

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday July 6, 2016 –4:30 p.m.

City Conference Room – County-City Building
1515 Strongs Avenue, Stevens Point, WI 54481

(A Quorum of the City Council May Attend This Meeting)

PRESENT: Chairperson Lee Beveridge, Alderperson Garrett Ryan, Commissioner Tim Siebert, and Commissioner Tom Baldischwiler.

ABSENT: Commissioner Sarah Scripps, Commissioner Joe Debauche, and Commissioner Robert Woehr.

ALSO PRESENT: Associate Planner Kearns, Director Ostrowski, City Attorney Beveridge, Alderperson Dugan, Tyler Feirtag, Talin Senner, Gregg Gokey, Brian Wogernese, Bob Brush, Sally McDonald-Lewis, and Robert McDonald.

INDEX:

Discussion and possible action on the following:

1. Approval of the report of the June 1, 2016 HP/DRC meeting.
2. Request from AJ Filtz, representing McDonald Title, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes the installation of a stucco finishing system at **1059 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-01)**.
3. Request from BriMark Builders, representing Cobblestone Hotels, for design review approval to construct a hotel on the **lot south of Centerpoint Drive, north of Main Street and between Strongs Avenue and Third Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2029-70)**.
4. Request Gregg Gokey, representing Penguin Properties, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes the installation of windows, doors, vinyl trim, railings, and masonry repairs, at **1324 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 2408-32-2031-37)**.
5. Adjourn.

-
1. Approval of the report of the June 1, 2016 HP/DRC meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the report of the June 1, 2016 HP / DRC meeting; seconded by Alderperson Ryan.

Motion carried 4-0.

2. Request from AJ Filtz, representing McDonald Title, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes the installation of a stucco finishing system at **1059 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-01)**.

Associate Planner Kearns reported a brief history of the McDonald building at 1059 Clark Street. He stated that on April 11, 2016, a building inspector and he went to the property after an inspection

request was made. At the property they confirmed that the brick of the east façade was deteriorating and pulling away from the underlying material. He went on to state there was a significant enough safety concern on the public right-of-way, and given the emergency procedures in Chapter 22 of the Revised Municipal Code, the building inspector bypassed the commission review and allowed for demolition the week of June 6, 2016 after a razing permit was issued. Mr. Kearns explained that the applicants proposed to install insulation and stucco material on the exterior façade. Based on the review however, the requested material did not meet the design standards that stipulate the replacement of similar or like material to the original structure should occur when there is razing or partial demolition of a façade. Therefore staff recommended denying the McDonald request, but also recommended approval if conditions laid out by staff were met. Mr. Kearns went on to explain two additional handouts that were provided by the applicant after the staff report and agenda were published. The handouts contained a study by Pie Consulting and Engineering outlining the brick condition prior to removal, as well as citing structural components that were missing in the original installation that had deteriorated and possibly lead to the cause of the failing façade.

Commissioner Siebert requested the whereabouts of the brick that was removed.

Sally McDonald-Lewis (1059 Clark St) stated that their contractor, AJ Filtz, had disposed of the brick.

Robert McDonald (1059 Clark St) commented that there had been no salvageable components.

Commissioner Siebert stated that the brick could have been reused or salvaged to which Mr. McDonald replied that they had attempted to find someone to salvage the bricks, but there had been no interest. Ms. McDonald-Lewis attempted to sell the brick, but also found no interest.

Mr. Kearns stated that the mural that was on the east façade was in the possession of the applicant which was removed prior to work commencing.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis voiced her concerns over several deteriorating causes of the building including water damage, and regularly freezing pipes in the winter.

Mr. McDonald mentioned that the building had several different surface materials and that they did not recommend using brick for the façade. He referenced surrounding properties that had several different surfaces which he felt had no historical significance.

Chairperson Beveridge clarified the instances in which different building materials were allowed, but also mentioned that the decisions to do so were not amicable and partially a result from lack of funds. He also mentioned that their obligation was to try to maintain and restore the downtown to its original state, as well as staying away from unapproved material as much as possible in order to follow Federal and State Historic Guidelines, as they differ considerably between new and historic properties.

Mr. McDonald reiterated his position on the different materials allowed on the surrounding buildings to which Ms. McDonald-Lewis mentioned that the diversity of building material on the property was contributing to deteriorating conditions to the point that their insurance company did not want to pay claims due to excessive damage. She also asked for clarification on items

concerning windows within the staff report prior to summarizing their latest updates to windows. Lastly, she presented colored materials for the proposed project.

Chairperson Beveridge stressed that stucco was not an allowable material.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis voiced her dissatisfaction and noted a voicemail message they had received stating that their property did not have historic site designation, was not in the Clark Street historical district, the Mathias Mitchell District, and that they only fell under the Downtown Design Review District. She went on to explain that under the law, they could not be held under eminent domain and be forced to pay for something they did not want to do, or something their insurance company would not pay for.

Chairperson Beveridge and Ms. McDonald-Lewis had a brief discussion related to potential causes and solutions to water issues and the possibility of securing mortar ties.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis stressed that they did not have funds to use brick and they could not be forced to pay. However, if the city wanted to provide a grant, they would follow conditions.

Commissioner Siebert asked if there were still funds available in the Downtown Façade Improvement Grant Program.

Associate Planner Kearns confirmed that the funds were depleted.

Aldersperson Dugan (Eighth District) voiced her concern for the deteriorating building, noting that it may have been due to neglect. She also mentioned the possibility of placing insulation on the interior of the building as a solution.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis assured Aldersperson Dugan that the deteriorating façade was not due to neglect, and that they had taken steps to find out why the façade had failed, concluding that the brick was not properly placed.

Mr. McDonald noted that the building had been power washed and repainted 20 years ago; adding that they saw the bottom was not brick, but cement blocks. Ms. McDonald-Lewis added that they could instead choose a stucco color to match the brick. Mr. McDonald went on to summarize the different colors and materials on the exterior and interior of the building. He felt there was no historical significance other than the second floor of the building and Ms. McDonald-Lewis reiterated that the building did not hold heat during the winter and that there was water damage between the wood structure and brick veneer. She also stated that the structure was too high for brick which was a reason for the brick façade failure. Lastly, Ms. McDonald-Lewis requested stucco and proper insulation that would adhere to the wood structure as it warranties for 15 years.

Chairperson Beveridge noted that brick can be maintained for hundreds of years. Commissioner Siebert agreed, as well as stating that brick can be engineered to stay attached.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis stated that it would be an additional \$25,000 for brick and stressed she would rather keep her business open and employees paid than pay for brick. She noted that the total cost would be about \$45,000 for a non-high-end brick.

Mr. McDonald addressed the surface materials of the surrounding buildings to which Ms. McDonald-Lewis reiterated that stucco would flow with the surrounding buildings. She goes on to ask for clarification on the windows.

Associate Planner Kearns explained that the original window openings seemed to have been made smaller.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis disagreed and explained that windows had not been made smaller.

Associate Planner Kearns explained that design guidelines state a window should never be filled in and/or made smaller. He pointed out three window locations on the east façade where window openings appear to be smaller or covered with the new façade material.

Mr. McDonald commented that they changed the windows.

Associate Planner Kearns reiterated that windows should never be bricked in or have their opening shrunk, and the full height of the window should be maintained.

Ms. McDonald-Lewis and Mr. McDonald stressed that they did not shrink any windows and that there were no longer any boards over them.

Mr. McDonald voiced his concern in making the building consistent when there were already four different surfaces on the building, some dramatic, some minor.

Associate Planner Kearns requested the commission's thoughts on installing a brick face rather than a full brick on the exterior as it may allow for an inch of insulation while maintaining the original aesthetic of brick. He noted that the material has been approved in the past and could act as a compromise on the project, as well as potentially savings in cost. He recommended that Ms. McDonald-Lewis and Mr. McDonald speak to a mason to discuss the feasibility of installing a brick face.

Chairperson Beveridge went into detail about having a brick face installed and stressed that the commission would work with them as much as possible as the commission was aware of the financial implications of the project.

Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the request from AJ Filtz, representing McDonald Title, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements at 1059 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-01) with the following conditions:

- 1. All architectural masonry design features, such as window headers; and openings shall be maintained or restored.**
- 2. Rounded window and door headers matching the original shall be incorporated into the design.**
- 3. All window and door openings must remain open and shall be prohibited from being permanently filled-in.**
- 4. Brick (full or veneer) closely matching the original in color, texture, and mortar shall be installed along the east façade. Type N mortar shall be used as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM).**

5. **Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.**

6. **All applicable building permits shall be obtained.**

seconded by Alderperson Ryan.

Motion carried 4-0.

3. Request from BriMark Builders, representing Cobblestone Hotels, for design review approval to construct a hotel on the **lot south of Centerpoint Drive, north of Main Street and between Strongs Avenue and Third Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2029-70).**

Associate Planner Kearns summarized that BriMark Builders was requesting to construct a 4-story hotel in the B3-Central Business District between Shopko and Great Lakes Loan Services on a small development pad, and that the hotel would also require a conditional use permit which the Plan Commission had recommend for approval. He noted that a parking area was not required and that the site would utilize surrounding public parking lots. Exterior materials recommended were brick, stone veneer, and EIFS. He reminded the committee that there were different guideline requirements for new construction compared to existing buildings: modern materials should be similar in quality within the district. Associate Planner Kearns also explained how the hotel would fit in with the downtown area by referencing surrounding buildings, as well as meeting several items outlined in the report. Lastly, he noted that Plan Commission had recommended additional landscaping on the west side of the site where the walkway connected the downtown to the north.

Director Ostrowski explained that the sidewalk on the west side of the building between Great Lakes Loan Services and the hotel would be kept all the way up to Centerpoint Drive and back down to the Children's Museum, keeping the view shed from Centerpoint in case there was a development on the property to the north.

Commissioner Siebert asked for clarification on the main entryway location.

Director Ostrowski and Associate Planner Kearns confirmed the entryway would be on the east side, just off of Strongs Avenue.

Associate Planner Kearns added that masonry would be on two-thirds of the building and that an exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) would come into play above the second story.

Commissioner Seibert questioned the use of EIFS and if there was an engineering reason in using it.

Brian Wogernese, representing Cobblestone Hotels, explained the use of EIFS is more of a design choice in order to visually break up the brick of the building.

Associate Planner Kearns added that the approval included signage. Signage would be placed on all four façades, with the potential of a fifth sign for the restaurant at the north side of building. He referenced Chapter 25 (Sign Ordinance) where it states the signable area must be between the first floor and second floor. He made sure to note that the guidelines were created primarily for Main Street businesses, and that it didn't consider a project as large as Cobblestone Hotel. Overall he stated the signage was fitting and appropriate at the 4-story height and recommended approval with staff recommendations.

Director Ostrowski clarified that Plan commission has approved the building and sign variance.

Aldersperson Ryan asked if there were different materials between the EFIS and concrete.

Associate Planner Kearns confirmed there would be an EFIS band separating the material.

Commissioner Baldischwiler expressed concern about parking.

Associate Planner Kearns confirmed there would be 7-8 stalls on site, but the majority of parking would be in surrounding public lots.

Commissioner Baldischwiler asked if there would be any controlled walkways.

Associate Planner Kearns and Director Ostrowski commented on the existing pedestrian walkways that would be available.

Aldersperson Dugan (Eighth District) stated she sees the hotel as an excellent addition to the community, but expressed concerns on the height of the proposed development. She went on to reference surrounding building heights that were met with local opposition and felt a three-story hotel would better compliment the area. Lastly, she stated she felt the north side of the hotel design was bare, but understood there would be a restaurant in that area, and questioned the possibility of getting more windows.

Brian Wogernese, representing Cobblestone Hotels, confirmed that the bare area of the hotel side would be a part of restaurant and adding windows would change the makeup of the building. He also explained that a three-story building wouldn't work out financially.

Commissioner Siebert asked if there were ways to fake a window.

Brian Wogernese said they were not sure if they could fake a window, but would be open to exploring that option as long as it did not become cost prohibited.

Motion by Aldersperson Ryan to approve the request from BriMark Builders, representing Cobblestone Hotels, for design review approval to construct a hotel on the lot south of Centerpoint Drive, north of Main Street and between Strongs Avenue and Third Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2029-70) with the following conditions:

- 1. EIFS shall be permitted to exist as shown on the attached plans and shall not be located below the third story.**
- 2. The chairperson and designated agent shall have the authority to review and approve minor changes to the project and building design.**
- 3. Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.**
- 4. All applicable building permits shall be obtained.**
- 5. The chairperson and designated agent shall have the authority to review and approve minor modifications to the building design and architecture.**

seconded by Commissioner Baldischwiler.

Motion carried 4-0.

4. Request Gregg Gokey, representing Penguin Properties, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes the installation of windows, doors, vinyl trim, railings, and masonry repairs, at **1324 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 2408-32-2031-37)**.

Associate Planner Kearns began the summary by noting an error on page 31/40. He explained the applicant has requested to perform exterior work along Centerpoint Drive on a building that was constructed in 1977. Given the construction date and features, he noted that the building may be defined as a noncontributing building in the design district, but that the guidelines would still apply. He summarized the request for new windows, doors, vinyl siding and masonry work. Associate Planner Kearns also mentioned that a few details were missing in regards to the type of windows being proposed. Staff recommended wood windows as they would have most likely existed originally as well as wood siding instead of vinyl, and recommend approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Gregg Gokey (1324 Centerpoint Dr) reported that they had looked into the cost of complete replacement of the handrails which was not financially feasible. He was looking for approval to fix and replace without making major changes, but was having a hard time finding a mason. Mr. Gokey was also concerned that the accessibility ramp essentially could not be used.

Talin Senner (1324 Centerpoint Dr) explained that the windows being requested would be vinyl. He noted the yellow fascia that was visible at the front of the windows were some sort of composite material and the outline around the windows were all painted wood. He was especially concerned about the constant flow of water coming off their roof and leading to continuous water penetration. He wants to wrap the entire bump out window box to mitigate the water. They have chosen to wrap the entire bump out window box with cedar look-a-like vinyl shakes to mitigate the water. He explained further that their current windows were wood wrapped in aluminum clad that had not been maintained. His concerns were the amount of water and moisture getting inside the soffit, and the drywall becoming deteriorated.

Mr. Gokey stated that they would prefer not to do an aluminum wrap around the windows.

Mr. Senner mentioned that they would like to match the surrounding homes as much as possible in terms of aesthetics while fixing the water penetration issue. He noted that the existing door had to be replaced as the locking mechanism was destroyed which prevented the door from locking.

Associate Planner Kearns asked if they would be willing to maintain the moulding around the door if they installed any glass.

Mr. Senner confirmed that they would maintain the moulding if any new glass was installed. He also gave a brief summary of when the building was originally located at 1100 Union Street until it was moved in 1983 to its current location.

Mr. Gokey mentioned that in addition to these requests, they were also looking to mimic the landscaping that was recently done at Shopko.

Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the request of Gregg Gokey, representing Penguin Properties for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes

the installation of windows, doors, vinyl trim, railings, and masonry repairs, at 1324 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 2408-32-2031-37) with staff recommendations.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Senner asked for confirmation on the staff recommendations and if it included maintaining the wood windows and aluminum cladding.

Associate Planner Kearns confirmed that they would be able to install new windows, but the recommendation was for wood windows rather than vinyl windows.

Mr. Senner asked for further clarification on window replacement in terms of keeping a three-pane windows or replacing with a one pane window.

Associate Planner Kearns confirmed that his recommendation was to replace windows as they were: a three-pane window for three-pane window.

Mr. Senner was concerned that they would not be mitigating water issues as wood had caused the water damage thus far.

Associate Planner Kearns asked for clarification regarding the wood exterior or the wood windows themselves to which Mr. Senner confirmed that he meant both the wood exterior and wood windows.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if the water penetration was from the water coming off the roof.

Mr. Senner explained that water would drip and run straight onto the windows due to a metal roof and small drip edge. He also mentioned that interior drywall had been water damaged. Furthermore, Mr. Senner confirmed that the drip edge was not long enough and rain continued to run over and down onto the windows. He would prefer not to install rain gutters and had several contractors give the same recommendation that they need to seal the entire window. Lastly, he explained that the windows originally opened, but had to be sealed shut with glue and silicone.

Commissioner Siebert stated that the water hitting the windows would still be a problem even with vinyl.

Mr. Senner agreed that water would still hit the windows, but mentioned that the seal would be better. He did not want to go through the expense of replacing all the windows without making sure they weren't sealed properly.

Director Ostrowski asked if the windows were original to the 1979 construction.

Mr. Senner stated that the windows looked recently replaced, but that they did not mitigate water issues.

Commissioner Siebert questioned if there was another way to run the water off.

Mr. Senner and Tyler Feirtag reiterated that the roof is half way down the window which allows water to come down the side as well.

Director Ostrowski questioned what would be vinyl wrapped.

Mr. Senner explained that they would wrap each side of the window box, as well as placing a channel along each edge and on the front of the box as well as to have the whole thing be sealed against water penetration.

Commissioner Siebert questioned why they could not do the same with aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Senner commented that they currently had aluminum around wood, and water still had penetrated even after sealing every window with silicone.

Commissioner Siebert asked for clarification between a vinyl over wood wrap, and an all vinyl wrap.

Talin Senner reiterated that they would do a white frame vinyl picture window to match the surrounding homes, as well as have the whole window box wrapped in a cedar vinyl shake.

Chairperson Beveridge referenced the Cape Code housing with a similar overhang that did not leak.

Aldersperson Ryan suggested the windows may not have been installed properly.

Mr. Senner mentioned that there may be damaged drywall on the west side that has not been uncovered yet.

Aldersperson Ryan recommended the possibility of installing a three-pane window that does not open. He noted that it would maintain the aesthetics of the building while providing a tight seal unless they wanted the ability to open the windows.

Mr. Senner saw no reason to open the windows.

Chairperson Beveridge questioned if all windows were currently sealed.

Mr. Senner could not give a confirmation as only some windows have been wrapped in aluminum or sealed with glue and he has not attempted to open all the windows.

Commissioner Sierbert questioned if using aluminum instead of vinyl would really solve the problem as they would be sealed windows.

Mr. Senner reiterated that he would rather not have the windows open and that their main goal would be to seal them properly if they have to replace 18 windows. He wants to avoid replacing the windows in a couple years if water continues to penetrate.

Associate Planner Kearns briefly summarized a previous project where there were vinyl window inserts but the exterior moulding was wood. He mentioned the interior could not be seen from the exterior because the original moulding and trims were restored and reutilized.

Mr. Senner questioned if the window could be vinyl in order to obtain the seal, but still have the aluminum cladding on the exterior.

Director Ostrowski voiced his concern in having sealed windows on the property in case a new buyer comes along and decides they want operating windows. Completely sealing the windows may pose future implications in re-selling the property. That being said, he understood the implications of needing sealed windows with rain constantly hitting the building given how the window boxes were designed. While vinyl is not recommended, he's not sure if the water penetration can be fixed with wood, but would also prefer functioning windows.

Associate Planner Kearns reiterated his point of the possibility of the building being considered noncontributing due to its aesthetics prior to its most recent renovations, and therefore less significant.

Commissioner Sierbert affirmed that vinyl windows still had to be sealed to the building.

Director Ostrowski confirmed that while they did need to be sealed, the seal would be better. He understands that vinyl is not historically accurate.

Aldersperson Dugan (Eighth District) shares a similar concern regarding older wooden windows on her home.

Mr. Gokey agreed that older windows needed maintenance, but that the roof was causing different water issues.

Mr. Senner stated that they preferred not keep the green color of trim. They wished to change to white vinyl wrapped windows to match the surrounding homes and change the green to a muted Auburn Red to match the vinyl cedar shakes.

Chairperson Beveridge asked for clarification on what the yellow and green wood would be replaced with.

Mr. Senner confirmed that the whole window box would be wrapped in cedar shakes, side-to-side.

Director Ostrowski asked if there would be a corner piece to which Mr. Senner confirmed.

Chairperson Beveridge questioned how operable the current windows were.

Mr. Gokey confirmed that there was no real consistency with which windows were operable as some windows were sealed, and some not, in different locations.

Motion by Aldersperson Ryan to approve the request of Gregg Gokey, representing Penguin Properties, for design review approval to perform exterior facade improvements which includes the installation of windows, doors, vinyl trim, railings, and masonry repairs, at 1324 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 2408-32-2031-37) with the following conditions:

1. Operable windows matching the original in design, and size shall be installed.
2. Decorative moulding and trim around doors shall remain.
3. The applicant shall provide further details regarding window and doors to be approved by the chairperson and designated agent.
4. Windows shall be allowed to be constructed of vinyl.
5. Window and door trim shall match in color and material.
6. Type N mortar shall be used as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), matching in color and texture to the original mortar.
7. Brick matching the original in size and color shall be installed if necessary under the walkways.

8. The existing railings shall be repaired and restored, however, if they are beyond repair, a new metal railing matching the original design shall be installed which shall be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.
9. Vinyl cedar siding as proposed shall be allowed to be installed around the window boxes.
10. Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.
11. All applicable building permits shall be obtained.

seconded by Commissioner Baldischwiler.

Motion carried 3-1, with Commissioner Seibert voting in the negative.

5. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:54 PM.

**Attachment - Pertaining to
Agenda Item 2 - Email**

From: [Sally McDonald](#)
To: [Kyle Kearns](#); [Ximena Christianson](#); [Jim Zepp](#); smcdonald@mcddtitle.com
Subject: McDonald Title "East Wall" 1059 Clark Street
Date: Friday, July 1, 2016 12:35:33 PM
Attachments: [SKMBT_C224e16070110100.pdf](#)

Gentlemen;

Please find attached the engineer's "Technical Memorandum" that we have used to determine the best structural and aesthetic renovation to our building. Meeting scheduled for July 6, 2016.

Samples of the Stucco arrived today. I will provide a few samples at the meeting. Or in advance if you want them dropped off somewhere? It isn't really fair to view them inside a building without viewing outside, at our building, with it's surrounding structures. Also, the coordination of colors to the mural, which is the main focus of that wall. Our selection of materials takes into account structural soundness, insulation and the causation of brick failing on our two story structure, as well as the absolute improvement of the aesthetics pronouncing and preserving history.

As an aside, we had numerous people in the public inquiring as to the mural. "Windows to the Past". Clients, professionals and members of the public that we shared our plans to apply stucco of an "almond" or "moonstone" color was met with lots of compliments. Builders, realtors, architects and colleagues reacted very positively. One said, "that would really make the building "pop" as well as accentuate the mural, and complement the adjoining building, as well as flow with the downtown scattering of finishes". Trying to "match" a color such as the orange-like paint on the painted cement would be like wearing red pants with an orange shirt.

Speaking of windows, the boarded up windows was only during removal of brick to protect them, as was true of your sidewalk (covered with plywood to prevent cracking). I don't understand your statement that we planned on making a first floor window smaller? We have no such plans.

Thank you,

Sally McDonald



Technical Memorandum

Date: May 16, 2016
To: Jim Gould - United Fire and Casualty Insurance Company (United Fire and Casualty)
From: Tom G. Peterson, P.E. - Pie Consulting & Engineering (Pie)
Subject: Claim #482005970: McDonald Title and Law - MN716056.00 (000)

Dear Mr. Gould:

In accordance with your request on behalf of United Fire and Casualty on April 28, 2016, Pie observed the site and reviewed information on the above-noted claim. The purpose and scope of the investigation was as follows:

- A. Review background information related to the claim.
- B. Travel to and from the site in Stevens Point, Wisconsin.
- C. Observe exterior brick veneer walls at commercial building to determine cause of the existing condition.
- D. Provide verbal feedback to client regarding engineering opinions of damage and repair options if required.
- E. Upon request, Pie will provide an engineering report summarizing observations, opinions and recommendations.

Background information regarding the claim is as follows:

- A. The property under review is a business establishment located in downtown Stevens Point, Wisconsin at the corner of Ellis and Clark streets. The exact address is 1059 Clark Street. For the purpose of this report, the building faces to the north.
- B. Based on information provided, the original structure was built in the early 1900's and the insured has owned the building since 1967.
- C. According to the insured, recent building modifications have included new windows on the second floor level on the east side of the building and the installation of a new roofing system. Based on information available, these activities have occurred within the past two (2) years.
- D. During the spring of 2016, the insured observed separation of the brick from the exterior wall at the windows on the east side of the building and a significant leaning of the brick veneer panel away from the exterior wall on that same side.

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS

6275 Joyce Drive, Suite 200 - Arvada, CO 80403-7541

303.552.0177 (tel) · 1.866.552.5246 (nationwide) · 303.552.0178 (fax)

www.pieglobal.com

Colorado · Minnesota · Texas · Florida · Arizona · Tennessee · Wyoming

- E. Although no specific cause is identified, the insured claims damage to the building related to the condition of the brick and a structural evaluation of the existing wall system is requested.
- F. Pie was subsequently retained by United Fire and Casualty to investigate this matter.

On Tuesday, May 3, 2016, Pie visited the property, met with the insured and Jim Gould of United Fire and Casualty and observed the following:

- A. The building has a split-level entry with a total of three (3) floors of space utilized as a law and property title office with storage and living quarters on the upper level.
- B. The exterior of the structure is brick masonry walls on the north, west and east sides, except for the rear 10-feet of the building at the west end, which is constructed of concrete block.
- C. A similarly constructed structure abuts the insured's building on the south side and a building to the west is separated from the insured's building by an alley approximately 10-feet in width.
- D. The area of sidewalk on the east side of the property is cordoned off with hazard cones and caution tape.
- E. The approximate dimensions of the building are 24-feet wide along Clark Street by 68-feet deep along Ellis Street.
- F. The front elevation of the building is approximately 28-feet above the sidewalk with the roof sloping down from the front (north) to the rear (south).
- G. As viewed from the east side along Ellis Street, the second floor has a series of five (5) windows spaced along its length, which includes the new window installations identified by the insured.
- H. A brick chimney is located at the east exterior wall approximately 40-feet from the front building corner. There is considerable discoloration of the east brick wall directly below the chimney for nearly its full height. The discoloration is accompanied by deterioration of the brick surface and the masonry joints. The balance of the brick on this wall exhibits only minor discoloration.
- I. As viewed from the sidewalk on the east side of the structure, the brick is noticeably out of alignment in the vertical plane.
- J. The roof was accessed for observation:
 - 1. The existing roof is a 0.45 mil EPDM mechanically attached membrane system provided by Carlisle. The roof is in good condition and, as mentioned above, was installed within the past two (2) years based on information provided by the insured.
 - 2. The roof slopes down toward the rear (south) and then to the southwest corner at a rate sufficient to promote adequate drainage.
 - 3. There are multiple penetrations of the roof membrane including the previously mentioned chimney at the east wall:
 - a. The chimney is constructed of brick and cementitious mortar.

concrete block

— how gone

- b. The chimney has no cover or rain shield to protect from moisture infiltration. } gone
- c. Based on observation, the chimney is vacated or utilized only as a chase for mechanical/electrical systems.
- d. One of the roof vents with cover is exhibiting severe corrosion as evidence of long term exposure to the elements and a lack of maintenance. } replaced

K. The second floor was accessed for observation:

1. The windows were opened to observe the reported separation of the brick:

- a. Cracking and separation of the brick from the building frame were evident at all window sills and jambs. The separation varied from hairline to a maximum of 2.5-inches. The interior portion of the sills and jambs are constructed of wood framing in poor condition for the older windows and aluminum framing for the newer installations.
- b. Deformation of the brick veneer panel is evident as bulging of the system outward. It is most prominent near the second floor elevation which is approximately the mid-height of the structure.
- c. Based on limited access and visibility at the window locations only, the building wall structure is expected to be wood framing with the brick acting only as an aesthetic veneer.
- d. Horizontal metal tabs were observed to be fastened to the wood wall system, but those that could be observed were not engaged with the brick veneer. It is expected that these tabs remain from the original system of ties that were embedded in the brick mortar joints and served to provide horizontal support for the veneer.
- e. The metal tabs that could be observed exhibited signs of severe corrosion.
- f. No horizontal brick ledger element along the length of the wall and near the second floor elevation was observed as would be expected in typical multi-story brick veneer construction. This feature is normally included, even in historic structures, to provide vertical and lateral support for the brick and allow for movements of the veneer system due to temperature and moisture fluctuations.

tabs to hold brick won't work

affects exterior veneer

2. The interior space of the second floor was observed and exhibited no signs of moisture intrusion or damage to ceiling, wall or floor finishes.

L. The first floor and lower level were accessed for review of the general condition of the space and finishes. No evidence of moisture intrusion or damage to ceiling, wall or floor finishes was observed.

Based on review of the information provided and on our site observations, the following analysis is provided:

A. The basics of building with brick veneer have remained fairly constant through decades of construction for single and multi-story buildings due to continued success. All buildings incorporating a brick veneer façade must account for the effects of two

potentially damaging factors. Although consideration must be given to all environmental conditions, the specific effects of moisture migration and temperature fluctuations must be addressed in materials and methods. Traditional veneer construction involves the following items:

1. A structural building shell for support of floors and roofs that does not rely on the brick for vertical support of building loads.
 2. A weather resistive barrier over the sheathing and air gap or insulation between the building shell and the brick veneer to provide temperature conditioning and to allow for movement of moisture through the system to a place of exit.
 3. Some form of horizontal anchorage of the brick veneer to the structural building shell. This provides lateral support for the brick.
 4. A continuous structural element at regular intervals for the height of the building to provide vertical support for the brick veneer. This element is generally provided at each building floor elevation. Brick veneer is not designed as a material that is capable of spanning multiple floor heights without appropriate horizontal and vertical support.
 5. An expansion joint at approximately each floor elevation to allow for expansion of the brick veneer panels due to moisture and temperature changes. The location of the expansion joint usually corresponds with the location of the horizontal support element. It should be noted that there is a difference in the performance of clay brick and concrete brick. It is expected that the veneer on this project is a clay brick product, but most of the means and methods mentioned here apply to both types.
 6. A system of flashings at the top of veneer walls, changes in plane, and around openings to prevent moisture ingress behind the veneer and into the wall cavity.
 7. A system of internal thru-wall flashings that span from the sheathing to the exterior face of the veneer providing an exit path for unwanted and damaging moisture that enters the system. Thru-wall flashings are generally provided at horizontal interruptions such as brick support angles, lintels, as well as the base of the wall.
- B. Based on site observations, the current installation of the brick veneer system does not include:
1. Effective horizontal anchorage of the brick veneer to the building shell.
 2. Vertical support for the brick veneer at any location other than the foundation.
 3. Allowance for expansion of the brick due to temperature variations.
 4. Effective exterior flashings and thru-wall flashings to prevent bulk water from entering the cavity and/or to channel the water away from the sheathing and to the veneer exterior.
- C. It is expected that the primary deficiency in the current veneer system on the east wall involves the loss of horizontal support from the building shell framework to the brick veneer panel, due to the deterioration of the metal tie elements. The deterioration of the

Brick's
failures

metal tie system is attributed to long-term corrosive effects of uncontrolled moisture migration into the wall cavity.

Based on review of the available information, the following is concluded:

- A. It is Pie's determination, based on a reasonable degree of engineering certainty that the loss of an effective horizontal veneer tie system is primarily causal to the current detached and deformed condition of the brick panel on the east wall. Although the original construction appears to have included a system of horizontal veneer ties that was likely standard for that era, the effects of uncontrolled bulk moisture entering the wall system over the life of the structure have severely corroded the ties to the point that those observed no longer engage the brick as required for stability of the veneer.
- B. It is expected that moisture has entered the wall cavity system by various means over the life of the structure. Due to the recent re-roofing, it cannot be known for certain the condition of the roof immediately prior to that effort, but the observed corrosion of the vent noted above provides some insight into the likelihood that a leaking roof system existed. Additional possibilities for entrance of unwanted moisture into wall cavity include:
 1. The perimeter coping cap.
 2. Wall parapet flashing.
 3. Open chimney stack and base flashing.
 4. Brick mortar joint cracks and unsealed exterior finish.

Once moisture has entered the system, its detrimental effects can be substantially negated by providing a system of exit via thru-wall flashings. However, no such system was observed at this installation.

- C. Secondary factors affecting the current brick veneer condition include the lack of horizontal structural support at any elevation other than the foundation and the lack of a provision for expansion of the brick material due to moisture and temperature fluctuations.
- D. It is further determined that no single occurrence or sudden event, such as a storm with high winds or driving rains are responsible for the condition of the brick veneer. Rather, the condition is expected to be the result of long-term deterioration of the metal tie system.

Based on review of the available information, the following recommendations are provided:

- A. The brick veneer on the east wall no longer functions as intended and requires repair. It is expected that the veneer may be removed without affecting the structural integrity of the building shell, but this requires verification by a licensed professional engineer.
- B. Any and all demolition activity and reconstruction must be performed by a licensed contractor experienced in this type of work and must be completed under the direction of a professional engineer licensed in the State of Wisconsin.

The determinations and results described in this memorandum are based on information available at the time of the observation and preparation of this memorandum. Should additional information or unknown conditions be uncovered or made available, Pie Consulting & Engineering retains the right to revise and supplement this memorandum accordingly.

Sincerely,

Pie Consulting & Engineering



Observed by,
Tom G. Peterson, P.E.
Senior Forensic Engineer



Tom Peterson
May 16 2016 2:59 PM
eSign

TGP:BDE:mp

Attachments: Picture Pages

K:\2016\MN71605600\Task 000-General\05 Reports Attachments Submittals\2016-04-28-000-McDonaldTitleandLaw-TechMemo.docx



Northeast building elevation.



East exterior wall.



Roof facing north.



Roof facing south.



Second floor windows with brick veneer separation.



Second floor window with brick veneer separation at sill and jambs.



Separation of brick veneer from window at exterior wall.



Wood exterior wall with corroded metal tie not engaged with brick veneer.

Attachment - Pertaining to
Agenda Item 4 - Photos































