newer hardware. A new threshold is planned. Mr. Jones provided an example of the proposed door, noting there will be no wood grain.

Commissioner Hamilton inquired as to why the door was being replaced, wherein Mr. Jones indicated it was due to wear and tear, the wood expanded and contracted over the years so it was not energy efficient, and the current threshold was rotted. Commissioner Stazin pointed out the size difference in the panels of both the current door and the proposed door and asked if other commissioners were concerned about the panels as well, given the door was 50 years old or older. Mr. Jones explained that the proposed door had the most consistent panel features to replicate the existing door and, in addition, he understood that this was the second time the door was being replaced. He was trying to keep the same pattern, scheme, and color of the door.

Mr. Lambert explained that the home was remodeled by the second owner in 1905 and two more owners followed after that. He did not have much historical information on the home. However, he posed the question to the commissioners whether the doorway itself gained significance on its own, pointing out that the period of when the door was replaced was during a modernization of the home after 1945 and not so much as an architectural statement or trend. He also pointed out the details of the doorway were not consistent with the original architecture or the style of the home.

Further dialog followed that a screen door existed and would be replaced thereby questioning whether one would really be able to see the panel configuration. Commissioner Hamilton pointed out the door was replaced between 1945 and 1955 which was the period of significance and asked his fellow commissioners whether they should consider the door as a historic element by itself and not be replaced but refurbished. Commissioner Salomon pointed out the door was not original and it was being replaced with another six-panel door with better weather sealing features. A person would notice the trim around the door before noticing the door itself. Salomon was fine with what was being proposed.

Historic Planner Lambert added that it may have been a matter of function to replace the door while a powder room was being added years ago and now it was a question of whether the existing door was worthy of a period of development or tied to a significant event or person associated with the remodeling. He did not believe so. Chairman Zellmer also conveyed the proposal was not a concern since the door had been replaced prior.

**Motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Stazin to approve the door replacement for 312 S. Fifth Street, as presented. Roll call:**

**Aye: Hamilton, Salomon, Stazin, Zellmer**

**Nay: None**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

B. 415 Peyton Street (Case No. 2020-054). Applicant: Kevin and Holly Burg, Owners: Home Work of Batavia, Inc., Contractor. Application for replacement in-kind of wood T&G decking at front and side porches accessory building at a Significant Property. Preservation Planner Michael Lambert located the property on the overhead and explained the proposal was a permit review to replace the porch decking in-kind and, according to the permit review matrix, the

proposal was before the commission due to having a front and side view of the home. Existing conditions of the wooden porch and side porch were depicted.

Applicant, Mr. Burg, confirmed the wooden porch boards were being replaced in-kind with the same shaped boards, same color paint -- because the current ones were splitting and warping after 15 years. He was the second owner since the home's addition.

Commissioners agreed the case was straight forward.

**Motion by Commissioner Hamilton, second by Commissioner Salomon to approve the porch replacement (in-kind) for 415 Peyton Street, as presented.**

**Aye: Hamilton, Salomon, Stazin, Zellmer**  
**Nay: None**

**MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 4-0**

## **6. Secretary's Report**

Mr. Lambert recalled that last month the Changs were requesting to replace the siding and fascia on their garage with LP Smartside trim, which was approved. A request had now come from the Changs to replace the LP Smartside with Hardiplank fiber cement, which had also been approved in the historic district prior. Per Lambert, the issue was that Hardiplank did not come in an 8" inch exposure which the commission approved to match the exposure on the house; it had a 6" inch exposure. (Same color and same trim details would be used.) Mr. Lambert explained the Changs were using a new contractor who wanted to use Hardiplank.

Commissioners discussed and agreed the home would look different and were not comfortable changing the material. Commissioner Stazin, who relayed he was not present at the last meeting, considered what was being proposed, and agreed with his fellow commissioners. Commissioners agreed that the motion from last month would stand as approved.

## **7. New Business**

A. From the Commission: Per Hamilton's question, Mr. Lambert provided a brief update on the former Mill Race Inn property.

B. From the Public: None

## **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Historic Preservation Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Salomon, second by Commissioner Stazin. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 4-0.