

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

February 13, 2019 – 1:00 PM

Police Department, Room 122  
933 Michigan Avenue, Stevens Point, WI 54481

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

ALSO PRESENT: Associate Planner Kearns, Director Ostrowski, Alderperson Dugan, Maria Mohr, Nick Bahcuk, Mike Wiza, Jim Belke, Brian Beaulieu, Ryan Wanta, and Randy Wanta.

---

INDEX:

1. A physical inspection of the site(s) described below by the Commission will take place at **1:00 PM:**
  - a) 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418) and 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414)

**Following the site inspection(s) referenced above, the Commission will convene in Room 122 at the Police Department, 933 Michigan Avenue for discussion and possible action on the following:**

2. Call to Order
3. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to demolish the structures on 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418) and the home at 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414)
4. Request from Wanta Properties, LLC for design review to construct a live/work unit development on the property bounded by Centerpoint Drive, Third Street, Second Street and Portage Street with the following addresses: 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418), 941 Portage Street (Parcel ID 281240832200402), 1000 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200401), 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414), 1105 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200409), 916 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 281240832200408), and unaddressed parcels 281240832200413, 281240832200417, and 281240832200419
5. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to reconstruct a parking lot located on Centerpoint Drive, between Third Street and Second Street (Parcel ID's 281240832200417 and 281240832200419)
6. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to remove the cupola atop the building at 1101 Centerpoint Drive (281240832202961)
7. Request from the City of Stevens Point to create a downtown trash receptacle/planter artwork program
8. Adjourn

- 
1. A physical inspection of the site(s) described below by the Commission will take place at **1:00 PM:**
    - a) 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418) and 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414)

**Following the site inspection(s) referenced above, the Commission will convene in Room 122 at the Police Department, 933 Michigan Avenue for discussion and possible action on the following:**

Chairperson Beveridge called the meeting to order.

Associate Planner Kearns reminded the Commission that direct conversation about the request should not occur, but questions to the applicant regarding the request are permitted.

2. Call to Order

**Present: Beveridge, Jennings, Siebert, Scripps, Debauche, McFarland**

**Excused: Woehr**

3. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to demolish the structures on 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418) and the home at 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414)

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request to demolish seven structures on the stated parcels for redevelopment purposes. He expanded on the individual structures in regards to their location, status of any historical significance, their material state, and interior review findings based on the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. It was noted that one of the seven structures, the residential home, had been referenced in the intensive survey, specifically due in part to being a clapboard clad one-story cube style build. After review however, it was found that the structures overall were of simple design and created of easily reproduced materials. Therefore, staff concluded that the manufacturing building and accessory buildings did not have historical significance specifically related to design or architecture. While the home was an example of a design and style of architecture that was referenced in the intensive survey, others of similar design and style did exist within historic districts. Approval of the request was recommended with the conditions outlined in the staff report. Commissioners had several comments regarding the request as described below:

1. Inquiry if whether the materials from the demolished structures would be repurposed within the proposed development, to which Associate Planner Kearns stated that while encouraged, they were not specifying specific locations.
2. Inquiry on whether the Redevelopment Authority or the developer would be doing the demolition, to which Director Ostrowski explained that the Redevelopment Authority would be transferring the site to the developer, and they would do the demolition.
3. Highlighted the history of the site, but noted the complexity and challenges associated with reusing and developing the existing space.
4. Inquiry whether there would be any effort to renovate the residential home, to which Director Ostrowski explained that the residence needed a lot of work as it was so dilapidated that it would most likely not be habitable. They were open to moving the residential structure.
5. Requested confirmation that the only building needed to be razed in order to proceed with the development would be the large metal storage shed. Director Ostrowski confirmed that to be accurate, however he detailed how leaving the remaining dilapidated structures could hinder the efforts in marketing the Lullabye site as well.
6. Inquiry on whether there had been attempts at outreach for moving the house, to which Director Ostrowski noted that they could look at doing so.
7. Statement that the buildings seemed connected, and inquiry on what would occur with the neighboring tenants if the Belke building was demolished. Director Ostrowski clarified that

while they looked connected, they were not, and added that it was hard to determine what the facing walls would look like until the building was demolished.

8. Inquiry on the timeline of Phase 1 of the development, and whether they had time to look at alternative options. Director Ostrowski stated that the intention would be to start Phase 1 in the upcoming summer, along with the Lullabye project.
9. Inquiry on the dimensions of the residence, to which staff pointed to page 24 of the staff packet for specifics.
10. Inquiry as to the type of comments received on walkthroughs through the residence, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the concerns came down to cost.
11. Inquiry on whether repurposing and reusing materials would be part of the approval, to which Director Ostrowski explained that the conditions allowed for it with how it had been written.
12. Inquiry on whether the staff conditions would follow the contractors, to which it was confirmed that they would.

Jim Belke provided testimony on the historic importance of the residence, noting that many of the items within the interior of the residence were unique, as well as the previous homeowner being an honored individual who did a lot for the community. To tear down the residence seemed disgraceful, he stated. He asked if there were any ways to honor past residents.

Chairperson Beveridge did not disagree on the historic significance of the individual or interior, however he stated that they were discussing the demolition only.

There was a brief discussion between Mr. Belke and the commission in regards to the historical significance of the property, and potential options to renovate or move the residence.

Associate Planner Kearns briefly explained that the Design Guidelines focused on the exterior only, and the commission could not look at the interior of the structure when making a determination. He also advised against a back and forth discussion during testimony.

Aldersperson Dugan noted her support in repurposing materials from the existing buildings into the new development, as well as detailed some items from individual conversations with the developer. She stated her preference for saving the main Belke building, and provided handouts that detailed a historic building that had been saved and repurposed.

Aldersperson Jennings noted that the agenda item was specifically for demolition, as well as acknowledged Mr. Belke's personal connections and attachments with the property. However in regards to honoring past individuals, she stated that they could not have a memorial for every business that had contributed to the community or its history, noting that they did not even have a memorial to honor the Menominee people or any other Native people whose land they were standing on and whose lands had been taken. They needed to be realistic about what they could save and how the City could run or pay for those services, she stated. While they could not save every building, as a commission, they could insist on having the materials salvaged and repurposed.

Randy Wanta stated that their intention would be to reuse and repurpose material, noting their appreciation for its historic nature.

There was a brief discussion to clarify the timeline of the development, as well as how the conditions within the staff report would apply.

**Commissioner Jennings made a motion to approve the request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to demolish the structures on 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418) and the home at 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414) with the following;**

1. **A razing permit shall be obtained.**
2. **Building materials shall be re-purposed and reused where possible, including the possibility of relocating the home at 1016 Third Street.**

**seconded by Commissioner Scripps**

**Motion carried 4-1, with Commissioner Siebert voting in the negative.**

4. Request from Wanta Properties, LLC for design review to construct a live/work unit development on the property bounded by Centerpoint Drive, Third Street, Second Street and Portage Street with the following addresses: 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418), 941 Portage Street (Parcel ID 281240832200402), 1000 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200401), 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414), 1105 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200409), 916 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 281240832200408), and unaddressed parcels 281240832200413, 281240832200417, and 281240832200419

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request to construct a 10 unit live/work development within the Central Business Transition District on the northwest corner of Third Street and Centerpoint Drive. The proposed development would offer first floor work units along Centerpoint Drive, which would connect to a garage in the rear and a second floor living space and balcony, he explained. After review, the development was found to be fitting for the area in terms of height, façade materials, orientation, and design. He recommended approval of the design review request with conditions outlined in the staff report. Commissioners had several comments regarding the request as described below:

1. Inquiry as to whether the individual would need to move if their business failed, to which applicant Mr. Ryan Wanta stated that they were still working on lease concepts and exit strategies.
2. Inquiry to whether an individual could run their business in the first floor, and lease the second floor living area, to which the applicant indicated that the business owner would need to live on-site.
3. Request for the applicant to share their personal history and experience with live/work units and challenges the site in question posed, to which the applicant detailed a history of living in a live/work building, as well as the uniqueness of the development for the City.
4. Clarification on whether there were patios over the garages, to which the applicant confirmed accurate.
5. Inquiry on whether the patio feature could cause issues with snow or rain, to which the applicant explained that they would have pavers and a drainage system, and possible heat coils, to handle with the elements.
6. Inquiry on whether there would be solar installed, to which the applicant confirmed that their future intent would be to have solar installed on the roof.
7. Inquiry on greenspace specifics, to which the applicant explained that their intent would be to maintain as much greenspace and trees as possible.
8. Inquiry on the aesthetics of the development, to which the applicant briefly explained that the design elements were inspired by merging historic, modern, and industrial elements.

Director Ostrowski asked if the installation of solar panels could be included as part of their review if the developer wished to move forward with them, to which Chairperson Beveridge saw no issues with doing so.

**Chairperson Beveridge made a motion to approve the request from Wanta Properties, LLC for design review to construct a live/work unit development on the property bounded by Centerpoint**

Drive, Third Street, Second Street and Portage Street with the following addresses: 1013 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200418), 941 Portage Street (Parcel ID 281240832200402), 1000 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200401), 1016 Third Street (Parcel ID 281240832200414), 1105 Second Street (Parcel ID 281240832200409), 916 Centerpoint Drive (Parcel ID 281240832200408), and unaddressed parcels 281240832200413, 281240832200417, and 281240832200419 with the following;

1. The applicant shall add additional architectural features or materials to the east and west facades, such as windows, doors, or awnings, to be reviewed and approved by the chairperson and designated agent.
2. The chairperson and designated agent shall have the authority to review and approve minor changes to the project and building design.
3. Building codes and zoning ordinance requirements shall be met.
4. All applicable building permits shall be obtained.
5. The potential future installation of solar panels on the property shall be permitted, but shall be reviewed & approved by the chairperson and designated agent.

seconded by Alderperson Jennings

**Motion carried 5-0.**

5. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to reconstruct a parking lot located on Centerpoint Drive, between Third Street and Second Street (Parcel ID's 281240832200417 and 281240832200419)

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request for design review to reconstruct a parking lot located on Centerpoint Drive in conjunction with the proposed development to the north from the previous request. The parking lot would contain 66 stalls with ingress and egress on Third Street and Second Street, as well as be crucial to the overall development of the site. While a landscaping plan had yet to be submitted, it would need to be provided as part of the zoning code requirements. He noted that a large storm sewer existed beneath the parking lot that needed to be maintained, and thus the Redevelopment Authority would maintain ownership as part of the development. After review, staff found the reconstruction to be appropriate and recommended approval with conditions outlined in the staff report, adding that all ordinance requirements were to also be met. Commissioners had several comments regarding the request as described below:

1. Inquiry on whether the neighboring Lullabye development would affect parking access for the lot, to which Director Ostrowski explained that they would work with City departments to possibly modifying Centerpoint Drive in the future or allowing on street parking. The Director also added that the middle walkway on the south may shift slightly east or west.
2. Inquiry on whether the parking lot would change with the change of the streetscape, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the stalls would mostly stay the same, but that there may be a small shift in design.
3. Inquiry on whether the commission could require a permeable surface to be placed under cars, to which Associate Planner Kearns stated that while they could not require it, they could recommend it.

Brian Beaulieu asked if the developers were going to be incurring the lot's maintenance costs as it would mainly serve their development, to which Associate Planner Kearns stated that the question was more appropriate for the Common Council or Public Works department as they were not the body that dispensed funds.

**Alderperson Jennings made a motion to approve the request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to reconstruct a parking lot located on Centerpoint**

**Drive, between Third Street and Second Street (Parcel ID's 281240832200417 and 281240832200419) with the following;**

- 1. A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted, meeting all applicable zoning requirements, to be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department.**
- 2. Staff shall have the authority to approve minor modifications to the plan.**

**seconded by Commissioner Siebert.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

6. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to remove the cupola atop the building at 1101 Centerpoint Drive (281240832202961)

Associate Planner Kearns summarized the request to remove the cupola atop the Great Lakes Loan Services building at 1101 Centerpoint Drive, and detailed that the tenants continued to experience roof leaks regardless of constant repairs and an entire roof replacement. The applicant had cited the cupola as the reason for the leaks. After review, it was found that the cupola was not historic in nature as it had been an added feature of the building, therefore its removal would not decrease the historic integrity of the building or those within the district. He recommended approval with conditions outlined in the staff report. Commissioners had several comments regarding the request as described below:

1. Inquiry on whether the cupola would be repurposed, to which Director Ostrowski noted ongoing efforts to do so.
2. Inquiry on whether the cupola had been reroofed, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the cupola had not been reroofed, but it had been sealed. The flat roof had also been entirely reroofed.
3. Comment that it would be a shame to lose it as it was very characteristic of Stevens Point.
4. Comment that the cupola was a piece of Stevens Point history regardless of it being from the 90s. Examples of it being used on merchandise, flyers and pamphlets were provided.
5. Comment that there were no specific timelines within the Design Guidelines of when things became historic.
6. Inquiry on whether the cupola could be moved to the greenspace behind the Fox Theater, to which Director Ostrowski explained that the area needed to be maintained as is per an agreement.
7. Inquiry on whether there was a way to fully attach it to the base, to which Director Ostrowski stated that there most likely was, however it would be costly and the tenant as responsible for all improvements and repairs. The Director also reminded the commission that they had approved the demolition of the mall, and the building in question was part of the mall.
8. Inquiry on whether there would be an attempt to save the cupola as a whole piece, to which Director Ostrowski noted that the efforts would be taken in doing so.

There was a brief discussion on whether the cupola held any historic significance or whether it represented fake historic.

Associate Planner Kearns noted that the roofing structure was not historic, and as a feature placed on a non-historic roof, did not play into the Design Guideline standards. He questioned whether the cupola would be relevant prior to the mall's existence.

**Chairperson Beveridge made a motion to approve the request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point for design review to remove the cupola atop the building at 1101 Centerpoint Drive (281240832202961) with the following;**

- 1. The roof deck shall be repaired and roofed to match the existing roof materials.**
- 2. The cupola structure, and/or any materials on the structure shall be save, repurposed, or salvaged if possible.**

**seconded by Alderperson Jennings**

**Motion carried 4-1, with Commissioner Scripps voting in the negative.**

7. Request from the City of Stevens Point to create a downtown trash receptacle/planter artwork program

Associate Planner Kearns explained that the City, in cooperation with Create Portage County, had been working on beginning an annual art program to decorate trash receptacles and planters within the downtown area. He noted that while the program details had not been finalized, the contest was proposed to take place in the spring, with the winning artwork to become a permanent installation. Over time, the City would have a permanent artwork collection in the downtown to complement the existing murals. He advised that they work with local business owners to assist in drafting the guidelines, but questioned whether they would be opening a door to additional graffiti. He welcomed additional feedback, of which commissioners had several comments regarding the request as described below:

1. Comment that there was not a lot of vandalism on the existing murals, and suspected that it would be the same with the proposed program. The receptacles and planters were in a very visible location.
2. Concern noted for quality of artwork, as well as the type of images or themes that would be used in the artwork.
3. Preference for tile art, or mosaic, noting its higher quality and permanence.
4. Comment about setting a yearly theme.
5. Inquiry on whether it was a partnership with Create and their plans on management and funding, to which Associate Planner Kearns explained that due to the City's limited staff, it would be ideal if an outside organization managed the event if successful. The City could continue to participate in funding some aspects.
6. Concern that heavily textured planters would be a difficult surface to work with.
7. Comment that they had a similar discussion regarding concerns for artwork quality when discussing murals, but so far had been a nonissue. If it didn't look good, they could just paint over it.
8. Preference on investing on more permanent installations within the downtown, rather than a rotating program.
9. Preference on greater vetting of artwork.
10. Comment about artwork being subjective, as well as possible concerns arising from removing artwork based on preference, and whether they could face first amendment issues.

Associate Planner Kearns noted concerns regarding wanting to place restrictions on the artwork, as well as having to bring every design before the commission for approval, noting that it would defeat the purpose of the program, as well as complicate it.

Ryan Wanta stated a concern for the quality of artwork based on the examples provided.

Maria Mohr detailed a process for open art calls and selection based on her experience.

Director Ostrowski mirrored concerns on restricting artwork to the point of defeating the purpose of the program, which would be to get more people involved and bring more energy downtown for a fun event. He noted challenges with going through a rigorous proposal and selection process.

There was a general interest in pursuing a public art program in the downtown area, however it was requested that the program details be revisited with their feedback taken into account prior to being brought forth for action.

No action was taken.

8. Adjourn.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM.**

[https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isaac\\_Staples'\\_Sawmill#/media/File%3AIsaac\\_Staples\\_Sawmill.jpg](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isaac_Staples'_Sawmill#/media/File%3AIsaac_Staples_Sawmill.jpg)

## Isaac Staples' Sawmill

**Isaac Staples' Sawmill** is a historic industrial property in Stillwater, Minnesota, United States, consisting of an 1850 stone powerhouse and a 1900 metal-clad factory. The property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places as **St. Croix Lumber Mills—Stillwater Manufacturing Company** in 1982 for its local significance in the theme of industry.<sup>[2]</sup> It was nominated because the powerhouse is the only surviving industrial building associated with Isaac Staples (1816–1898), a major figure in Minnesota's early commercial development.<sup>[3]</sup> The property now operates as a shopping mall with upper level apartments.

### History

The powerhouse with its 80-foot (24 m) smokestack was constructed by the partners Sawyer and Heaton in 1850, establishing the second sawmill in Stillwater. Isaac Staples arrived in the booming lumber town in 1853 as the representative of Samuel F. Hersey and other eastern investors. Successfully establishing himself in the lumber milling and mercantile industries, Staples decided to go into business for himself in 1869. He purchased Sawyer and Heaton's mill, which had passed through several owners, overhauling and renaming it the **St. Croix Lumber Mills**.<sup>[3]</sup>

Staples operated the mill until the 1880s, when it was sold to J.H. Townsend and Company for use as a flour mill. The **Stillwater Manufacturing Company** also moved into the complex in 1888. A subsidiary of the Minnesota Thresher Company, they were a manufacturer of doors, window blinds, and window sashes. In 1894 a fire destroyed all the wooden mill structures, leaving only the limestone powerhouse. The Stillwater Manufacturing Company constructed a four-story, metal-sided building adjacent to the powerhouse in 1900.<sup>[3]</sup>

### See also

- National Register of Historic Places listings in Washington County, Minnesota

## References

1. *National Park Service (2010-07-09). "National Register Information System". National Register of Historic Places. National Park Service.*
2. *"St. Croix Lumber Mills/Stillwater Manufacturing Company". Minnesota National Register Properties Database. Minnesota Historical Society. 2009. Retrieved 2015-06-23.*
3. *Harvey, Tom (March 1981). "Minnesota Historic Properties Inventory Form: St. Croix Lumber Mills/Stillwater Manufacturing Company" (PDF). National Park Service. Retrieved 2015-09-03.*

## External links

- [Staples Mill Antiques](#)—a current tenant

&lt;img

src="//en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special:CentralAutoLogin/start?type=1x1&mobile=1" alt="" title="" width="1" height="1" style="border: none; position: absolute;"/>

Sent from my iPad

