

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday, September 2, 2015 –4:30 p.m.

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Lee Beveridge, Alderperson Garrett Ryan, Commissioner Tim Siebert, Commissioner Sarah Scripps, and Commissioner Bob Woehr.

ABSENT: Commissioner Tom Baldischwiler and Commissioner Joe Debauche

ALSO PRESENT: Director Ostrowski, Associate Planner Kyle Kearns, Comptroller/Treasurer Corey Ladick, Alderperson Kneebone, Dale Warner, Jeff Peterson, Brandi Makuski, Jackson Case, Andrew Green, and Jonathan Vauer.

INDEX:

Discussion and possible action on the following:

1. A physical inspection of the site described below by the Commission will take place at **4:00 PM**:
 - The first and only site to be inspected will be 1055 Main Street;

Following the site inspection referenced above, the Commission will convene its formal meeting at **4:30 PM** in the City Conference Room, 1515 Strongs Avenue for discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Approval of the report from the July 1, 2015 HP/DRC meeting.
3. Request from Jeff Peterson, representing the property owner, for design review approval to construct an addition at **2101 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-33-2006-04)**.
4. Façade Improvement Grant Program summary.
5. Request from DBGreen LLC., for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$119,445.00 and design review for exterior building work at **1055 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2026-11)**.
6. Design Guideline review relating to regulating paint color.
7. Adjourn.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

1. A physical inspection of the site described below by the Commission will take place at **4:00 PM**:
 - The first and only site to be inspected will be 1055 Main Street;

Following the site inspection referenced above, the Commission will convene its formal meeting at **4:30 PM** in the City Conference Room, 1515 Strongs Avenue for discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Approval of the report from the July 1, 2015 HP/DRC meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the minutes of the July 1, 2015 HP/DRC meeting; seconded by Commissioner Scripps.

Commissioner Woehr stated a correct on page two of the minutes, clarifying he was not the one who read a portion of the Design Guidelines, but instead asked another Commissioner to read them. Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated that change would be noted.

Motion carried 5-0.

3. Request from Jeff Peterson, representing the property owner, for design review approval to construct an addition at **2101 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-33-2006-04)**.

Jeff Peterson, J. L. Peterson Builders, explained the addition is attached to the house through an existing porch.

Commissioner Woehr asked if any type of zoning permit would be needed to which Director Ostrowski stated no, the zoning is ok. He then asked if the siding would match the rest of the home, to which Mr. Peterson stated yes and they do not see any issues with the other conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Siebert asked how much space will be between the south side of the home and the north side of the garage, to which Mr. Peterson stated less than 10 feet, so a firewall will be required, and all the exterior materials will match to the rest of the house.

Motion by Alderperson Ryan to approve the request from Jeff Peterson, representing the property owner, for design review approval to construct an addition at 2101 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-33-2006-04 with the following conditions:

- **Columns at the addition entrance shall match those found at the front of the home, without stone.**
- **The overhang at the entrance of the addition shall be shingled.**
- **Trees shall not be removed during the construction of the addition.**
- **Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.**
- **All applicable building permits shall be obtained.**

Commissioner Beveridge asked if the windows on the house were all original, Mr. Peterson answered that they have been replaced. Mr. Warner added that the house does have a variety of different style grids to it, but the plan is to match the windows to the patters that are existing in the area of the addition.

Seconded by Commissioner Siebert.

Commissioner Beveridge asked what type of material is the siding, to which Mr. Peterson answered a vinyl shake.

Commissioner Woehr asked if there is an issue with any of the trees on site due to staff recommendations to not remove any of the trees, to which Mr. Warner stated there is a plum tree which is about 10-15 feet tall that is in the foot print of the addition, which would need to be removed.

Aldersperson Ryan amended his motion to approve the request from Jeff Peterson, representing the property owner, for design review approval to construct an addition at 2101 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-33-2006-04 with the following conditions:

- **Columns at the addition entrance shall match those found at the front of the home, without stone.**
- **The overhang at the entrance of the addition shall be shingled.**
- **Trees shall not be removed during the construction of the addition with the exception of the plum tree located by the garage.**
- **Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.**
- **All applicable building permits shall be obtained.**

Seconded Commissioner Siebert.

Motion carried 5-0.

4. Façade Improvement Grant Program summary.

Economic Specialist Kyle Kearns explained we have allocated approximately \$172,059 so far leaving us with \$172,490 left in the fund. The next agenda item involves a large request, which would likely take up the majority of the remaining funds. We still have had interest from other applicants downtown that would like to do Façade Improvement Grant Program projects in the future. At this point we have not talked to Common Council to see if funds could be replenished, but that is an option as well.

Commissioner Scripps asked if council would replenish the same amounts, to which Director Ostrowski answered there are 3-4 projects that may be requested, one of which that is not downtown, but definitely an historic structure which may be a large project as well.

5. Request from DBGreen LLC., for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$119,445.00 and design review for exterior building work at **1055 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2026-11).**

Commissioner Siebert feels that the effort to restore this building as close to original is great, and he is ok with the project. Commissioner Beveridge agreed.

Commissioner Scripps asked why the request is for \$90,000, to which Director Ostrowski explained this building meets all the goals set forth by the grant. The building is in three sections and has two facades. Jackson Case of Guzman Case asked why the city would only put forth \$90,000, to which Director Ostrowski explained that the building can be separated into three separate fronts. In that

case the façade improvement grant funds allows for a maximum of \$30,000 per building, and with the multiple fronts the argument can be made for \$90,000 and that since it has been vacant for so long this improvement will help in filling it. Mr. Case then asked if the approval from the Historic Preservation was received, would there still be a need to go before the Common Council, to which Director Ostrowski stated yes any approvals above the \$30,000 maximum would still need the finance and council's approval.

Commissioner Woehr asked Mr. Green if the \$90,000 would be able to still have the project move forward, to which Mr. Green stated as long as the bids are reduced. Mr. Case pointed out this is a large scale structure downtown, the owner wants to restore it historically correct, and there will be lots of dollars invested into this project. Mr. Green added nothing really needs to be done to the façade, but the building will be a center piece of the downtown.

Commissioner Beveridge emphasized the guideline is a maximum of \$30,000 per building, and anything beyond that is approved by finance and the common council.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns reminded the Commission that one bid has been received for the project activities thus far. The requirement of the grant is to receive two bids. Typically in the past, the lower of the bids have been approved based on the staff recommendations. With the significance of this project and the additional funds, staff is making the recommendation to get three bids. Again with that being said, we have the condition that the lowest of the bids or the bids would be reviewed by the chairperson and staff to ensure that the work being performed is comparable in the marketplace.

Mr. Case argued that staff recommends a second bid or multiple bids, and on the next page it states a minimum of three bids. In the process of renovation there is not a well defined scope of work and it changes as the project goes on. To obtain a second comparable bid is not really possible.

Commissioner Beveridge responded that the commission is aware of that, and would approve based on the plan provided, but is flexible based on what is found as the project develops. Mr. Kearns added that the bids give the commission a starting place and is flexible within reason, but this is what the application process requires and has done for all other applicants. Alderperson Ryan pointed out that Guu's renovations are a good example and that they did have to come back for some amendments as the project continued, Mr. Kearns added the initial request was for the front façade, and they did come back for approval to the rear façade.

Mr. Case clarified they are possibly in the position to receive the grant for \$90,000, however, a second or third proposal is still going to be above the amounts of the total cost of the project, so he asked what is gained by having the bids required. Director Ostrowski explained the requirement for two bids is outlined in the design guideline requirements that were approved by Common Council. Council has given the authority to the Historic Preservation Commission to issue these funds without going back for approval unless there are certain criteria, such as exceeding the maximum, extraordinary condition such as not wanting to get two bids.

Commissioner Siebert asked if we could recommend two bids at the Historic level, to which Director Ostrowski stated yes.

Alderperson Ryan asked if Mr. Green called a contractor for other bids, would it not give him an advantage to possibly get a better deal, to which Mr. Case stated there is more than one way to bid a project. With the work he is doing on bidding this project, we would work through a process where payments are made on invoices plus a percentage instead of a cost basis. The design build works in a way that the best product is created for the best price and the project actually costs less.

Commissioner Woehr asked if there were additional bids, the project would have to be specifically laid out as to the work to be completed, to which Director Ostrowski stated yes.

Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the Request from DBGreen LLC., for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$119,445.00 and design review for exterior building work at 1055 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2026-11) with the following conditions:

- **Type N mortar as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) shall be used, matching in color and texture to the original mortar.**
- **The applicant shall inform the designated agent of any changes to window and door activities prior from occurring, upon which the chairperson and designated agent shall have the authority to review and approve changes.**
- **Windows and doors shall be of a clear/transparent finish, more so resembling the original glass, except for windows and doors along the south façade which would be permitted to have a limited tint due to the high exposure of the sun.**
- **The applicant shall submit window and door trim color to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent. The color shall be consistent for all window and door trim on the building.**
- **New windows and doors shall be of the same design and material as originals being restored.**
- **Mechanical equipment located on the first floor rooftop (rooftop deck) shall be screened using fencing to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.**
- **The applicant shall submit details regarding rooftop fencing, i.e. height, color, etc. to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.**
- **Fence supports should be fastened to the façade within brick mortar.**
- **All windows shall match exactly the window opening.**
- **Due to the cost of the project and the request to secure funds over the \$30,000 maximum, a minimum of two bids shall be submitted for the proposed activities. Both bids shall list detailed components for each project activity.**
- **All work shall be completed within one year, with extensions up to one additional year to be approved by the chairperson and designated agent.**
- **Project must adhere to Façade Improvement Grant Program Guidelines.**
- **No funds shall be disbursed until project is fully completed.**

- **The chairperson and designated agent shall have the authority to review and /or approve minor amendments to the project.**
- **The maximum City participation shall not exceed \$90,000. Individual line items shall be reviewed and approved upon receiving the additional bids.**

Mr. Green asked if more funds were made available, would he then have to come back through the approval and design process, to which Director Ostrowski stated yes if there are funds available it will need to come back to the Historic Preservation Commission, Finance, and Common Council for approvals. Mr. Kearns added that a contract amendment would be needed at that time as well.

Seconded by Commissioner Woehr. Motion carried 5-0.

6. Design Guideline review relating to regulating paint color.

Mr. Kearns explained this discussion came up at the last commission meeting. He had reached out to the State of Wisconsin regarding feedback for regulating paint color. The State identified only two communities that regulate paint colors and that was for painting of buildings only. The articles provided by the state were very vague in nature and were directed more to the property owner than to a regulation by commission. As it sits now within our guidelines, paint is not recommended to be regulated, but we do have flexibility for awnings and signs. At the end of the packet there have been some historic color palettes provided from Sherwin Williams which allow for regulation based on type of architecture and type of design. If the commission wanted to regulate paint, you could adopt these color palettes.

Commissioner Siebert pointed out that we have regulated paint in the past, to which Director Ostrowski pointed out that was prior to the updated design guidelines. He also pointed out that the state does not regulate paint.

Mr. Kearns recommended that if paint is regulated, we must reference a color palette due to the review being arbitrary and at the discretion of the Commission.

Commissioner Woehr asked what was the City Attorney's opinion regarding dictating color. Director Ostrowski stated there would have to be an amendment to the Design Guidelines and a palette of color provided. Commissioner Scripps asked how specific does the color have to be, to which Director Ostrowski stated the same shade or similar.

Mr. Kearns clarified you typically decide paint based on the architecture of the building, the era the building was constructed, furthermore identifying what are the types of color palettes that existed with that building and era. He finished identifying this method will take a great deal of staff time to research colors, architecture, etc. Director Ostrowski added the other thing to consider is new buildings, and what would be expected of them.

Commissioner Beveridge stated he is having a hard time understanding why are the other Historic Commissioners not regulating paint colors. Director Ostrowski answered that the State commented that paint can be changed easily.

Aldersperson Ryan asked if we could use general wording verses having direct and specific language.

Commissioner Scripps asked if there was wordage as to how the other municipalities addressed the color issue. Mr. Kearns stated he called a community and found paint to be regulated similarly to how this commission operated previously, which was at the digression of the commission, with no paint palette cited.

Director Ostrowski stated that staff can draft some examples of the wording if that is what the commission would like. He added that we do have a resource called the American Planning Service which can do some of the research for us. Commissioner Siebert and Commissioner Scripps agreed that would be great to do before we push through regulations.

Mr. Green stated from a business owner and investor in the downtown, he does not want a bad color to be next to his building considering the funding it will cost him to restore it.

7. Adjourn.

Adjourn 5:38 pm.