

REPORT OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION/DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

**Monday, August 9, 2010 – 3:30 p.m.**

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

ALSO

PRESENT: Comm. Dev. Dir. Michael Ostrowski; Ald. Suomi; Tom Brown; Cathy Dugan; Sarah Robinson, Downtown Mgr.; Mark Seiler; Jim Lucas; John Dolan; Matt Brown, Po. Co. Gazette

---

1. Discussion and possible action on a request from Jim Lucas to renovate the existing building, and do other exterior improvements to the building and properties located at **1000 Third Street (former Eagle Plumbing) and 941 Portage Street. Parcel ID's 2408-32-2004-01 and 2408-32-2004-02**

Chm. Lee Beveridge noted we are here because of the Eagle Plumbing building which most of us toured last year and decided that we wanted to save it. We are being asked to approve exterior renovations to the property. He has had calls from former commissioners and emails and material from Tom Brown.

Since the Historic Preservation Design Review Committee did not save this building to have it wrapped in siding, some of which will be a fake historic brick pattern, he would like to make a motion.

**Lee Beveridge moved, seconded by Tim Siebert, as follows:**

**Denial of 1) siding of any type being attached to the exterior brick, 2) architectural elements be attached to the exterior of this brick building, and 3) creation of any masonry openings until exterior plan is approved by HPDRC;**

**Require 1) review and approval of windows to be used on this project by HPDRC, 2) external elements currently on this building not to be removed, and 3) exterior lighting to be used on this building be approved by HPDRC.**

**Approve removal of concrete block shed addition on the south facing side.**

Kathy Kruthoff noted Lee made the motion that several of them would have made especially after touring the building last year. It is worth saving and we applaud the idea that someone is doing something with this building, but this is not the answer yet.

John Dolan, co-owner of Arc Central Inc., noted that while he appreciates the fact that most of you feel this building is of historic significance and that is the only reason to save it, our interpretation is somewhat different. Any building is worth saving whether or not you can save its original character from when it was built or not. Our interpretation of this building is as a structure. Therefore, we are looking at an adaptive re-use of the structure versus having it torn down. No one else has come up with a plan to save this building in any way, shape, or form. If you feel that the only way to save this is through historic renovation, it will never be preserved.

Jim Lucas noted the committee wants to save the building from the wrecking ball. He went through a similar process in Wisconsin Rapids, a piece fell off the building and the city attorney said get it down as soon as you can. Your next step is the wrecking ball.

Norm Myers noted he had voted to tear it down. The building is out of the historic area of the city which is Main and Clark Streets. He agrees with Mr. Dolan and Mr. Lucas.

Ald. Tom Mallison stated if something doesn't get done with this building, it will come down. He will vote against the motion. These people have a great plan and at least the building will be there.

Cathy Dugan gave some background and indicated she is happy that the city is encouraging development and someone is interested in doing something with the property. We should support this development and support the cultural historic significance of the Eagle building by requiring this developer, or any other developer, to retain more of the architectural character than this plan includes. She encouraged input from the State Historical Society and the Main Street Program. This could be a good connector between the historic area and the northside.

Tom Brown stated he is very much in support of what they are trying to do to the building, he just disagrees on the approach. It may be true that if they don't get to develop it the building will come down. He doesn't feel the city has done a darn thing to try and promote this building and package it for a developer. This commission should encourage the city to actively promote it. In his opinion, the building is historically significant. The city is undertaking a city-wide survey of architecturally significant properties. It would be a real shame to take a building that he thinks would be at the top of anybody's list of significant properties and do what is proposed. The politics of whether you save this building no matter how it is treated is a decision to be made by the common council. The charge of this commission is to decide if the treatment being proposed is appropriate or not. He doesn't believe it is, and the State Historic Society Preservation Architect doesn't believe it is. He has offered his expertise to both Jim and John with respect to tax credits. Should the common council decide to overrule your motion and this project goes forward, his personal preference would be to see a very contemporary treatment for this building and nothing that even smacks of fake historic. I do want to save this building.

Argumentative discussion followed. Ald. Mallison called for point of order.

Kathy Kruthoff called for a vote on the motion.

**Ayes, Lee Beveridge, Tim Siebert, Kathy Kruthoff, Jack Curtis, George Hanson, and Tom Mallison. Nays, Norm Myers. Motion carried to call for a vote on the motion.**

Norm Myers noted the commission has not really had time to discuss this, Tom Brown did all the discussing and we didn't get a chance to answer it.

Chm. Beveridge responded the only discussion is do we want to put siding on a brick building. We are just telling them that these are the requirements. If there are ways to satisfy these requirements, we are more than happy to see the building develop with everything else.

Jim Lucas noted the outcome is this group does not want cladding on the building.

John Dolan noted they are telling us just exactly what we have to do with the building. You have listed out a dozen things that we have to follow. You have taken all design creativity out of the picture.

Chm. Beveridge noted at this point, if you have a design criteria that will meet ....

Additional argumentative discussion followed. Ald. Mallison again called for point of order.

Motion reads as follows:

**Lee Beveridge moved, seconded by Tim Siebert, as follows:**

**Denial of 1) siding of any type being attached to the exterior brick, 2) architectural elements be attached to the exterior of this brick building, and 3) creation of any masonry openings until exterior plan is approved by HPDRC;**

**Require 1) review and approval of windows to be used on this project by HPDRC, 2) external elements currently on this building not to be removed, and 3) exterior lighting to be used on this building be approved by HPDRC.**

**Approve removal of concrete block shed addition on the south facing side.**

**Ayes, Lee Beveridge, Tim Siebert, Kathy Kruthoff, and Jack Curtis.**

**Nays, Norm Myers, George Hanson, and Tom Mallison.**

**Motion carried.**

**Kathy Kruthoff moved, seconded by Tim Siebert, to adjourn the meeting.**

**Ayes, Kruthoff, Siebert, Beveridge, Curtis, Hanson, and Mallison.**

**Nays, Myers. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.