REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday, February 2, 2011 – 4:30 p.m.

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Lee Beveridge, Ald. Tom Mallison, Tim Siebert, Jack Curtis, Hans Walther, Kathy Kruthoff, and Karl Halsey

EXCUSED: Norm Myers and George Hanson

ALSO PRESENT: Community Development Director Michael Ostrowski, Tom Wolf, and Cathy Dugan

---

INDEX:

1. Approval of the minutes of the December 1, 2010 HP/DRC meeting.
2. Discussion and possible action on a request from Tom Wolfe of Café 27, for an exterior building review of 945 Clark Street, for the purposes of adding an addition on to both the north and south sides of the building. Parcel ID 2408-32-2019-01.
3. Adjourn.

---

1. Approval of the minutes of the December 1, 2010 HP/DRC meeting.

   Motion by Siebert to approve the minutes as presented; seconded by Walther. Motion carried 6-0 (Halsey not present).

2. Discussion and possible action on a request from Tom Wolfe of Café 27, for an exterior building review of 945 Clark Street, for the purposes of adding an addition on to both the north and south sides of the building. Parcel ID 2408-32-2019-01.

   Motion by Kruthoff to approve only the addition to the south side of the building; seconded by Siebert.

   Seibert asked what the addition would look like. Director Ostrowski pointed out on the drawings that the south side of the building would be bumped out to make room for additional seating and service area. The exterior materials will be the same as the existing materials.

   Tom Wolf explained that the addition would come right up to the frame of the existing greenhouse, but would not remove it.

   Karl Halsey arrived.

Motion carried 6-0 with Halsey abstaining.

Motion by Siebert to approve the addition to the north side of the building; seconded by Mallison.

Kruthoff expressed her concern with loosing the drive in aspect of this building. It is a landmark and if we change the front of the building that would then change the historical aspect.

Siebert asked if the bump out would meet the existing addition?

Tom Wolf said yes it will. It will be the same as the addition in 2009. Mr. Wolf explained that no one really accesses the front. He hopes that he has shown respect to the historical character of the building with the 2009 addition. The original building is really inefficient for the operation of the business, and that is why he is coming back with the proposed additions.

Beveridge asked if the addition would remove all of the other building and the canopy, and would the new entry come into that area?

Tom Wolf stated that was correct. The addition would create a new entry area and the bakery counter would be moved to that area. Currently, patrons need to go all the way to the back of the building to pick up items.

Beveridge stated that he has the same concerns as Kruthoff, and that the architectural standards do not support this addition. If the addition happens as submitted, there is no longer a historical view, and no one will ever know that it was formally a drive-in.

Siebert read from a 2009 memo, "The removal or modifications of any distinguishing architectural feature of the building is not allowed unless safety is questioned."

Cathy Dugan asked if there is a way for Mr. Wolf to use the current area that is there for the bakery counter?

Tom Wolf responded that not for a clear flow of customers, as the space is very small.

Mallison stated that there is only about eight to ten feet if you cut out the counters.

Kruthoff asked what types of materials would be used in the addition?

Tom Wolf stated that they would be using block and aluminum windows again, the same materials and colors as the 2009 addition.

Mallison said that he can see both sides of the discussion, but the building has been altered so much, that just this small section on the north side remains, and is not even recognizable as a root beer stand.

Siebert stated that the original building has not really changed much, just that there has been an addition around it.

Beveridge said he can still see the root beer stand, and what we did approve in the past, filling in space that was unoccupied, should not affect the decision today of changing the existing structure.

Beveridge called for a vote.

Motion carried 4-3 with Beveridge, Siebert, and Kruthoff voting in the negative.

3. Adjourn.

Motion by Beveridge to adjourn; seconded by Siebert. Motion carried 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.