

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday October 5, 2016 – 4:00 PM

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Lee Beveridge, Alderperson Ryan, Commissioner Siebert, Commissioner Scripps, Commissioner Baldischwiler, and Commissioner Woehr.

ABSENT: Commissioner Joe Debauche

ALSO PRESENT: Associate Planner Kearns, Scott Dimler, Jim Roecker, Bailey Voigt, Chad Piotrowski, Jay Servis, and Joyce Waite.

---

INDEX:

1. Approval of the report of the September 7, 2016 HP/DRC meeting.
2. Request from Bailey Voigt, representing the property owner, for design review to install multiple wall signs at **1009 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-04)**.
3. Request from Joyce Waite, for design review to replace siding, trim, and porches at **1801 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-1027-06)**.
4. Adjourn.

- 
1. Approval of the report of the September 7, 2016 HP/DRC meeting.

**Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the report of the September 7, 2016 HP/DRC meeting; seconded by Alderperson Ryan.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

2. Request from Bailey Voigt, representing the property owner, for design review to install multiple wall signs at **1009 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-04)**.

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request and staff report and identified the staff recommendation to approve the signs with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Beveridge asked for clarification on a planter removed on the site, to which Mr. Kearns confirmed, and stated the planter was recommended to be maintained and restored by the Commission during the original design review request.

Commissioner Beveridge inquired about removal of glass block on the north façade and urged the block to be maintained. Furthermore, he referenced the request to install a cabinet sign on the west façade smaller than the existing cabinet.

Commissioner Siebert ask for clarification on gooseneck style lighting. Mr. Kearns answered stating is exterior lighting above signage with a cut off fixture casting light down onto the sign.

Commissioner Woehr questioned the sign proposed over glass block and whether it was proposed to be translucent or internally lit. Bailey Voigt, representing the property owner, responded by indicating glass block is proposed to be removed, as some block is damaged. She went on to state upon removal, clear glass would be installed and an etched film of the logo and lettering would be

installed. Commissioner Woehr added that light would then shine through and illuminate the stairwell, to which Mrs. Voigt confirmed and added it would be ambient lighting.

Commissioner Woehr questioned access once into the facility via the main entrance. Scott Dimler, property owner, answered by saying upon entering, stairwells exist going up and down.

Commissioner Woehr asked what type of damage has occurred to the glass block. Scott Dimler said a few blocks are cracked and smashed out, and cited any repairs would be an additional expense.

Commissioner Beveridge stated in the past, things have similarly been required to be covered or sealed in, but not removed. Furthermore, he mentioned the proposed west cabinet sign face is not exactly the same size as what is existing and removal of an existing cabinet sign would not allow a new sign. Bailey Voigt clarified that the electronic message center sign is a self-contained cabinet sign, and cannot be placed within an existing cabinet sign. She added an option exists to retro-fit an electronic message center into an existing cabinet sign as a module face, but lacks in quality.

Commissioner Woehr asked if the electronic message center sign would have scrolling text. Mrs. Voigt responded by stating the applicant has a similar sign at their Village of Plover location in a residential area. Scott Dimler mentioned the sign would be used to advertise the weekly events and service times which would be a changing text.

Commissioner Siebert stated that to be consistent with previous request and Commission action, the request for an electronic message center should be denied.

Bailey Voigt stated her understanding that the denial of the previous electronic message center sign was because of the building location on Main Street and near residential second-story apartments. Commissioner Siebert indicated that both locations are within the Historic Downtown Design Review District and historic character needs to be maintained.

Commissioner Ryan questioned whether the distressed text of the individual channel letter sign can be constructed of metal or vinyl overlaid over metal. Mrs. Voigt answered that the background colors would be a solid piece with dimensional letters that have a white film on them.

Commissioner Scripps asked for staff to clarify the past review of electronic message centers and their location within the sign ordinance. Associate Planner Kearns clarified that changeable copy signs are permitted within the downtown B-3 zoning district, however, as time progressed and automatic copy signs were added to the ordinance, they were not incorporated wholly throughout the ordinance. He also proceeded to mention other locations within the downtown where electronic message centers exist and were approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Scripps cited that nearby residents could be distracted by the electronic message center signs, and asked if this was a concern for this location. Mr. Kearns identified residential units to the west of the property. Mr. Kearns added that restrictions could be added onto the approval of an electronic message center sign, for example, controlling the scroll time of text.

Commissioner Woehr stated that no signs can be flashing in the district.

Commissioner Beveridge stated the recommendation within the guidelines is to allow re-face of existing cabinet signs and the request is totally different. Furthermore, he indicated that the sign ordinance is to eliminate an over prolific amount of signage downtown, and furthermore cited previous signage. Lastly, he asked the applicant if the ability existed to insert a message center in the existing cabinet.

Bailey Voigt said it is possible to replace the face and include a digital sign, but the quality of the sign is reduced with this method as a retro-fit design is needed. She then stated the ability to provide a new face to the existing cabinet sign with just the logo and name of the church.

Commissioner Beveridge commented that there were no electronic signs on the building upon its construction.

**Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the installation of three new wall signs as proposed, two individual channel letter signs, and one glass sign at 1009 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2020-04) subject to the following conditions:**

1. Signage shall be installed within the brick/stone mortar joints.
2. Individual channel letter signs shall be constructed of metal, such as aluminum.
3. Gooseneck style lighting shall be installed for the individual channel letter signs, to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.
4. No new cabinet sign shall be installed, however, the existing cabinet sign shall be permitted to have a new face installed.
5. Glass block on the north façade shall be repaired and maintained, but shall be permitted to be covered with the proposed glass sign.

Commissioner Ryan questioned the material of the signage, to which Mr. Kearns stated his recommended is to require the signs be constructed of metal, and the guidelines recommend a more historically appropriate material.

**seconded by Commissioner Baldischwiler**

**Motion Carried 5-0.**

3. Request from Joyce Waite, for design review to replace siding, trim, and porches at **1801 Clark Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-1027-06)**.

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request and staff report by the applicant to install aluminum siding and reconstruct the western and southern porch. He then stated staff's recommendation to deny vinyl siding, but approve a wooden siding, and reconstruction of both porches.

Aldersperson Ryan asked if the color of the original siding is known, to which, Jay Servis, contractor, responded that red was the color, and added there were two layers of siding on the home, a wood clap board siding, and a red cedar siding. Mr. Servis continued stating that a red colored siding is proposed. Lastly, he summarized the situation and cited the owners application for a loan to CAP Services, upon which a vinyl siding was recommended. Furthermore, he indicated the state entity for historic preservation review approved the vinyl siding.

Joyce Waite, property owner, explained she attended a previous meeting and spoke to City staff where she was told she can do whatever she wants with her property and it is not historic. She went on to clarify the meeting was held at the library recently.

Mr. Kearns stated a meeting at the library occurred earlier this year, upon which a state representative spoke and provided a presentation on state historical tax credits. Mr. Kearns went on to say that the state has jurisdiction for review in State and National historic districts where tax credits are requested, and the City of Stevens Point has only one State and National historic district, Mathias Mitchell Public Square Historic District. Two additional districts exist in the City as locally designated districts, which include the Historic Downtown Design Review District and the Clark

Street Historic District. Lastly, he indicated these districts have separate regulations and the State or National District regulations do not apply to the locally designated districts.

Jay Servis stated the proposed vinyl siding is a 0.044 thickness siding, and mentioned he has examples of other types of siding.

Chap Piotrowski asked if any City funding exists to assist with the project, to which Mr. Kearns identified that no funding exists. Mr. Kearns went on to mention that a previous grant existed which has been extinguished, but only commercial properties were eligible for funding. Chad commented that CAP Services are trying to keep the costs down when funding the project and also trying to alleviate on-going maintenance as the applicant is retiring soon.

Commissioner Beveridge stated that the problem is that there was no maintenance done on the siding. He went on to state that the Clark Street Historic District was created by home owners wanting to preserve properties. Lastly he discerned his belief that wood siding should be installed and porches should be reproduced as originally built.

Commissioner Woehr asked if a permit was issued for any work on the home, with which Mr. Kearns responded stating a re-roofing permit was issued, as shingles were replacing shingles. Commissioner Woehr then asked if the existing porches were removed, to which Mr. Servis said correct. Mr. Servis went on to state porches were rotted and falling down once siding was removed.

Commissioner Woehr identified his frustration with siding removal, and porch removal being performed prior to a building permit being obtained. Mr. Servis clarified that he usually begins work and obtains a permit the same day. He went on to state that with this project, after being told of the situation, siding continued to be removed and dried-out in order to ensure the owner had a dry house. Furthermore he said when porch reconstruction began he was told a permit cannot be issued, but upon discovering the rot, new posts needed to be built to hold the existing porch roof. Lastly, he described the footings for the porch.

Commissioner Ryan asked what has been the Commission's justification in the past for approving vinyl or synthetic siding, to which Mr. Kearns stated many projects may have been approved prior to the adoption of the new design guidelines in 2014. Mr. Kearns added that cost, difficulty in obtaining materials, maintenance, improved efficiency in products, and other factors have been taken into consideration.

Commissioner Ryan asked if a shake style siding is proposed or a lap board siding. Mr. Servis responded that vinyl siding is proposed, but LP siding, hardy-board, or a vinyl shake, which is nearby on a green house, can be pursued. He proceeded to show examples and mentioned that a pre-finished cedar-shake siding cannot be obtained, and he would have to finish the siding, which also creates additional cost and maintenance in the future.

Commissioner Ryan mentioned that the Commission previously approved a synthetic fiberboard siding for his newly constructed garage. Commissioner Beveridge clarified that new construction differs from existing.

Jay Servis commented that the western porch has twelve feet of double hung or slider windows. Furthermore, he stated the existing windows on the home are double hung.

Commissioner Beveridge asked what previously supported the porch and porch roofs, to which Mr. Servis responded by indicating that brick stacks and wooden posts encased in hollow boxes supported the porch. He referenced pictures submitted within the application and cited that prior to the recent reconstruction the roofs were slanted and would have collapsed.

Commissioner Beveridge asked if the original porch floor slanted away from the house, to which Mr. Servis stated correct, at some point someone put a roof on. Commissioner Beveridge commented that likely the porch was originally covered, but open.

Joyce Waite asked for clarification as to whether the porches needed to match the home construction or time when she purchased to home. Commissioner Beveridge said the guidelines recommend changes to reflect the time of building construction and materials used during construction.

Commissioner Scripps asked if this home will be part of the potential expanded Clark Street / Main Street District, to which Mr. Kearns said yes, the home will remain as part of the existing locally designated district, but will also potentially be a State and National historic district as well, which would allow for the ability to obtain tax credits for restoration projects. He added the district expansion and nomination would not be final for at least two years. Further conversation ensued about the State historical tax credit program.

Joyce Waite asked if there is any way the side porch can be enclosed, as the enclosure would assist in insulating the house. Commissioner Beveridge responded that the porch was likely not originally enclosed. Ms. Waite stated that the home was not originally the same size and has been enlarged, and questioned if enclosure could occur if the porch size was maintained.

Commissioner Beveridge said that reconstruction should occur with historically accurate materials and design.

**Commissioner Scripps motioned to deny the request to install vinyl siding, but approve the installation of wood siding and approve the request to reconstruct porches on the western and southern façade subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The applicant shall submit a wooden siding option more closely matching the design, material, and color of the original siding, to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.**
- 2. Porches shall not be enclosed.**
- 3. All applicable building and zoning codes shall be met prior to construction.**
- 4. All required permits shall be obtained prior to construction.**

Commissioner Ryan asked how CAP Services would respond to the requirement and motion made, given they are providing a loan to the property owner. Chad Piotrowski summarized that in his time with CAP Services they pursue vinyl siding as they see lead and asbestos on homes where the vinyl would have an encapsulating effect.

Commissioner Ryan asked what project should have required a permit, to which Mr. Kearns stated roofing, siding and porch reconstruction would all require a permit. He went on to state that the re-roofing permit was given as staff has the authority to approve reroofing of like materials.

**seconded by Commissioner Ryan**

**Motion Carried 5-0.**

4. Adjourn.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:54 PM.**