

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Friday, October 6, 2017 – 2:00 PM

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Beveridge, Alderperson Jennings, Commissioner Siebert, Commissioner Scripps, Commissioner Debauche, and Commissioner Woehr.

ALSO PRESENT: Associate Planner Kearns, Carl Hurrish, Lee Portmann, and Randy Balko.

INDEX:

1. Roll Call

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Request from Commercial Roofing Inc. for design review to install a roof membrane material behind parapet walls at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651).
3. Request from Angus Young Associates for design review to install windows at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651).
4. Adjourn.

1. Roll Call.

Present: Beveridge, Jennings, Siebert, Scripps, Debauche, Woehr

Excused: Baldischwiler

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Request from Commercial Roofing Inc. for design review to install a roof membrane material behind parapet walls at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651).

Associate Planner Kearns briefly stated that the County was in the process of doing renovations and updates to the Portage County Library which was currently owned by the City. There were two requests to consider, the first being the installation of a roof membrane behind an existing parapet wall to provide a better seal, and the second was to replace existing windows. He further explained that the parapet wall was slightly visible from the right-of-way, in addition to the design guidelines stating that brick should not be covered, but repaired or tuck pointed appropriately if in disrepair. However, since the repair would not take place on the front plane of the building, it did make sense to move forward with the request in order to improve the efficiency of the roof. Furthermore it would stop the deteriorating of the brick, adding that most of the brick had previously been covered in plaster and paint. Staff recommended approval with conditions stated in the staff report. The applicant was available to provide additional information.

Chairperson Beveridge asked why the request was being brought up at the last minute, to which Associate Planner Kearns explained that while the County had been planning the project for quite some time, they may not have been aware that exterior improvements needed to go through Historic Preservation review. That being the case, the contractors had already been scheduled to start the roof project, but were waiting for approval for the parapet wall to finish it.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if the only exposed brick were the ones that had already been plastered over, to which that was confirmed correct.

Chairperson Beveridge asked how the proposed covering would be fastened to the brick that was not currently covered.

Lee Portmann, with Commercial Roofing, Inc., explained that the membrane would be fully adhered to the brick and then terminated either with a termination bar or stripped in with a piece of rubber based on where the detail was stopped. The membrane was currently terminated with a termination bar.

Commissioner Siebert asked for clarification on what a termination bar was, to which examples were shown.

Lee Portmann further explained that portions of the white covering may be visible on the inside portion of the parapet wall, but that the outward facing face would not be touched. Their goal was to seal the brick to preserve the interior of the building from leaking. If the corner leaked, he stated, it wouldn't be covered because the warranty would stop at the termination bar.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if the membrane would go over the flashing and then be tucked.

Lee Portmann noted that the flashing was most likely ripped away during a storm, adding that there were no plans to touch or alter it. He proposed bringing the membrane up over the top of the parapet wall and sealing it.

Chairperson Beveridge asked how far up they were planning to go, to which Lee Portmann noted they were planning to go completely up and over the wall, but stopping before it was visible on the outside wall, roughly an inch from the outside edge with white rubber.

Chairperson Beveridge noted the exposed flashing at the top on the north wall, and asked what was underneath it.

Lee Portmann stated that the flashing was exposed when they got on site, suggesting that it could have occurred during a storm. He stated that the area was badly porous and deteriorated, and that the fasteners and nails had rotted out.

Chairperson Beveridge asked whether there would be any brick repair, to which Mr. Portmann noted that there were no plans to repair the brick, and if it would be required, another contractor would need to do the work.

Commissioner Scripps pointed to one of the conditions of approval that required the repair of the deteriorated brick by a professional mason.

Lee Portmann noted that it wouldn't need to be tuck pointed if the rubber membrane was to cover it. Adding that the repair would have to occur before the membrane went on if required.

Commissioner Debauche asked for confirmation that there would be no exposed brick once it was covered by the membrane, to which Mr. Portmann confirmed that there would be no exposed brick on the backside of the parapet wall.

Associate Planner Kearns stated that those conditions had been included due to there being other exposed and deteriorated brick walls.

Commissioner Woehr noted that any moisture in the wall would remain in the wall once it was covered with the membrane and would continue to deteriorate underneath it. He recommended that if the request was approved, that condition one be enforced.

Lee Portmann stated that normally bricks contained weep holes in the event that happened which would prevent any additional moisture once it was out.

Chairperson Beveridge asked whether the process could be reversed, to which Mr. Portmann stated that while the membrane could be pulled off the wall, the bricks would most likely be pulled off along with it.

Commissioner Siebert stated that it didn't make sense to leave loose brick in even if the membrane were to cover them.

Lee Portmann stated that the bricks were loose where the metal had been removed. Additionally, there were stress cracks and missing mortar right below that area.

Commissioner Siebert asked whether the section that was still attached would have to be peeled back as well.

Commissioner Scripps asked if there was a timeframe available for obtaining a mason to do the work as it could add a sense of urgency to the request.

Lee Portmann stated that they could still terminate the roof as is and that it would stay that way until further notice, which was just above the existing termination bar.

Carl Hurrish, Assistant Facilities Director for Portage County, noted that the project would be on hold until they were able to contract a mason. If they were just replacing or tuck pointing the exposed brick, it wouldn't add too much of a time constraint as opposed to also needing to pull metal back which could expose more extensive issues.

Chairperson Beveridge briefly discussed several options for the parapet wall with Mr. Hurrish.

Aldersperson Jennings, for clarification on staff recommendations, reiterated that the brick would need to be repaired, to which Associate Planner Kearns confirmed that was correct. Additionally, that would also require that any damaged flashing was also repaired with appropriate or matching flashing.

Aldersperson Jennings asked if there was anything keeping them from moving forward with the project, to which Mr. Portmann confirmed that they could still do the contracted wall, minus the parapet wall.

Aldersperson Jennings noted that tuck pointing could then occur at any time in the future then be sealed after.

Associate Planner Kearns further explained that unless the City's building inspector deemed it a hazard or found it to be in violation of the Maintenance and Occupancy Code, the applicants would not be required to make the repairs as the commission did not have the authority to force repairs. The tuck pointing would be at the decision of the County as they were responsible for the improvements of the building. He further explained that if the roof was terminated at the termination bar and the inspector did not identify that it needed to be repaired, then it could remain as is. If the request was approved, he stated, the applicant could cover the parapet wall if they met the conditions within the staff report, otherwise they could do the roof up to the existing termination bar only.

Motion by Aldersperson Jennings to approve the request from Commercial Roofing Inc. for design review to install a roof membrane material behind parapet walls at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651) with the following conditions:

- 1. Deteriorated brick along the parapet walls shall be repaired by a professional mason.**
- 2. Type N mortar shall be used when filling brick joints, matching in color and texture of the existing mortar.**

3. **Metal flashing along the parapet wall shall be repaired and replaced where deteriorated with a metal flashing matching the existing.**
4. **The roof membrane shall terminate at the top of the parapet walls and shall not extend to the western or northern facades.**

seconded by Commissioner Siebert

Motion Carried 5-0.

5. Request from Angus Young Associates for design review to install windows at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651).

Randy Balko, representing Eagle Construction, arrived.

Associate Planner Kearns briefly explained that they were also requesting the installation of new seven windows on the north and west façade. The proposed picture design windows were not consistent with the design guidelines, adding that they were required to replace them similar to the original or repair the existing ones. Additionally, he was not aware of the state of deterioration of the existing windows and whether they could or could not be repaired, but the applicant was present in order to provide additional information. While staff recommended denial, he explained that staff recommended that a single or double hung design be pursued with additional conditions if approved by the commission.

Aldersperson Jennings asked what the justification was for the replacement.

Carl Hurrish stated that they were trying to preserve the integrity of the building. The wooden windows were deteriorated, and allowed for moisture to seep in, in addition to being inefficient for heating, with Mr. Balko adding that the sills were bad.

Commissioner Debauche asked if the windows were replaced when the building was converted into the library.

Commissioner Siebert noted that he had been on the committee that raised the funds for the conversion, adding that they had maintained absolute integrity of the façade, and only the interior was remodeled. At the time of the remodel, the windows were not replaced. How far those windows went back, he was not certain.

Randy Balko, Eagle Construction, stated that while some windows could be original, those looking to be replaced were not.

Commissioner Woehr asked whether the windows were single or double hung and if the transoms were operable.

Randy Balko stated that they were single hung windows and that the transoms were fixed.

Aldersperson Jennings asked if there was any cost exploration for estimates to repair what was existing. Additionally, she asked if they knew whether the windows contained waverly glass. Waverly glass would be a very old and unique feature to preserve as it was hand-blown.

Carl Hurrish stated that they had not explored repair estimates.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that the design guidelines recommended that existing windows typically be repaired. He agreed that waverly glass would be a desired item to keep.

Carl Hurrish stated that from the County's perspective, the integrity of the windows had been compromised in terms of moisture, and heating and cooling concerns.

Aldersperson Jennings stated that it was possible for the integrity of the building to be preserved with repairs rather than replacement, but that option hadn't been explored.

Chairperson Beveridge noted that the windows could be removed, taken apart, and revamped to be more efficient while remaining original in nature.

Commissioner Scripps recommended that the applicant retrieve an estimate on the cost of window repair, in addition to getting an idea if there are any structural integrity issues.

Randy Balko explained that the windows were bided as an alternate, but the bulk of the job were interior HVAC upgrades and a re-roof. He asked if it was possible to conference the architect into the meeting, to which Associate Planner Kearns noted that it would be too late as a motion had already been made. Additionally, Commissioner Scripps stated that she was not inclined to reconsider her motion if the research hadn't been done in regards to the repair costs.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that he would like to do an additional on-site visit to inspect the windows more closely, even if it was just him and the Associate Planner, prior to speaking with the architect. He asked if the architect had ever worked in a Historic District as there were a lot of design requirements.

Randy Balko stated that he couldn't speak to the architect's previous work.

Carl Hurrish asked what would occur if the restoration was cost prohibited, to which Chairperson Beveridge understood the concern as they often faced financial issues with repairs being done historically accurate.

Commissioner Debauche noted that they couldn't be sure that the repairs were cost prohibitive as they didn't have any cost related information.

Randy Balko asked what they meant in terms of repairing what was there, to which Commissioner Debauche stated that the repair requirements and costs could differ from window to window.

Randy Balko noted that the glass was 20 years old in addition to being insulated glass.

Associate Planner Kearns stated that if the request was denied, it was up to the applicant to pursue other options: leave the windows as is, or come back to the commission with a new design or repair options. He briefly explained that the design guidelines allowed regular maintenance on existing windows and that any repairs could be approved internally. While the design guidelines did not identify cost, it was something the commission had taken into consideration in the past due to historically accurate improvements being significantly more expensive.

Motion by Commissioner Scripps to deny the from Angus Young Associates for design review to install windows at 1001 Main Street (Parcel ID 281240832202651); seconded by Alderperson Jennings.

Motion Carried 5-0.

3. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 2:44 PM.