

AGENDA

HISTORIC PRESERVATION/DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday, December 1, 2010 – 4:30 p.m.

**Lincoln Center**  
**1519 Water Street, Stevens Point, WI**

(A Quorum of the Common Council may attend this meeting)

1. Approval of the minutes of the November 3, 2010 HP/DRC meeting.
2. Discussion and possible action on a request from the Community Development Authority of the City of Stevens Point, to raze the building located at **1000 Third Street** (former Eagle Plumbing building). **Parcel ID 2408-32-2004-01**.
3. Adjourn.

## REPORT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION/DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday, November 3, 2010 – 4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Lee Beveridge; Ald. Tom Mallison; Tim Siebert; Jack Curtis;  
Norm Myers; Hans Walther; Kathy Kruthoff; Karl Halsey; George Hanson

ALSO

PRESENT: Comm. Dev. Dir. Michael Ostrowski; Ald. M. Stroik; Craig Buttke; Mayoral  
Intern Trevor Knight

### INDEX:

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 6, 2010 HP/DRC meeting
2. Discussion and possible action on a request from Luke Hilgers for an exterior building review of **1141-57 Main Street**, for the purpose of replacing the second story windows on the north side of the building. **Parcel ID 2408-32-2015-09**
3. Discussion and possible action on a request from Craig Buttke of Northwind Renewable Energy, for an exterior building review of **1009 First Street**, for the purpose of installing solar panels on the building. **Parcel ID 2408-32-2005-05**
4. Discussion and possible action on the operation of the Historic Preservation/Design Review Commission including, but not limited to, meeting dates and times, selection of a designated agent, roles and responsibilities, and staff preparation.
5. Adjourn.

- 
1. Approval of the minutes of the October 6, 2010 HP/DRC meeting

**Tim Siebert moved, seconded by George Hanson, to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2010 meeting.**  
**Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.**

Dir. Ostrowski provided an update on the addition for Pioneer Park Place Apartments at 1020 First Street. The state approved the proposal but wanted to see wood or fiber cement board siding instead of vinyl.

2. Discussion and possible action on a request from Luke Hilgers for an exterior building review of **1141-57 Main Street**, for the purpose of replacing the second story windows on the north side of the building. **Parcel ID 2408-32-2015-09**

Lee Beveridge stated staff has provided a lot of information and recommended against the replacement windows as presented.

Hans Walther thought the newer windows would look pretty good but he is disappointed that the owner is not here to discuss it.

Lee Beveridge noted the proposed new windows are smaller than the originals.

Dir. Ostrowski stated the owner told him that the windows would be custom so he would be able to make them larger to fit in the openings. The question would then be whether you would rather see the wood windows preserved or allow vinyl windows. If replaced, they would be very similar to the windows on the east side of the building, but larger to fill the entire opening.

Lee Beveridge questioned what condition the current windows are in. We have allowed things like that in the past. If the owner seems amenable to repairing the windows, that is the way we would like to go first.

Dir. Ostrowski responded the owner thought they could be preserved but his main concern was energy conservation.

**Tom Mallison moved, seconded by Hans Walther, to accept the staff recommendation of repairing or restoring the existing windows, or if new windows are needed, that the same size windows be installed on the north side as what currently exists. Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.**

3. Discussion and possible action on a request from Craig Buttke of Northwind Renewable Energy, for an exterior building review of **1009 First Street**, for the purpose of installing solar panels on the building. **Parcel ID 2408-32-2005-05**

Lee Beveridge stated the request is to put pv panels across the mansard roof that faces south. We approved some panels for this building in the past. **He doesn't see a particular** problem with the panels and doubted if many people will notice them.

Craig Buttke discussed the make-up of the panels and stated each of the 21 panels will be **5.18' long x 2.65' high and cover 110' of the 114' length of the roof**. The angle of the roof is 60 degrees.

Tom Mallison noted he doesn't have any problems whatsoever. Emmy J's has practiced a lot of energy conservation and this seems to be right along with that.

**Tom Mallison moved, seconded by Norm Myers, to accept the staff recommendation of approving the plan to install solar panels at 1009 First Street as presented with the condition that the panels do not overlay the signage on the building.**

**Ayes, Mallison, Myers, Beveridge, Siebert, Curtis, Walther, Halsey, and Hanson; Nays none; Kruthoff abstained. Motion carried.**

4. Discussion and possible action on the operation of the Historic Preservation/Design Review Commission including, but not limited to, meeting dates and times, selection of a designated agent, roles and responsibilities, and staff preparation.

Dir. Ostrowski noted he wants to get an update and set some parameters for the commission and make sure everything is working well. It seems that the new date and time is working well, the first Wednesday of the month at 4:30 p.m.

**The design guidelines haven't been updated in quite a while and he would like to run** copies for the commissioners to look over and possible discuss at the next meeting.

He reviewed the current duties of the designated and noted John Gardner has been the designated agent in the past.

Lee Beveridge noted he and John Gardner have reviewed requests for painting, roofing, signs, etc. They would discuss the guidelines and determine if staff approval was appropriate. Anything major would come before the commission.

Dir. Ostrowski discussed procedures at meetings and noted the order of presentation. Deliberation shall take place by the commission without interruption and other persons present must be recognized before they speak.

Tom Mallison noted wording should be added that people have to be recognized and that they are not allowed to cross-examine the petitioners or developers. They must direct the questions to the Chair and the Chair would direct questions to the applicant and/or commissioner if the Chair feels the questions are suitable.

Commissioners complimented Dir. Ostrowski on his staff reports. The new format is very understandable and the pictures are well done. They would like the reports to continue as they are.

5. Adjourn.

**Lee Beveridge moved, seconded by Norm Myers, to adjourn.  
Ayes all; Nays none; Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

# Administrative Staff Report

**Raze Building  
1000 Third Street  
December 1, 2010**



Department of Community Development

## Applicant(s):

- Community Development Authority of the City of Stevens Point

## Staff:

- Michael Ostrowski, Director  
Community Development  
Ph: (715) 346-1567  
Fax: (715) 346-1498  
[mostrowski@stevenspoint.com](mailto:mostrowski@stevenspoint.com)

## Parcel Number(s):

- 2408-32-2004-01

## Zone(s):

- "B-2" Central Business Transition District

## Master Plan:

- Downtown District

## Council District:

- District 1 – Tom Mallison

## Lot Information:

- Actual Frontage: 100 feet
- Effective Frontage: 100 feet
- Effective Depth: 65 feet
- Square Footage: 6,500
- Acreage: 0.149

## Structure Information:

- Year Built: 1910 (100 years)
- Number of Stories: 2

## Current Use:

- Vacant

## Request

Raze existing building.

## Attachment(s)

- Parcel data sheet
- January 21, 2009 HPDRC meeting minutes
- February 16, 2009 Common Council meeting minutes
- City Risk Manager's memorandum
- Building inspector's report
- Images of the building

## City Official Design Review / Historic District

- Design Review District

## Register of Historic Places

- -

## Staff Introduction

On January 21, 2009, the Historic Preservation / Design Review Commission denied the request to raze this building. At that time, the former owner of the building had stated that it was not financially feasible to preserve building. In addition, the City had another developer look at the building, and they were not interested in preserving the building. Please see the attached minutes of the January 21, 2009 HPDRC meeting.

Following these developments, the City appealed the HPDRC decision to the Common Council. On February 16, 2009, the Common Council failed to override the HPDRC's decision to deny razing of the building. Please see the attached minutes of the February 16, 2009 Common Council meeting.

On August 16, 2010, the Common Council overturned the HPDRC's decision to deny proposed plans to renovate this building into a seven, 1-bedroom apartment complex. Since then, the proposed project has not moved forward. On November 9, 2010, I received a memorandum from the City's Risk Manager expressing concerns with the condition of the building. Please see the attached memorandum. On November 10, 2010 the City building inspectors evaluated the building and found several condition issues. Please see their attached report.

Subsequently, the Community Development Authority (CDA) met on November 18, 2010 to decide how to address the current status of the

**Applicable Regulations:**

- Chapter 22
- Design Guidelines

building. At the November 18, 2010, the CDA decided to move forward with razing the building due to its deterioration, and resulting immediate safety concerns.

**Staff Recommendation**

Chapter 22 of the Municipal Code outlines the regulation of demolition of buildings:

- c) Regulation of Demolition. No permit to demolish all or part of an improvement in a historic district or a landmark, shall be granted by the building inspector except as follows:
1. At such time as such person applies for a permit to demolish such property, the commission may refuse to grant such written approval, or suspend action for a period of up to four (4) months from the time of such application. During such period, the applicant and the city shall cooperate in attempting to avoid demolition of the property. During this time, the owner shall take whatever steps are necessary to prevent further deterioration of the building. At the end of this four (4) month period, the commission shall act on the application by either granting or refusing to grant permission to demolish such property. The applicant may appeal any decision of the historic preservation/design review commission made under this paragraph to the common council.
  2. Standards. In determining whether to grant or deny the demolition request, the commission shall consider and may give decisive weight to the following:
    - a. Whether the building or structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the city or state.
    - b. Whether the building or structure, although not itself a landmark building, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole, and therefore, should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the city or the state.
    - c. Whether demolition of the subject property would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter and to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable district as duly adopted.
    - d. Whether the building or structure is of such old, unusual or uncommon design, texture, and/or material, that it could be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.
    - e. Whether retention of the building or structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the city or the state, by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design, or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage.
    - f. Whether the building or structure is in such a deteriorated condition that it is not structurally or economically feasible to preserve or restore it, provided that any hardship-or difficulty claimed by the owner which is the result of any failure to





[Return To Search Page](#)   [Return To Search Results](#)

2010   2009   2008   2007   2006   2005   2004   2003   2002   2001   2000   1999   1998   1997

**PARCEL / OWNER DATA**

NAME AND ADDRESS	PARCEL #	LAND USE	ALDERMANIC DISTRICT
City of Stevens Point 1515 Strongs Ave Stevens Point, WI 54481	240832200401	Government	
	PROPERTY ADDRESS		NEIGHBORHOOD
	1000 Third St		Cntrl Bus & 2nd St area(Comm)
	SUBDIVISION		ZONING
			M1-LIGHT INDUSTRIAL

**OWNERSHIP HISTORY\***

OWNER	SALE DATE	AMOUNT	CONVEYANCE	VOLUME	PAGE	SALE TYPE
City of Stevens Point	12/19/2007	\$68,000	Warranty Deed	712167		Land & Buildings
Kenneth L Lepak	7/21/2004	\$57,100	Warranty Deed	660010		Land & Buildings

**SITE DATA**

ACTUAL FRONTAGE	100.0
EFFECTIVE FRONTAGE	100.0
EFFECTIVE DEPTH	65.0
SQUARE FOOTAGE	6,500.0
ACREAGE	0.149

**PERMIT HISTORY\***

DATE	NUMBER	AMOUNT	PURPOSE	NOTE
10/25/2004	32831	\$0	070 Raze/Demolition	raze garage 20x20
10/25/2004	32831	\$0	036 Garage	5x12 add

**2010 ASSESSED VALUE**

CLASS	LAND	IMPROVEMENTS	TOTAL	RATIO	EST. FAIR MARKET VALUE
X4-Local Exempt		\$0	\$0	90.05%	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$0</b>

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

E 1/2 OF LOTS 4 & 5 BLK 26 V BROWN 2ND ADD 712167

**PROPERTY IMAGE**

**PROPERTY SKETCH**



**BUILDING SUPERSTRUCTURE DATA**

BLDG	SEC	OCCUPANCY	YEAR	AREA	FRAMING	HGT
1	2	Garage/Shop, Mas (C avg)	1910	1,152	Masonry - Avg	14
1	1	Warehse, Storage (C avg)	1910	5,083	Masonry - Avg	14
<b>TOTAL AREA</b>				<b>6,235</b>		

**BASEMENT DATA**

BLDG	SEC	ADJUSTMENT DESCRIPTION	AREA

**SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

SITE IMPROVEMENT	UNITS

**COMPONENTS**

COMPONENT DESCRIPTION	AREA

**STRUCTURE DATA**

AGE	100
YEAR BUILT	1910
EFF. YEAR	1950
ONE BEDROOM	n/a
TWO BEDROOM	n/a
THREE BEDROOM	n/a
TOTAL UNITS	n/a
STORIES	2.00
BUSINESS NAME	Warehouse

Disclaimer: Information shown here is considered accurate but not guaranteed.

\* Additional data may be available by contacting the assessors office.

Copyright 2010 Ruekert/ Mielke. All rights reserved.

Please contact [Webmaster](#) if you have any comments or questions about our site.

## REPORT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION/PRESERVATION

January 21, 2009

Present: Chm. Lee Beveridge, Kathy Kruthoff, William Love, Tom Ness, Bonnie Maher, Tim Siebert, Ald. Norm Myers, Bernice Sevenich

Also

Present: Jim Siebers, City Assessor; Sarah Robinson, Main Street Mgr.; Rich Sommer, Kathy Dugan, Bill Yudchitz

### 1. On-Site Visit – 1000 Third Street – 4:30 p.m.

Meeting convened at 4:30 at 1000 Third St. The Commission toured the interior and exterior of 1000 Third St. and viewed the exterior of 941 Portage St. (next door to 1000 Third St.)

### 2. Meet at City Conference Room – Approximately 5:15 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 5:05 pm at City Conference Room in County-City Building (all members of the Commission and public present).

### 3. Consideration and Possible Action on Request of City to Demolish 941 Portage St. and 1000 Third St.

John Gardner was asked who owned the buildings and why the buildings were requested to be demolished.

John Gardner stated the 2 buildings were owned by the City. They were purchased for the purpose of revitalizing the two-block area. The City also owns the former Lullaby site as well as the former Portesi building. The City purchased the land because we have been advised by developers that we cannot re-sell what we do not own. Developers will not enter into agreements for redevelopment unless the City controls the land. One of the reasons Travel Guard would not consider the downtown site is because they did not believe we could purchase and assemble the development site in a timely manner. We have been advised that the best way to market the property is to own it and to prepare the site for redevelopment. The City was also advised preparing the site includes clearing the site.

The City has had several contractors/developers review the property. Mr. Lepak, former building owner, is a local builder who advised us the costs to remodel and refurbish the building was not financially feasible. He stated major work included tuck pointing, major repairs on the roof structure, and other wall repairs. We also had the McCoy brothers tour the building. They are developers who have experience in rehabilitating buildings. They said they would not be interested in this building. The City inspectors, City Assessor, as well as other City public works staff reviewed the building. City staff members recommended its demolition.

Norm Myers asked how long the building has been vacant. Commission discussion estimated the building has been vacant since approximately 1997 with no one interested in the building.

Bonnie Maher felt the building was a solid building and was in better shape than the building at 1020 First St. before that building was rehabbed into apartments. She didn't see the need to hurry to tear it down. She felt that this building with its fancy brick work cornice and Italianate windows is representative of historic downtown buildings. She reminded the committee that the State Dept. of Historic Preservation recommendation regarding downtowns is to infill not to demolish.

Sarah Robinson, manager for the Association of Downtown Businesses, was asked her opinion. She said she hated to see buildings demolished but on the other hand the building has been empty for a number of years without any purchasers.

Cathy Dugan said the City has completed a relocation plan to acquire all the properties in these two blocks. Gardner said a relocation plan approved by the State of Wisconsin is necessary before the City acquires any occupied properties. The properties in question were not occupied. The relocation plan has been approved.

Bernice Sevenich said the former Quality Beverage building (1001 Union St.) was an old building that was rehabbed. She felt the same could happen here. Sevenich quoted "(3) Powers and Duties for Historic Preservation 2b. Whether the building or structure, although not itself a landmark building, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole, and therefore, should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City or the state." She felt this applied in this case.

An email from Mary McComb, member of the ADB Design Committee was distributed. The email encouraged not demolishing 1000 Third Street.

Norm Myers said he didn't think this building was comparable to the former Post Office. Some people have said we should have preserved the former Post Office and he agrees. But this building is not as good as the former Post Office.

Rich Sommer said he has been told the amount of energy expended to demolish any building and rebuild a new building is more than the total energy needed to remodel this building (carbon footprint is less to remodel).

**Tom Ness moved, seconded by Tim Siebert, to not tear down 1000 Third St.**

Bill Yudchitz said small rehab projects are easier for local builders/owners to undertake than large projects. He said his experience is there is no money in rehab projects.

**Ayes, Ness, Siebert, Beveridge, Kruthoff, Love, Maher, and Sevenich; Nays, Myers;  
Motion carried. (7-1)**

**Tom Ness moved, seconded by Norm Myers, that the Commission allow the tear  
down of the home at 941 Portage St.**

Bonnie Maher asked what the hurry is. Maher said that the house was over 50 years old and meets the minimum age requirement for a historic building. She stated this house is representative of the style of many of the downtown northside homes. She saw no hurry to tear it down

Jim Siebers said there is only a ¼ basement under the home. It has old electric. In his opinion, he did not think the home was in good shape. He also stated there was a large hole in the roof of the garage which he felt was unsafe and unsound.

John Gardner said the home was out of place in a block that would be redeveloped for other uses. Redevelopment of the property as a single family would not be reasonable because of the small size of the home in a mixed use area. He also clarified Maher's statement that the house is over 50 years old and may be old enough to qualify as historic based on age but, in his opinion, the house was not indicative of a specific style and was not eligible to be on the state or local register. Gardner pointed to interior pictures showing the home never contained fine woodwork but was constructed as a plain home.

Dugan said the City has begun demolition by authorizing the removal of hardwood from the home.

Maher said the home was illustrative of a type of home construction and was historic. Ness said just because the home is old does not make it historic.

Vote on motion to allow demolition of 941 Portage St.:

**Ayes, Ness, Myers, Love, Nays Beveridge, Kruthoff, Maher, Siebert, Sevenich  
Motion failed. ( 5-3)**

**Lee Beveridge moved, seconded by Tim Siebert, to deny demolition of the home at  
941 Portage St. but to allow demolition of the garage on the site.**

**Ayes, Beveridge, Siebert, Maher, Kruthoff, Ness, and Sevenich; Nays, Myers &  
Love. Motion passed (6-2)**

Kathy Kruthoff stated both items should come back to the Commission in the event there is a proposal to re-use the site which would require demolition of both structures.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm

Common Council  
Monday, February 16, 2009

**8. Review of Appeal of Request to Demolish 941 Portage Street and 1000 Third Street Pursuant to Sect. 22.03(4)(b)4 RMC - Demolition within Design Review District.** [Historic Preservation Minutes](#) | [January 13 Memo](#) | [February 11 Memo](#) | [Request to Appeal](#)

[Photo #1](#)

[Photo #2](#)

[Photo #3](#)

[Photo #4](#)

[Photo #5](#)

[Photo #6](#)

[Photo #7](#)

[Photo #8](#)

[Photo #9](#)

[Photo #10](#)

Sarah Robinson, 1600 Fremont Street, agrees with the decision of the Design Review Commission because the City does not have a developer in place and the Eagle Plumbing building could be used by a future developer. She said the building is rough but not in disrepair.

Bernice Sevenich, 1324 Fourth Avenue, is in favor of keeping the buildings intact. She said if the City continues to tear down all older buildings, there will not be any history left for the young people.

Rick Whipp, 2016 Main Street, encouraged the Council to demolish the buildings, saying that repairing and maintaining these buildings will be more costly. Mr. Whipp noted progress will be easier and more cost effective without the buildings.

Henry Korger, 3200 Water Street, said older buildings provide character and we need to preserve heritage.

Tom Brown, 317 Sixth Avenue, believes the City is obligated to preserve historic buildings. He suggested the City put the building up for sale and request proposals. Mr. Brown urged the Council to support the Design Review Commission and not tear the building down.

Mary Ann Laszewski, 1209 Wisconsin Street, asked that the buildings not be demolished. She suggested only considering developers that will consider these buildings as part of their development.

Cathy Dugan, 615 Sommers Street, agrees with the previous speakers who support saving the buildings.

Bob Woehr, 727 Second Street, said saving the buildings would be a liability for the City and they do not serve much purpose.

Mildred Neville, 1709 Jefferson Street, is concerned that the appeal came only a few days after the Design Review Commission's decision. She does not feel the ordinance was followed when this appeal was filed. Ms. Neville noted the appeal shall be in writing to the City Clerk and shall specify the grounds for the appeal. She said the appeal was only a short paragraph with no grounds included.

Jack Curtis, 717 Green Avenue, said when he asked why it was decided not to tear down the buildings, no one could give him an answer. He said a building in this condition has no future.

Ald. Stroik asked Comptroller/Treasurer Schlice to reiterate why the City should demolish the buildings.

Comptroller/Treasurer Schlice said as the City's Risk Manager, he has concerns with people breaking into the building. He said we have a liability with the building because it is owned by the City. The Comptroller/Treasurer said the building was sold to the City because it was too expensive to refurbish.

Ald. Stroik asked if there is a developer in line.

Mayor Halverson said there is no one in line particularly. He said the building is in extreme disrepair and there seems to be no logic for investment to refurbish it.

Ald. Stroik asked if it could be noticed in the newspaper to be purchased to either move the building or refurbish it.

Mayor Halverson said he would have the Comptroller/Treasurer and City Attorney handle the process.

Ald. Stroik said this is the opportunity for the Council to give someone a chance to do something with this building.

Ald. Wiza would like to split the question. He said the Council should consider postponing this since the appeal was not handled correctly.

Ald. Wiza moved, Ald. Heart seconded, to split the question having 941 Portage Street and 1000 Third Street voted on separately.

City Attorney Molepske asked why the alderman does not feel the appeal was handled correctly.

Ald. Wiza said based on what Ms. Neville stated regarding the City's policy, the appeal did not state why.

Mayor Halverson said he made the appeal in writing with the reasons why and turned them in simultaneously to the City Clerk.

City Attorney Molepske said he put together the initial appeal and the Mayor elected to write a complete memo outlining the reasons why.

Ald. Brooks asked if this is split, will the cost of demolition increase.

Comptroller/Treasurer Schlice said the bid for demolition was bid separately so there would be no difference.

Roll Call: Ayes majority.  
Nays Ald. Myers. Motion carried.

Ald. Myers said the Eagle Plumbing building is old and it is a liability to the City. He said the building needs to be torn down.

Ald. Walther is concerned with safety and with the warmer weather approaching there is an

increased risk for liability to the City.

Ald. Trzebiatowski is also concerned with safety.

Ald. Molski is not in favor of saving the building.

Ald. Heart said the risk is slight and the potential is awesome. She said the refurbished building is a great gateway to the downtown and encouraged the Council to agree with the decision of the Design Review Commission.

Ald. Wiza moved, Ald. Slowinski seconded, to open a 60 day window that would allow for people to partake with ideas and Director Gardner would determine their feasibility. If there are some feasible options, they will be brought back to the Plan Commission for review. If there is nothing that is feasible, the decision of the Historic Design Review Commission would be overridden and the building would be authorized for demolition.

Ald. Stroik added that there needs to be a detailed business plan for the building within the 60 days which includes financing.

Ald. Wiza noted that coming up with a business plan and financing in 60 days may be too short of a period. He hesitates to wait any longer. The alderman said he will leave it to the discretion of the Planning Department if the idea is viable.

Ald. Stroik is fearful it is too vague.

Mayor Halverson said there has to be some level of analysis to determine the feasibility of what will be developed.

Ald. Trzebiatowski suggested giving the building away and having it removed from the site.

Ald. Molski said someone could get hurt on this property.

Ald. Myers suggested that the building be demolished.

Ald. Wiza trusts Director Gardner's discretion for a viable business.

Mayor Halverson said there has to be a level of reasonableness that needs to be allocated to this debate.

Ald. Moore questioned if the structure is sound and why it has not been condemned.

Director Gardner said if a developer proposes to redevelop the project, the Inspectors would want an Engineer's approval that the building is structurally sound.

Mayor Halverson questions how sound the building is but he is not an engineer or architect.

Ald. Brooks does not feel the Eagle building fits the area.

Mayor Halverson stated the Eagle building did not have a historical use or materially architecturally significant details.

Ald. Heart said they cannot tear down a building with City history for the potential of a new building that may fit better for a developer.

Ald. Myers said not all buildings are historic.

Ald. Wiza said he is not saying the City should save the building but he wants to give someone the opportunity to save the building if they want to.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ald. Hanson, Wiza, Heart, Slowinski, Stroik.

Nays: Ald. Myers, Walther, Trzebiatowski, Molski, Brooks, Moore.

Ayes - 5. Nays - 6. Motion failed.

Ald. Trzebiatowski moved, Ald. Myers seconded, to override the Historic Preservation Commission decision and authorize the demolition.

Ald. Heart would like to know when the demolition would take place.

Comptroller/Treasurer Schlice stated once the permit is issued, it is up to the contractor's schedule.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ald. Moore, Brooks, Molski, Trzebiatowski, Walther, Myers.

Nays: Ald. Stroik, Slowinski, Heart, Wiza, Hanson.

Ayes - 6. Nays - 5. Motion failed by one vote not reaching the majority plus one designated in the ordinance.

Ald. Wiza moved, Ald. Moore seconded, to approve overriding the previous decision of the Historic Design Review Commission to authorize the demolition at 941 Portage Street.

Roll Call: Ayes: Ald. Myers, Walther, Hanson, Wiza, Heart, Slowinski, Trzebiatowski, Molski, Stroik, Brooks, Moore.

Nays: None. Motion carried.

City of Stevens Point  
1515 Strongs Avenue  
Stevens Point, WI 54481-3594  
FAX 715-346-1683



**John J. Schlice**  
**Comptroller/Treasurer**  
**CMFA-CMTW**

715-346-1573

e-mail: [jschlice@stevenspoint.com](mailto:jschlice@stevenspoint.com)

November 9, 2010

To: Director Michael Ostrowski  
From: C/T Schlice  
Re: 1000 Third St

As risk manager for the City of Stevens Point I am greatly concerned with the property condition of 1000 Third St which is owned by the City of Stevens Point. The City currently has barricades posted outside the building because the building is literally falling apart. My concern is what will happen when the winter rains penetrate parts of the building and freeze which has the potential for additional building deterioration.

I request that you send the building inspectors to the site for a complete evaluation of the integrity of the building and safety concerns of the building deteriorating and falling onto the sidewalk which causes a great exposure to injury of bypassing pedestrians and vehicles.

From my perspective as risk manager I feel the best current alternative for this building would be immediate demolition.

## Michael Ostrowski

---

**From:** Jim Zepp  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 10, 2010 11:49 AM  
**To:** Michael Ostrowski  
**Subject:** Inspection of Eagle Plumbing building  
**Attachments:** IMG\_0294.JPG; IMG\_0295.JPG; IMG\_0296.JPG; IMG\_0297.JPG; IMG\_0298.JPG; IMG\_0299.JPG; IMG\_0300.JPG; IMG\_0301.JPG; IMG\_0302.JPG; IMG\_0303.JPG; IMG\_0304.JPG; IMG\_0305.JPG; IMG\_0306.JPG; IMG\_0307.JPG; IMG\_0308.JPG; IMG\_0309.JPG; IMG\_0310.JPG

November 10, 2010

Michael,

As per our inspection today at 1000 Third St. (former Eagle Plumbing Building) we observed the following conditions:

- 1) Exterior foundation cracking and deteriorating
- 2) Exterior parapet wall deteriorated and in an unsafe condition
- 3) Exterior walls show structural cracking in several locations
- 4) Exterior chimney in an unsafe and deteriorated condition
- 5) Numerous holes in walls and roof
- 6) Some roof rafters have been cut and are in an unsafe condition
- 7) Interior walls, plumbing and electrical in an unsafe and deteriorated condition
- 8) Windows not in a sound and weather tight condition
- 9) Interior stairs in an unsafe condition
- 10) Interior floor not in a sound condition in certain locations

Overall evaluation: The building is in an unsafe and deteriorated condition and would require more than fifty percent of its assessed value to repair and reconstruct to meet the requirements of the International Existing Building Code. Our recommendation is to raze the structure to avoid liability and ensure the safety of the general public.

Jim Zepp  
Building Inspector  
City of Stevens Point  
Point

Brent Curless  
Building Inspector  
City of Stevens



















