

December 5, 2025

Emily Stood
Preservation Planner
City of Geneva
22 S. First Street
Geneva, IL 60134

Re: 4 East State Street
Stone remnant structure (aka blacksmith shop)
Demolition permit application

Dear Emily:

In accordance with *Ordinance No. 10-6-10: Demolition of Designated Properties*, and as a follow-up to the required pre-application meeting that occurred on September 24, 2025, with a follow-up meeting on October 13, 2025, enclosed you will find the following required forms:

- City of Geneva Demolition Permit Application (Exhibit 1.a)
- Historic Property Demolition Application (Exhibit 1.b)
- Historical Preservation Review Form (Exhibit 1.c)
- One copy of a list containing the name/ mailing address of the Owner(s) of Record & Permanent Index Number (PIN) of all properties w/in 500 ft of the nominated property (Exhibit A)
- One signed and notarized copy of the Affidavit of Accuracy (Exhibit B)

In addition, per the aforesaid ordinance, please see below our responses to the various procedural requirements to the review process outlined in Section 2.A and 2.B.

ITEM: A.2.a.) A legible, dimensioned, and accurate Plat of Survey, prepared and sealed by an Illinois licensed surveyor within the last 12 months of application, indicating location of all improvements proposed for demolition:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.a

ITEM: A.2.b.) Written affidavit of the owners of record of the property acknowledging the proposed demolition when the applicant is not the owner of the property:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.b

ITEM: A.2.c.) Sketch floor plans of all levels of the building or structure proposed to be demolished:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.i

SHODEEN

77 N. First Street
Suite 17
Geneva, Illinois 60134

phone 630.444.0777

www.shodeen.com

ITEM: A.2.d.) Photographs of all existing conditions including all exterior elevations, all significant architectural features (exterior and interior), and all rooms or spaces (exterior and interior) affected by the proposed demolition work:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.d and photos within 2.f – REFERENCE STAFF REPORT

ITEM: A.2.e.) Historic images of the property and general area of proposed work, if any available:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.d

ITEM: A.2.f.) A written chain of title investigation that identifies previous owners of the property upon which demolition is proposed:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.f

ITEM: A.2.g.) A detailed report of non-code compliant elements and structural deficiencies, prepared by an Illinois-registered architect and/or structural engineer with expertise in the rehabilitation of existing and/or historic properties.

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.i

ITEM: A.2.h.) A detailed list of irreparable or deteriorated building features, components, or elements:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.i

ITEM: A.2.i.) A detailed cost estimate for the rehabilitation of the improvement, property, or site, prepared by a design professional or licensed contractor with expertise in the renovation of existing and/or historic properties:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.i

ITEM: A.2.j.) A comparison of the estimated rehabilitation cost of the property proposed for demolition with market values for comparable improvements, properties, or sites within the municipal boundaries:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 2.j.i, 2.j.ii, and 2.j.iii; wherein we provide you with the following items.

ITEM: 2.j.i: A detailed developers proforma dated 9/13/22 that incorporates the cost to rehabilitate the project and calculates the developers Return on Investment (ROI). This detailed proforma illustrates that no developer or lender would participate in this project due to the 0.20% ROI.

2.j.ii: This same proforma calculates the cost per square foot to be in excess of \$1,000 per square foot for this project. We could not find any building within the City of Geneva municipality that has a fair cash value of \$1,000 per square foot. We have provided comparable cash values of the abutting property and neighboring properties. These values are 1/10 the value of the proposed project. Thus, no person or entity would invest in such a project.

12 East State Street	\$96.62 per building square foot
22 Crissey Ave	\$125.89 per building square foot
34 N. Bennett St	\$132.00 per building square foot
102 E. State Street	\$108.00 per building square foot

2.j.iii: This same proforma incorporates a rental rate of \$20 per square foot. In comparison, we provide you with comparable lease rates in neighboring buildings. You will find that the advertised lease rates range from \$9.12 per square foot to \$25.90 per square foot. Thus, the proposed value of \$20 is comparable with the market.

ITEM: A.2.k.) A detailed cost estimate for the restoration of the site per city code in the event that no new construction activity commences following demolition:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 1.d at the end of EXHIBIT 2.i

ITEM: A.2.l.) A summary of potential sites, if any, to which the resources could be relocated within the historic district with an estimated cost of the move to each proposed location, if any, by a qualified building mover:

RESPONSE: Shodeen Construction contacted building movers, Muehlfelt Enterprises, who inspected the structure and advised the undersigned that the structure was not moveable. At one point in time the Geneva resident on East Side Drive that had a vacant lot was interested in the structure. That resident contacted a building mover from Wisconsin who inspected the structure and also determined it was not moveable. The City of Geneva conducted a Charrette process for the subject site, and their architects and engineers determined the structure was not moveable. Therefore, it has been concluded that the building cannot be moved. There are no known sites within the Historic District that the resources could be relocated to.

ITEM: A.2.m.) A proposed schedule for demolition activities:

RESPONSE: 90 DAYS AFTER DEMO PERMIT ISSUANCE

COMMENT: A.2.n.) A completed building permit application and a completed historic preservation review form:

RESPONSE: SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 1.a and EXHIBIT 1.c

ITEM: A.2.o.) Other reasonable information required by city ordinance or that may be requested by city staff:

RESPONSE: None

ITEM: B. *Standards for Demolition Request Review: Per Ordinance 10-6-10. B.4, The Historic Preservation Commission shall make findings related to a demolition request based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case and shall not approve a proposed demolition unless demolition action improves or corrects one (1) or more of the following conditions:*

4. The retention of a building, structure, object, improvement, or site is not in the best interest of the majority of the community.

RESPONSE: Please find the following 17 responses for supporting information as to why the retention of the remnant structure is not in the best interest of the majority of the community:

1. On 12/27/17, approximately 8 years ago, Geneva resident Fred H. Zinke submitted a nomination for Historic Landmark Designation of the entire 4 East State Street property. The request for Historic Landmark determination was considered based on historic significance separate and

apart from condition of assessment, economic feasibility, and/or future uses. The application should be evaluated alongside all factors associated with the structure including condition assessment, economic feasibility, and future uses desired by the community as a whole.

2. City Council Directive to Redevelop the site: On 4/15/19, the City Council passed Resolution 2019-40 approving a tax increment financing agreement between the City and the Shodeen Family Foundation for a planning charrette and entitlement project related to the redevelopment of the former Mill Race Inn property. The Resolution also authorized the City staff to execute a contract with Hitchcock Design Group to facilitate the planning charrette and manage the entitlement process for redevelopment of the property. Thus, the City Council was requesting the site to be redeveloped.
3. Public input to redevelop the site: The planning charrette conducted at City Council directive in 2019, was intended to create community consensus on an acceptable course of action to design for the future retail, lodging, residential and/or mixed-use redevelopment of the property. The charrette was held between June 24, 2019 and June 27, 2019 and at the conclusion of the charrette, the local charrette team recommended a redevelopment strategy that included 116 rental apartments, 8 townhomes, 2,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, 155 covered parking spaces, public riverfront improvements including seasonal commercial space, and deconstruction and reinterpretation of the historic landmark structure. This is what the 3rd party consultant concluded from the public hearings and presentations.
4. City Council reiterates the directive to redevelop the site: In 2019 there were concerns raised regarding the recommended redevelopment strategy by members of the public as well as members of the City Council and it was not clear that consensus had been reached. Therefore, a Resolution was advanced in the hopes of establishing basic development parameters that would allow the project to advance to the entitlement phase to work through the concerns that had been raised. The entitlement phase would allow for further detailed review by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning & Commission, and City Council. On July 15, 2019, the City Council passed Resolution 2019-73 establishing basic development parameters to be used in preparing a redevelopment plan for the Mill Race site. The parameters addressed permitted uses, parking, bulk regulations, public riverfront access from private property, and the historic landmark on the site – specifically that the historic landmark may be deconstructed and reinterpreted in a nearby location that fits with the land use plan. However, as stated in Section 3 of the Resolution, the development parameters were not to be construed as an approval of a demolition permit for historic landmark. All required plans and supporting data required for demolition of the historic landmark as set forth in the City Code were still to be required and reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission. However, the Historic Preservation Commission did not address the condition assessment, economic assessment or the redevelopment goals of the City Council and or the public.
5. City Council changes direction even though Public Hearings indicated otherwise: On November 30, 2020, the City Council considered a redevelopment plan that included 120 apartments, 7 townhomes, 1,720 square feet of commercial space, and reusing the stone from the historic

structure to veneer masonry columns framing pedestrian access to the riverfront. The Resolution to authorize the consultant to proceed with the entitlement process for the proposed redevelopment plan failed by a unanimous vote of the Council. It was not clear as to what direction the City Council wanted to take the redevelopment of the site.

6. City of Geneva taxpayers pay for failed charrette process. As a result of the City Council's denial, the City had to pay the entire cost of the charrette process that was in excess of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

7. **2022 Landmark Boundary Amendment (1 HPC meeting, 1 CC meeting)**
Historic Preservation acknowledges the entire site should not have been landmarked initially. On March 17, 2022, Mr. Patzelt submitted an application to consider the Rescinding of Historic Landmark Designation for the property located at 4 East State Street, Geneva. The submitted application – requesting a boundary amendment, in essence – was reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on April 19, 2022. After deliberation, a motion was made and seconded to “*recommend (to the Geneva City Council) the rescinding of designation for a portion of the subject property per the applicant’s request, subject to staff recommendation*” that included a larger parcel surrounding the historic limestone blacksmith shop than had been requested by the Applicant. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0. The HPC recommendation was brought before the Geneva City Council on May 2, 2022. With the adoption of Ordinance 2022-23, the Council supported the Commission’s recommendation unanimously, 10:0. However, not only was the remnant structure Landmarked, so was the +/- 20 feet of land surrounding the remnant structure. Further, the deliberation of the Historic Preservation Commission did not consider condition assessment, economic assessment or the redevelopment goals of the City Council and or the public.

8. Taxpayers pay thousands in fees on additional demo request:
2022-2023 Demolition Request (7 HPC meetings, 1 CC meeting - \$14,900 cost for 3rd party review)
On October 11, 2022, Mr. Patzelt submitted applications to demolish the historic stone structure and de-designate the property. The demolition request included only the historic stone structure and did not include the remnant concrete foundations of later additions that were not removed from the site in 2016. Pursuant to staff review, modified applications were submitted on November 22, 2022, and on December 8, 2022. A public hearing was held on January 18, 2023, and continued to the following dates: March 14, 2023; April 18, 2023; May 2, 2023; June 20, 2023; and July 18, 2023. On August 15, 2023, the Historic Preservation Commission denied the applications for demolition and de-designation by a unanimous vote of 7:0. On September 7, 2023, the applicant requested the City Council consider an appeal of the determination. The deliberation of the Historic Preservation Commission did not consider condition assessment, economic assessment or the redevelopment goals of the City Council and or the public. On September 7, 2023, the City Council unanimously upheld the Historic Preservation Commission’s determination by a vote of 9:0 and did not comment on or address the redevelopment goals of the property and or the desires of the public at large.

9. Wood roof can't and should not be saved:
2024 Partial Demolition Request (withdrawn)
On April 22, 2024, a representative from Shodeen Construction Company, L.L.C. submitted a permit application to remove the burned and deteriorated wood roof structure and keep the stone walls. The application outlined the condition and the need to remove existing wood roof that has burned, rotted, is collapsing and deteriorated to the top of the stone walls and remove temporary wood framed walls, and cover top of stone wall with secured tarpaulin. Application was withdrawn on July 16, 2024.

10. Identified as Opportunity Site 6 in the Downtown Station Area Master Plan:
The Downtown/Station area Master Plan is intended to guide the direction of change and growth in Downtown Geneva over the next 10-15 years. The vision for this plan includes goals with supporting objectives to lead the City of Geneva in a direction of implementation. The vision, goals, and objectives are based heavily on community input received in early stages of the planning process. Together, the Vision Statement and Goals and Objectives present a framework for future policy decisions and actions. Opportunity Site 6 (southwest corner of State and Bennet) illustrates a goal and desire for a newly redeveloped structure with new retail. The redevelopment concept keeps the banquet and restaurant use and provides a layout that makes better use of the river frontage with parking that could support the addition of a lodge or boutique hotel with outdoor dining along the river. New retail development is also shown on the corner. This concept would allow for the development at the corner to serve as an attractive "gateway" into downtown Geneva. The concept did not include the preservation of any existing structures. These goals and objectives were supported by the public hearings and public comments.

11. Downtown Station-Area Master Plan proposed structures:
This 80-page document summarizes the conclusions found in numerous interviews and meetings and factors considered when selecting sites including underutilized buildings or land, vacant buildings or land, structural soundness of buildings, obsolescence, size of property, unified ownership or opportunity to assemble parcels, location, visibility, access, market potential. The Mill Race site was shown as having new structures to be provided. The plan did not reflect a stone remnant structure.

12. Downtown Station-Area Master Plan Historic Preservation: Some buildings identified for preservation due to designation or some distinctive qualities desired by the community to remain. The stone remnant structure was not one of them.

13. Geneva Fox River Tax Increment Financing District:
TIF No 3 consists of 84 tax parcels and 49 buildings located east and west of the Fox River. TIF No. 3 primarily includes commercial and multi-family residential properties and public open space along the river. The redevelopment project area includes opportunity sites that are included in the Downtown Station Area Master Plan. This TIF district intends to provide the mechanisms necessary to support public and private development, strengthen the Fox River area

as a neighborhood- level commercial and residential district and improve connections to downtown and to the Fox River.

The Goals include:

- A. Facilitate redevelopment of vacant or underutilized properties by providing resources for site assembly and preparation, including demolition and environmental cleanup, where necessary, and marketing of vacant and underutilized sites for redevelopment and new development. The Mill Race building and former bike shop were 2 structures photographed as examples of this.
- B. Facilitate the rehabilitation of existing properties within the RPA, as well as the possible preservation of architecturally or historically significant buildings, and encourage the construction of new commercial, residential, civic/cultural and park/open space development that is compatible with the existing character of the area where appropriate. The stone remnant structure was not identified for rehabilitation.
- C. Provide resources for streetscaping, landscaping, and a coordinated package of identification, special events and wayfinding monument signage to improve the image, attractiveness and accessibility of the RPA; create a cohesive identity for the RPA and surrounding area; strengthen connections between the RPA, downtown and the Fox River; and provide, where appropriate, for buffering between different land uses and screening of unattractive service facilities, such as parking lots and loading areas. The existing stone structure does not fit or provide this. Thus, it should be removed.
- D. Support the goals and objectives of other overlapping plans, including, but not limited to the City's Comprehensive Plan and Downtown Station Area Master Plan; and coordinate available federal, state and local resources to further the goals of this Redevelopment Plan and Project

The stone remnant structure stands in the way of these Goals that are supported by the City Council and the public testimony at the hearings establishing these goals.

Strategies from the Fox River TIF District Plan:

- i. Redevelop Vacant and Underutilized Sites. The redevelopment of vacant and underutilized properties within the RPA is expected to stimulate private investment and increase the overall taxable value of properties within the RPA. Development of vacant and/or underutilized sites, including parking lots, is anticipated to have a positive impact on other properties beyond the individual project sites. This demolition will assist the strategy.
- ii. Facilitate Property Assembly, Demolition and Site Preparation. Sites may be acquired and assembled for use by the city to attract future private investment and development. The consolidated ownership of the stone structure site with the neighboring parcel will make it easier to market to potential developers and will streamline the redevelopment process.
- iii. Encourage Private Sector Activities. Through the creation and support of public-private partnerships or through written agreements, the City may provide financial and other assistance to encourage the private sector, including local property owners and businesses, to undertake redevelopment and new construction projects, and

other improvements that are consistent with the goals of this Redevelopment Plan and Project.

The stone remnant structure stands in the way of these Goals that are supported by the City Council and the public testimony at the hearings establishing these goals.

14. No Positive impacts have been accomplished in the 8 years, 20 public meetings, and the \$288,000 spent by the city taxpayers. This does not include the countless staff hours, and legal fees expended. The money spent is not in the best interest of the taxpayers who have paid these funds.
15. Residents are talking and speaking out:
 - A. On October 6th at the City of Geneva City Council & Committee of the Whole meeting, Geneva resident of 34 years, Debbie Kanarowski spoke passionately about her and her neighbors who are frustrated and dissatisfied with how long this has gone on and all the money being spent on attorney's fees and how this money being spent can be utilized on other things that need to be addressed.
She represents the common voice of residents throughout Geneva that want property redeveloped, that is attractive and generates revenues for the City.
 - B. The property owner has received comments from numerous residents in person, in phone calls, in emails and written letters.
 - i. The attached letter (Exhibit L) from Geneva resident Joel Erickson to Emily Stood, Preservation Planner, is an example of those who want something done. Simply put, Joel states "...I support the property owners' efforts to obtain a demolition permit for the former blacksmith shop".
 - ii. In the attached letter (Exhibit M) from 60-year Geneva resident David Rogers to Alderman William Malecki, he states his hopes for the "*long overdue development of the site*"..."*Geneva needs quality high density housing in the downtown area and has three prime sites that have been empty eyesores for far too long*".

Based on these numerous factors, we believe that the Historic Preservation Commission should evaluate the demolition permit application based on the City ordinance that reads:

B. Standards for Demolition Request Review: Per Ordinance 10-6-10.B.4, The Historic Preservation Commission shall make findings related to a demolition request based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case and shall not approve a proposed demolition unless demolition action improves or corrects one (1) or more of the following conditions:

4. The retention of a building, structure, object, improvement, or site is not in the best interest of the majority of the community.

We look forward to the issuance of the demolition permit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "David A. Patzelt". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "David" being the most prominent part.

David A. Patzelt
President

Enclosures
Cc: DAP/mal