

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION

### MINUTES

January 16, 2018

#### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Scott Winter at 4:07 PM.

Roll call was taken: Present: Nancy McDonald, Scott Winter, Jeannie Brinkmeier, Katie Ludwig, Christopher Fye

A Quorum was established with five members being present.

#### **Also Present**

Lucretia with Security First, Rhonda Scott

#### **Review and Approval of the meeting Agenda**

Nancy McDonald asked if the agenda approval needed to be included. Scott Winter stated that the by-laws would need to be reviewed. Jeannie Brinkmeier made a motion to approve the meeting agenda, Motion seconded by Katie Ludwig. Motion carried

#### **Public Comments and Communication**

Nancy McDonald stated that no one had signed in nor did she have any communications prior to the meeting regarding specific applications.

#### **Facade Grant Application Review**

Nancy presented the applicants as follows:

- SFTC Land Holdings, LLC - Replace Front Windows; 4 large tempered bronze insulated glass store front windows  
Request for 5,000, estimate is 10,000  
Work has not been performed  
Location would be the Security First building, 205 W. Stephenson St.  
Building was built in the 1970's  
North façade

Christopher Fye asked if the glass or framing of the windows is what is being replaced and if they would fit the exact opening. Lucretia responded positively to the windows fitting the opening and stated the seals on the windows are bad, causing moisture inside. She stated that they wish to replace the windows "as they are", with no changes.

Christopher confirmed the framing would stay intact and that just the glazing would be replaced. Lucretia stated that this was correct. Christopher asked if the windows were single or double glazed, to which Lucretia did not know.

Lucretia added that they recently had the building behind 205 W. Stephenson taken down and wish to have it bricked, but that work was not put into the application.

Scott asked for clarification that the windows in question were on the Stephenson St. side of the building. Lucretia confirmed that they were.

Nancy reviewed the scoring criteria. –

- 10pts for a complete application based on the application check list.
- Up to 10pts -Preference points for historic property.
- 10pts - active business on the first floor
- 10pts - active use of second floor
- Up to 10pts – does project include a major façade improvement beyond painting
- Up to 50pts – conforms to the design guides and interior rehabilitation standards

Scott asked about the points for active use of second floor and if there was a guideline for buildings without a second floor. Nancy suggested allowing the full 10pts as not to penalize for not having a second floor or using 90pt instead of the full 100pt possible. Katie Ludwig did not agree with allowing the full 10pts for non -second floor building and then not giving the full 10pt to a building that does. Jeannie Brinkmeier suggested scoring on a 90 and then use a percentage. That process was agreed to, meaning the active second floor criteria would be eliminated for buildings with a single floor.

Katie asked if there was any clarification on if the project was window only would that be considered a maintenance issue versus renovation. Nancy stated that this was up to the commission to make that determination and should be discussed the next meeting for the next application process.

Scott asked if anyone had any further question for Lucretia. Chris about scoring based on if a building contributed to the Downtown Historic District. Nancy stated that each commission member is scoring on their own expertise, what one thinks is a Historic contribution may be different from someone else. Chris stated there was some criteria that showed what established the District, but was unable to recall what criteria was used. Nancy stated that with the absence of that information the Commission should do their best at scoring. Chris stated that the building built in the 70's would not be Historic since it was only 47yrs old and the criteria is 50yrs to fit the Historic definition.

Scott added that he scored all the buildings 10pts since there was no other objective criteria, since there is no way to know if it is contributing or not.

- Amanda Scott/Rhonda Scott – 15 N Chicago – work has been completed  
Exterior of building – painting, scraping, caulk, one coat of primer, one coat of finish. Included soffits, fascia and freeze board. Brick and trim around the windows = \$9850

\$900 – two locations on West soffit that needed to be replaced,  
crown trim

\$100 – power wash brick front

\$400 - Sand, prime and repair glazing of paint

\$100 – (inaudible) Lift

\$100 - repair mortar and downspout

\$150 - Paint underside of awning and coats

---

Total – \$11,600

Materials – Awning – \$2200

Two corbels- \$74436

Grand Total - \$7272.18 - projected cost – \$16,500.

It was mentioned that the “72” was the amount of reimbursement making the projected cost \$14,544.36.

Rhoda stated the reason she changed the estimate she had not included the \$400 cost of removing and replacing the awning. She stated that she did not initially know this work was needed.

Nancy clarified that the total was 7672. With a request of 8250 to be reimbursed.

Christopher asked if it is OK to submit after the work has been completed. Nancy stated that it was not excluded by this application. Rhonda stated the reason the work is complete is because when she originally applied for the grant in 2015, she was told there was no money, so she proceeded with the work. When she found out there was money now, she reapplied.

Katie asked about the loft renovation. Rhoda stated that was work that she wants to do, but the other work had to be done first. Katie asked what the plans were for this space. Rhoda stated that the area is approx. 3000 sq/ft and was a radio station. It is big open area with minimal walls. Rhonda stated she does not want to add any walls, just want to clean up the area and make it usable. Katie asked what she wanted to use the area for and suggested an apartment. Rhoda responded yes.

Rhonda stated that 1/3 of that area is currently being used as an art studio, but due to heating problems it is only in use during the warmer months.

Jeannie asked about the active retail. Rhonda stated that space is set up for retail, she is looking for a tenant and it is up for lease.

Katie asked about the color chosen. Rhonda stated that she considered the property around her and was trying to stay within historic looking guidelines but yet complimentary. Rhonda stated that though she did not request reimbursement for the windows, she did go thru the steps to keep them original.

Katie asked about painting the brick and if it was considered a sealant. Scott stated that since the brick was painted prior to Rhonda it was not an issue for this application.

Deininger – Replace three old existing glass store front windows, being held together with tape. Replace with new aluminum windows with insulated glass, color to be determined.

Estimate is \$7161

Reimbursement Request is \$3580.50

Jeannie asked how the windows became broken. The reply was (inaudible) they have never been replaced and the business has been open for 78yrs. The windows are older than any generation at the flower shop. The windows were not damaged thru vandalism, but because of the age of the windows. Due to the age and condition of the windows, there had been pieces of glass fall from the windows and causing outside air to come thru.

Christopher asked when windows became bay window. The Deininger's representative did not know.

Nancy asked about the second floor of the building. Deininger's stated that the second floor is being used by the business.

Scott went through the scoring criteria. Katie asked about color. Deininger stated that they what to keep the same color, which was approved by the Historic Preservation Committee when it was chosen. There is no intention in changing the color.

Scott asked if the same size windows, filling the entire opening, would be used. Deininger's stated they would be.

Scott clarified that if an application does not meet the design guidelines with exact description a stipulation can be placed and it would be up to staff to follow up.

Christopher asked if the aluminum windows complied with the Sec. of the Interior guidelines. Scott stated that he understood that it depends on how close the new look is to the original. He also felt that this application would fit due to the box out of the windows, but with a stipulation that the color is as what is presented or approved by the Commission once it is selected.

London - Install new windows, replace common unit window pane

Estimate - 36 windows, color white, double pane, no storm windows 16,750

Reimbursement request is 8375

London representative stated that the current windows are missing the storm windows.

Christopher asked if the current windows were bigger on the inside. The representative stated the windows are the same size, but originally the windows were larger.

The question was posed if the plan was to replace the windows that are currently there or return the windows back to the original look. The representative stated that the plan was to replace what exist.

Christopher asked if it would take a lot to use windows that replaced the opening size. The representative stated that the current bid to use windows to replace what is currently there was shocking, she could not imagine what it would be to use other windows. The quote that was submitted is after the price was negotiated and multiple bids requested. She added that she did not know what the cost would entail due to the construction inside the building that would need to be done to go back to the original opening.

Katie asked if the color white was the set color because it was listed in the proposal. The representative stated that the color white was confusing because she thought the color to be used would be a brick color to match the outside. She added that maybe white was the inside color.

It was discussed that the white color was possibly cheaper and was what was detailed in the estimate to be white on both the inside and outside. The representative stated that Ronnie prepared all the quotes and she would have to ask him.

Katie asked if all the apartments occupied. The representative stated that they had one vacancy, one apartment was changed into a laundry room and two commercial units in the downstairs/main floor.

Katie asked if there were plans to update the façade of the building. The representative stated that it is in the plans. The building was recently painted when some other work was done to the building.

Scott addressed his thoughts that the elements for this application were that the replacing of non-historical elements with non-historical elements. Typically, the standard is to replace with a replica of the historical element. He did not feel that this would fall in the guidelines of the standard, due to it not being a restoration or preservation of the elements.

**Brittany Alexander – 121-125 E. Stephenson**

Cost of materials – 6980

Cost of Labor – 6980

Questions posed about how far will the repair go from the façade into the interior of the building?  
Work description – repair foundation, pour new concrete footing, reinforce rebar, replace steel post, repair subfloor and joist framing, build new entry, build knee walls, install new efficient windows and front door, install composite siding, install interior wall coverings.

Estimate for glass – 6386

Total quote - 20346

Maximum that can be reimbursed is \$10,000

Brittany stated that all windows are broken and the columns needed to be replaced. Sign doors will be taken out and keep the middle door. She stated that after some looking, she would like to replace some of the siding with cedar siding, leaving the top brick, and put the large windows back with a few more. Brittany add that the building is a one-story and believes that it is a great building due to the building be one of the first buildings seen as you enter the downtown.

Katie asked if the brick would remain white/black. Brittany stated she would like to.

Jeannie asked if there would be any signage. Brittany stated she will be making a stainless-steel sign.

Katie asked if the windows are going to be larger than the ones there or comparable to what's there. Brittany said there would be 5 4x6 windows. After getting quotes, the larger windows were very expensive.

Katie asked when removing the doors, will the door be staying. Brittany stated that the door will be staying.

Christopher expressed that the condition of the building was at the fault of the city and that it should never have gotten to condition it is in now. He also stated that the fact that the building was "boxed up" should have come before the commission based on the ordinance.

He added that he columns should remain and that the windows should be full storefront windows.

Nancy stated that she believed that the inspector looked at the building and stated that there were some structural issues that needed to be addressed.

Scott stated that the goal of the program was to provide money to help owners and incentivize work that would be done to the full standards of the program such as doing bigger windows versus smaller. Scott stated they are aware that it is expensive to perform work in an historical accurate way that is the intent of the façade program and smaller windows that fill the opening do not meet program standard.

Also, that deteriorated materials should be repaired rather than replaced, but if replacement has to be done, it should be replaced with materials that are like in color and texture.

Brittany added that she will be remodeling the inside as well and that she will have to pay for this on her own. She added that she will try to keep things as close to what the commission wants.

Jeannie asked if the five smaller windows were cheaper than three big windows. Brittany stated that they were. Christopher stated that this building calls for a store front system.

Katie asked if moving the door would allow for bigger windows. Brittany stated that due to the column placement that is way the door was placed there.

Nancy stated that she had tallied all the points:

SFTC – 349pt/90 - Average of 69.8% - 78% of pts earned

Scott – 457pt/100 - Average of 91.4% – 91% of pts earned

Deininger – 392pt/100 – Average of 78.4% - 78% of pts earned

London – 229pt/100 - Average of 45.8% - 46% of pts earned

Alexander – 331pt/90 - Average of 66.2% – 74% of pts earned

Nancy stated the points and tally would be posted on the website and wanted to go over the request.

SFTC Requested 5,000.00 reimbursement

Scott requested 7472.18 reimbursement

Deininger requested 3580.50 reimbursement

London requested 8375.00 reimbursement

Alexander requested 10,000 reimbursement

To fund all requested 34,427 / there is only 30,000.00 available funds

Nancy stated that the way she was familiar with disbursement of the funds was made off line by a grant reviewer, but she was not sure of what needed to be done in reference to the terms of the open meeting act.

Scott stated that in the past the commission had not be a part of the actual funding disbursements. In the past the commission just approved the C.O.A or not then it was up to the Façade committee, which included staff and other community members who ruled on who got the disbursement.

Scott then asked, based on the way the application was written and there being different funding sources if the committee were tied to a pending approval of a C.O.A for funding.

Nancy stated that if there was a something that was not going to get a C.O.A it would have to be pulled.

Scott added that it is in the ordinance that money was related to a historic review, but this was a different scenario because the funding sources are not from the city.

Nancy stated that there was 20,000 from the TIF and 10,000 from Paint the Port is where the revenue came from. Nancy added that if it was not specifically in the application the she did not know how they can pull.

Christopher stated that unless it was in the guidelines. Scott stated that there are separate things, the funding and the need for a C.O.A before you can do any of the work.

Nancy added that would be part of the conversation for next month when they talk about the next round.

Nancy stated that their recommendation would have to go before council, but suggested that they could look at anything that earned at least 70% of the points. If they funded those it would put them under the funding available.

Christopher added that the certificate of appropriateness is only binding when municipal money is used in a project requiring building moving or demolition permit is issued by the city and C.O.A issued by the commission shall be required before building permit moving/demolition permit is issued.

Nancy asked if there was anything on the list that would not be worthy of a C.O.A, even though some the work had been done prior to the application.

Scott stated that the London application with the vinyl windows not being the size and replacing historic windows would not meet the standards. He added that the Alexander application certainly has work that would be façade rehabilitation, but some things that were discussed would not be. It could be approved with stipulations.

Scott stated that typically the process did not have the first four criteria, and as they weighed percentages and points, only the fifth one related to historic preservation type things, the C.O.A. He added that they are being asked to evaluate it part on historic preservation type things and downtown economic development, which is not the purview of this commission.

Scott stated that somehow, they should rule on part of this and someone else within the city needs to rule on the rest.

Katie added that the Alexander project did get the go from the city. Christopher added that the permit was issued with no information. The city has worked that way for years, they issue permits willy nilly.

Katie stated the vision and mission of Paint the Port is to drastically change the way the downtown looks and make it more appealing to people who drive by or visit. The big thing was to have a big façade, not just windows done. It was not intended to be just windows, but a whole façade.

Christopher added that the purpose of the commission was to make the buildings look better, whether they are adding corniches, historic features to give it a street scape. He added that the purpose was not about windows, but about façade.

Christopher stated that what Brittany wants to do is good, but that it needs to be studied more. The inside is going to be nice and modern, but it is the outside that is going to affect the streetscape.

Katie stated that she did not think that it should be completely taken off the docket.

Nancy added that it goes back to Scott's stated that with stipulations you could get a certificate of appropriateness based on.

Nancy asked Brittany if she had given some ideas of some possible designs, but not necessarily the end.

Brittany stated that she has been waiting to have the meeting, talk with the commission and would like all opinions. She stated that is why she is at a stand still with the front. She added that she did need to know to move forward. She said that it was just an inspiration board and nothing is done, whatever needs to be done. Brittany said that \$10,000 is a lot of money to her but it will not restore it back exactly.



Christopher then read the policy in reference to the repairing of deteriorated historic features, which reads that they shall be repair rather than replaced. When the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, the new features will match in design, color, texture, visual quality and when possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary physical or pictorial evidence.

Brittany added that in reference to the door location, she was told by the fire inspector that the location of the door was in the right spot. It had to align with the rear door to allow a straight shot, and you had to be able to see the exit signs.

Nancy asked if the committee felt it was prepared to determine if projects are suitable for a C.O.A or if they felt they needed more time.

Scott stated that he felt they needed more guidance. Based on what is known about C.O.A's and the guidelines. He stated that it was clear to him what would get a C.O.A and what would not with conditions, would that eliminate the chance for funding. Scott stated this was completely different and that perhaps the funds should not have co-mingles.

The question was posed if the Paint the Port funds be separated if the co-mingling of funds becomes a sticking point. It was determined that it was possible.

Nancy stated that in the application it was stated that C.O.A's would be issued after the meeting, so there was not necessarily a requirement that they had to get it before they stated their project.

Scott stated that all the applications were put together proposals in good faith and that he would recommend that they defer and someone needs to make a ruling on how this should continue. He stated that he did not feel comfortable as a commission member, based on what he knows sorting it out.

Nancy stated that she would run it through an attorney. Nancy stated that a special meeting needs to be setup.

Scott then recommend that they could make a ruling on a C.O.A on each project and whether or not that is tied to funding or the percentage points or the application could be determined by someone else at a later date.

Christopher recommended that they could do the ones that they feel comfortable with a C.O.A and which ones need more information to see if they would consider it appropriate.

Rhonda then signed in to make a public comment.

It was decided to vote on a C.O.A for each project.

Jeannie added that she calculated the request of each project, multiplied the request by the percentage. Example if your met 78% of the criteria 3900. She added them all up, except for London and the total was 20991. If separating funds was done, then they would close to the 20000.

Scott added that without any guidance on how they are supposed to distribute the funds he did not feel comfortable making any recommendation.

SFTC – 5 votes yes 0 vote no

Scott Project – 5 votes 0 note no

Deininger – Scott made motion that approval with the stipulation of commission approves color and window size. Motion was seconded by Christopher. 5 vote yes 0 vote no

London – 0 vote yes 5 vote no

Alexander - Scott asked if the commission felt there should be stipulations for the approval of the C.O.A.

Nancy suggested the same stipulations as Deininger. Christopher stated that he felt the façade should be studied more. Nancy then suggested that the design elements be approved first.

Scott said that if the glass is replaced to the same size and orientation and maintains the character of the store front, then just like Deininger, if it meets those specific criteria, then it would be. He added that the siding could not be approved because it is not a like kind material being replaced. The rest of the proposal he felt was within the guidelines.

Jeannie wanted to clarify that the main point was the proposal of five windows and commission would like to see three and using siding to replace the deteriorated brick. Christopher stated that the point would be the windows need to fill the area and the three doors and it should be looked as three separate elements.

Jeannie stated that she felt like the windows were filling the opens. She said she was not bothered by the five windows and she can see the 1/3<sup>rd</sup>, the 1/3<sup>rd</sup>, the 1/3<sup>rd</sup>.

Nancy informed the commission that the meeting was going to need to be called due to another council meeting preparing to begin. Nancy said she would speak to the attorney and ask for guidance to see if a C.O eliminates a chance for funding. The vote for Alexander still needed to be done and she would setup a special meeting upon getting guidance.

Christopher asked about stipulations. Katie stated there might need to be a need to get guidance on the fact that Alexander has come to the city already and she was given the go, and where they need to go from there to be able to issue a true C.O.A.

Scott stated that if the commission did not feel there was enough information to approve a C.O.A, then they would typically deny it and then provide the stipulations on what needs to be done to reapply, whether its setting a timeframe to have the special meeting to reconsider it.

A motion was made that the C.O.A would be approved with the stipulation that the windows are replaced to the size and character to meet the guidelines as well as knee wall material meets and matches the character of the original material. Nancy made a motion. Jeannie seconded the motion.

### **Public Comment**

Rhonda stated she really appreciated the Historic Preservation Committee. She added that when she filled out her application she was informed that there was no funding and wished she had received a C.O.A and input from the commission for her project. She stated that she felt she was not allowed to attend meeting because she was not receiving any funding and suggested that maybe there was a break down in communication. Rhonda added that everything should go before the Historic Preservation. She

added that it is important to preserve buildings, but awarding points based on whether people are upstairs inside an apartment should get less points and if a building is historically significant should be weighted more and given more points. She stated that the commission should not care if someone is working on the upstairs.

Scott Winter made a motion to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Christopher Fye.

The Commission approved the January 16, 2018, minutes on February 20, 2018.

Prepared by C. Marney