

REPORT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION / DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – 4:30 PM

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Beveridge, Alderperson Stroik, Commissioner Siebert, and Commissioner Kruthoff.

ALSO PRESENT: Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns, Alderperson Logan Beveridge, Wilfred Fang, Jerry Kowski, and Deb Roman-Schrank.

---

INDEX:

Discussion and possible action on the following:

1. A physical inspection of the sites described below by the Commission will take place at **4:30 PM**:
  - The first site to be inspected will be 832 Main Street;
  - Immediately following the first site to be inspected, the second site to be inspected will be 1040 Main Street;
  - Immediately following the second site to be inspected, the third site to be inspected will be 1059 Main Street.

Following the site inspections referenced above, the Commission will convene its formal meeting at **5:20 PM** in the City Conference Room, 1515 Strongs Avenue for discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Approval of the report from the April 4, 2012 HPDRC meeting.
3. Request from Debbie Roman-Schrank for an amendment to façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$1,912.50 additional dollars for the painting of window trim, wood paneling, and cornice at **832 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2016-19)**.
4. Request from Wilfred Fang for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$5,474.25 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of second story windows, masonry work, paint, and signage at **1040 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2029-23)**.
5. Request from Jerome Kowski for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$10,960.52 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of windows, storefront awning, and significant masonry work at **1059 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2026-10)**.
6. Adjourn.

- 
1. A physical inspection of the sites described below by the Commission will take place at **4:30 PM**:
    - The first site to be inspected will be 832 Main Street;
    - Immediately following the first site to be inspected, the second site to be inspected will be 1040 Main Street;
    - Immediately following the second site to be inspected, the third site to be inspected will be 1059 Main Street.

Commission members inspected each of the following site stated above.

2. Approval of the report from the April 4, 2012 HPDRC meeting.

**Motion by Alderperson Stroik to approve the report from the April 4, 2012 HPDRC meeting; seconded by Commissioner Siebert. Motion carried 4-0**

3. Request from Debbie Roman-Schrank for an amendment to façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$1,912.50 additional dollars for the painting of window trim, wood paneling, and cornice at **832 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2016-19)**.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that the commission has seen this project before, but the applicant is coming back to ask for additional grant money in the sum of \$1,912.50, \$12,600 has previously been approved.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated this request is primarily for painting.

Commissioner Siebert asked if the wood was rotting, to which Deb Roman-Schrank answered yes. The first quote from Roska did not include wood replacement, but the second quote from Tom's Painting did include the wood replacement. Furthermore, she stated that she misunderstood that Dulak's bid for masonry, thinking wood replacement was included, but what he actually said was that he would replace it for an additional cost.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated that he also spoke with Roska about getting another quote to include wood replacement and the paint, to which they informed him was not possible, as they only perform painting. Mr. Kearns also said that he tried to get a hold of Tom's Paint for a breakdown of exactly what the paint cost was, separated from the wood replacement. However, he could not get a hold of them. Mr. Kearns said it is up to the commission whether or not to approve additional funding to cover the wood replacement or go with the lowest bid, which would not include the wood.

Commissioner Siebert stated that it would not make sense to not replace the wood. Mr. Kearns stated that it also could be up to the applicant to find another contractor that would do the wood work with no funding from the program. Mrs. Roman-Schrank stated that she would like to have the wood included as part of grant funding. She did not realize until recently that one bid did not include wood replacement, as Tom's Painting bid was received months ago. Furthermore, she stated the rotted wood is bad in a lot of areas, especially on the side where you go up to the apartments, as well as up above.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated that if the commission requests another bid for the wood working, the commission could add a condition for the applicant to submit that bid and leave the decision up to the chair and staff, like we have done in the past. The lowest qualified bid would be used for funding reimbursement and include the wood and the painting for both rather than have the applicant having to come back in next month.

**Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the amendment to the façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$1,912.50 additional dollars for the painting of window trim, wood paneling, and cornice at 832 Main Street with the following conditions:**

- **The mural located on the east façade will remain and that the applicant/owner pursues services to touch-up the mural after brick work is complete.**

- Second story window trim shall be painted to match that of the proposed first story bronze window trim to be installed.
- Cornice shall be painted to match that of the proposed first story bronze window trim to be installed.
- The Mitchell Square Building nameplate shall be restored with similar lettering on the new glass window.
- Tuckpointing shall match to the greatest extent possible the original mortar color and spacing on the building.
- Applicant must receive another bid for the masonry work and the lowest qualified bid shall be used for the awarding of funds.
- All work shall be completed within one year.
- Project must adhere to Façade Improvement Grant Program Guidelines.
- No funds shall be disbursed until project is fully completed.
- The maximum City participation shall not exceed \$14,512.50 and no individual cost shall exceed the following:

Improvements	Cost	Proposed Matching Grant Assistance
Masonry	\$10,000.00	\$5,000.00
Window & Door	\$15,200.00	\$7,600.00
Paint	\$3,825	\$1,912.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$29,025.00</b>	<b>\$14,512.50</b>

- That the Chairperson of HP/DRC and the designated agent work with the applicants to determine the appropriate actions to take for the ledge.
- That the Chairperson of HP/DRC and the designated agent work with the applicants to determine the appropriate paint color.
- That the Chairperson of HP/DRC and the designated agent are allowed to approve minor modifications to the project.
- A second bid for rotted wood replacement shall be obtained and submitted by the applicant for review by the Chairperson of HP/DRC and the designated agent.
- That the Chairperson of HP/DRC and the designated agent work to review and approve funding for wood replacement upon the receiving of a second bid to which will change the maximum city participation and improvements cost of the project.

seconded by Commissioner Kruthoff.

Deb Roman-Schrank asked if she can ask the contractor to do a breakdown of the bid and then get another one too, to which Mr. Kearns stated correct, and also stated that you could still choose Roska to perform the work but funding reimbursement would be for the lowest bid.

Commissioner Kruthoff asked if the commission should include a time factor condition to prevent contractors from taking forever to submit bids. Commissioner Siebert added that

clearly we want to get it done as soon as possible. Mr. Kearns stated that the applicant has a year from approval to complete the work and the further you go into the winter months the harder it is to do the work, so it really is up to the applicant. Commissioner Kruthoff stated that if we can see that she has tried to get a second bid and someone just hasn't come in with one, is that going to hold up the whole thing. Chairperson Beveridge answered that we don't provide the funds until it is all finished. Mr. Kearns stated that they have to submit paid invoices and then we would reimburse them half of what the approved costs would be, so that is why we document the breakdown of the estimates.

**Motion carried 4-0.**

Aldersperson Stroik asked what kind of funding do we have, to which Mr. Kearns stated \$300,000 and we have already allocated about \$60,000. Chairperson Beveridge stated that it is discussed in some of the first pages of the staff report. Mr. Kearns stated that as projects come in, every meeting he will provide an updated list of what we have available, so we know how much we can work with, and how much each project has used. Aldersperson Stroik asked if this was a yearly grant, to which Mr. Kearns stated it has only been approved once, so it may not be approved in the future. She asked if we had a time limit to use the funds, to which Mr. Kearns replied when the funds are extinguished they are done. Additional funds can be allocated in the future, but it would be dependent upon receiving approval from the common council.

4. Request from Wilfred Fang for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$5,474.25 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of second story windows, masonry work, paint, and signage at **1040 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2029-23)**.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated that a bid was submitted by Altmann Construction for the window work. The original bid included in the staff report was not for a historically accurate or relevant window. A new bid was submitted a few days ago after speaking with a representative from Altmann Construction. Mr. Kearns stated he has provided two options for the windows and has paint samples and photos that were submitted by Mr. Fang.

Chairperson Beveridge commented that on the window bids he is seeing the false screen, and stated that it would be nice to have the kind of screens that you can't see. Furthermore, there is a screening material that when the window is up, it is almost invisible. Research should be conducted to see if there is a large price difference for that screening.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns stated that perhaps a condition could be added addressing that issue.

Commissioner Siebert asked if the windows are going to be wooden, to which Mr. Kearns stated correct.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if the white clad exterior would be aluminum. Mr. Kearns stated yes, the other bid has a grey exterior, from Pella windows. Mr. Kearns clarified the color was Morning Sky Grey, and the difference between the windows is that the Pella windows are square and they have a separate arch that will go above the window. The other quote has the arch included in the window, making them more expensive. Commissioner Siebert pointed out that then you would have a line that would go across the window. Mr. Kearns stated correct, it

would be almost like a transom, but smaller. Chairperson Beveridge asked if that window was in the original bid, to which Mr. Kearns stated with the Pella windows. Mr. Fang confirmed that the Pella windows are the square windows with the separate arch. Mr. Kearns also pointed out that the Pella windows are a single hung window. Commissioner Siebert asked what brand the Altmann Construction windows were, to which Mr. Kearns stated Anderson and Semco arch top.

Commissioner Kruthoff asked what the area on the second floor is used for, to which Mr. Fang stated nothing.

Commissioner Siebert clarified that the request is for \$5,474 but that would not reflect the new quote. Mr. Kearns stated that would reflect the previous bid information; the lowest bid is not effective in this case with this submission, the lowest bid would include the single hung Pella windows that are two pieces with the window and the arch above. When you add this bid and get rid of Altmann Construction Companies previous bid, now you are up to \$15,000 and the award reimbursement request would be \$7,500. The table in the staff report is broken down into two main contractors, SDS Paint and Rice's Paint Company. SDS will be doing the tuckpointing to the building, as well as the painting to the building. Mr. Kearns continued stating that Rice's Paint Company would be hiring Altmann Construction to do the tuckpointing and window installation, while they perform the painting and cleaning.

Commissioner Siebert asked if it would be a problem for the applicant to use Altmann Construction, to which Mr. Fang answered it should be ok. He then asked if he really had to go with the double hung windows because they don't use the upstairs of the building. Commissioner Kruthoff also questioned whether the double hungs are needed, as there is no use on the second floor and no proposed future use. Mr. Fang asked if the commission would allow the installation of single hung windows because the space is vacant.

Commissioner Siebert asked Mr. Fang if he owned the building, to which he replied yes. Commissioner Kruthoff stated when the mall was put in and the Historic Commission was created, he was one of the first to clean up his building and make it look nice.

Commissioner Siebert stated he has no problem with a single hung window. Chairperson Beveridge asked if the second floor was used at all for storage or anything. Mr. Fang answered that there is no storage and really no access to the second floor, other than a ladder; there are no stairs at all. The stairs were taken out to increase retail space.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if Mr. Fang would ever go up and open the windows for ventilation, to which Mr. Fang answered no. He then asked why you would even put screens up. Mr. Kearns stated that the Pella windows don't even mention screens, to which Commissioner Siebert added it doesn't make much sense to put a screen on. Chairperson Beveridge stated that he was looking at the Semco window and asked if that was the single hung, to which Mr. Kearns stated the single hung are the Pella windows and both of the ones he was looking at were double hung. Mr. Kearns clarified that the single hung windows are the Pella windows with the separate arch.

Commissioner Siebert asked what the difference was with the two windows on the same bid, to which Mr. Kearns stated they had just submitted two types of windows on the bid. Commissioner Kruthoff stated the only difference she could see was possibly the type of glass in the window.

Commissioner Siebert stated that the only problem with the Pella windows is the line between the window and the arch. Chairperson Beveridge agreed and stated he would like to see what is currently there replaced as best as possible. Commissioner Siebert stated that it seems the cheaper windows would be the Altmann Construction as a compromise. Commissioner Kruthoff expressed it would not be a problem for her.

Commissioner Kruthoff asked what the price difference was, to which Commissioner Siebert stated about \$3,000. Mr. Kearns stated \$3,974 is what is proposed for funding, the Pella windows are \$7,948, and pointed out that the Pella is slightly cheaper with JL Peterson Construction performing the installation. Chairperson Beveridge asked if Altmann Construction had their windows available in a single hung to make it cheaper, to which Mr. Kearns stated that can be made as a condition like we had done in the past with staff and chair approval.

Commissioner Siebert strongly recommended not to power wash the brick, because of the impact to the brick. Mr. Fang stated that SDS is going to wash it themselves. Chairperson Beveridge stated that it is all painted, so it is somewhat stabilized, but Commissioner Siebert expressed that the power washing will take the exterior of the brick and just powder it, even at a low psi.

Chairperson Beveridge clarified to ask that it is not power washed at all and to use the Semco arch and check for less single hung windows with no screen.

**Motion by Commissioner Siebert to approve the request from Wilfred Fang for the façade improvement grant funds, in the amount of \$5,474.25 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of second story windows, masonry work, paint, and signage at 1040 Main Street with the following conditions:**

- Pressure washing shall not be done at all to the brick.
- A bid for the Semco windows, single hung with no screens shall be resubmitted for Chairman and designated agent approval.
- Caulk shall not be used as a fill in the place of brick mortar.
- Tuckpointing shall match to the greatest extent possible the original mortar color and spacing on the building.
- Painting scheme and colors shall closely match that of the existing building window trim & sills, ornate brick, etc.
- All work shall be completed within one year.
- Project must adhere to Façade Improvement Grant Program Guidelines.
- No funds shall be disbursed until project is fully completed.
- The maximum City participation shall not exceed \$5,474.23, with no individual cost exceeding that below, dependent upon the second bid submission by Altman Construction to be approved by Chair and designated agent:

Improvements	Cost	Proposed Matching Grant Assistance
Masonry	SDS Painting Company (See paint) \$1,910.00 – Altmann Cons.	- \$955.00
Windows	\$7,948.55 – JL Peterson Cons.	\$3,974.28

	\$8,625 – Altmann Cons.	\$4,312.50
Paint	\$3,000.00 – SDS Painting Company	\$1,500.00
	\$4,465.00 – Rice’s Paint Company	\$2,232.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	SDS Painting Co. – \$10,948.55	<b>\$5,474.23</b>
	Rice’s Paint Co. – \$15,000.00	\$7,500.50

**seconded by Alderperson Stroik. Motion carried 4-0**

- Request from Jerome Kawski for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$10,960.52 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of windows, storefront awning, and significant masonry work at **1059 Main Street (Parcel ID 2408-32-2026-10)**.

Chairperson Beveridge started reviewing the conditions in the staff report, clarifying that first window and door trim shall match. The proposed exterior color is bronze and that color already exists around the door. Mr. Kearns provided a sample of the window trim for the commission to view and pass around, to which Chairperson Beveridge clarified that this is what, is to go around the windows on the first floor. Mr. Kearns confirmed with Mr. Kawski that it is the dark bronze trim. Mr. Kawski stated that there were only three colors to choose from and that the sample was the closest that they could come to matching the door frame color. Chairperson Beveridge asked if there was a reddish highlight to the bronze that is currently there, to which Mr. Kawski stated yes. Chairperson Beveridge asked if the original doorframe will stay, and if this color will be on all of the windows, and if all windows are being replaced with a high energy glass. Mr. Kawski answered there is a low E glass that he believes is a double pane window. Mr. Kearns stated that the same type of glass was submitted by both window contractors.

Chairperson Beveridge clarified that his understanding was that the awning will not be done right away, to which Mr. Kawski stated they would like to do it right away. Their plan is keep the existing frame and replace the cloth. Mr. Kearns confirmed that it would be the same design as what currently exists. Chairperson Beveridge stated that the commission likes to see the old fashion crank out triangular awnings. Currently, there is a variety of awnings in the downtown.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that he noticed the detailing at the top of the building in the center is wearing off. Mr. Kawski stated that the building in general needs attention. Chairperson Beveridge stated that there is a lot going on in the front of the building and is well worth and deserving of all of the improvements.

Chairperson Beveridge spoke of the pressure washing condition, and Commissioner Siebert added that most of the building is stone and should hold up well to the washing. Mr. Kawski stated that on the right of the building, Don Dulak came and washed it by hand about two weeks ago, and he does not think it changed the color that much, but Mr. Kawski stated he thought it did a little. He explained that Mr. Dulak is worried about the iron look. Furthermore, there are several different colors to the building, and that the mortar is a more reddish tint and no one really knows what it was when it was first put in. Chairperson Beveridge stated that after you clean it up, the color will be easier to determine. Mr. Kawski stated that the contractor would not do the tuckpointing until after it was washed because he won’t really know the color.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that the little spot that was washed looked nice, and if you clean the stone back to its original color you may be surprised. Commissioner Siebert asked if the cost was significantly more to do it that way as opposed to power washing, to which Mr. Kowski stated he did not know, and that the power washing may be better but they do not want to damage the material. Commissioner Siebert stated that it is sandstone, so it is soft stone, not as soft as brick. Mr. Kowski stated that you can probably get the color back, but you don't want to damage the material. Commissioner Siebert stated that washing it would be better, but it would be more time consuming. Chairperson Beveridge asked if it would be a scrub brush and bucket type of wash, to which Mr. Kowski stated he thought that they would just use a low pressure but did not know what a low pressure would be. They would not use detergent, just an organic soap. Commissioner Siebert assumed that the color is from grime, not from rust, which would be part of the stone. Mr. Kowski stated that the contractor pointed out that with the building facing north, it doesn't take a beating from the sun. Chairperson Beveridge stated that it could be mildew too. Mr. Kearns stated that 500 is a lower psi based off of research and personal knowledge. He stated that Mr. Dulak has done this and he knows what he is doing, and the commission can remove the 500 psi from the conditions if they want. Mr. Kearns pointed out that this is why this building is so unique, because this is not common in this area, and you want to use the proper technique so as not to damage the material. Commissioner Siebert asked if this was Bayfield Sandstone, to which Mr. Kowski stated he was told so by a person from Stone Innovations. Commissioner Siebert questioned if this is the material that is used a lot in the Upper Peninsula, if it is quarried near there, and if they know treatment methods. Mr. Kearns stated that that could be a condition; that we look into the proper techniques for treatment prior to the work being done, and to have staff and the chairperson approve the proper cleaning techniques and methods to clean the Bayfield sandstone.

Chairperson Beveridge asked if they had any bids or prices to replace just the fabric on the awning, to which Mr. Kowski stated that he had received two bids. Mr. Kearns added that the bids are listed in the staff report and both are for strictly replacement of the awning and lettering graphics as it sits with no proposed changes. Mr. Kowski stated that the lettering appears to be painted on, not stitched. Chairperson Beveridge asked if anyone knew when the awning went up, or the Wooden Chair opened, to which Mr. Kowski stated he thought it was 1993. Commissioner Kruthoff asked if that was when Mr. Jansen still owned the business. Mr. Kowski stated that he believed that Mr. Jansen installed the awning. Commissioner Kruthoff pointed out that the board behind the framing for the awning may need some care as well and if you are going to be doing something then this may be the time to address that as well. Mr. Kowski stated he thinks it is painted wood. Commissioner Siebert stated it looks worn, and Chairperson Beveridge asked if it was plywood. Mr. Kowski stated that he did not know. Mr. Kearns pointed out that when you look at the old historic photos, you can see the windows go all the way up almost to the top of the portico, so the windows that are currently in there are probably shorter, which is why there is wood above.

Chairperson Beveridge stated that the rosettes on the iron beam cannot be removed. Mr. Kowski stated that the historic photo shows the First National Bank awning in comparison to the delivery truck, concluding that the window would go to about a foot below where it says First National. Chairperson Beveridge said the shadow of the portico is visible above the awning, and the awning must be right at the bottom of the iron beam. Mr. Kearns pointed out in one of the current photos you can still see the beam. Commissioner Kruthoff stated that the rosettes would be behind the board, and if the frame is removed the board can be repaired or replaced. Mr. Kearns stated that it is dependent on numerous factors and a condition can be placed onto

the request addressing the board. Chairperson Beveridge stated that you could take the awning down and inspect it, and sometimes you find some interesting stuff and other times just a hole.

Commissioner Siebert asked about the pipe on the right side, to which Mr. Kowski explained it was for fuel, and thinks that it can be covered up. Alderperson Stroik asked if it went anywhere. Mr. Kowski stated it was closed off in the basement and in the past there had been grates on the sidewalks. Commissioner Siebert stated that was for coal shoots and retail elevators. He also asked what type of heat system is used now, to which Mr. Kowski answered natural gas.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns said that Dakota Mahogany granite will be used to replace the black vitrolite, found below the first floor windows. The color closely matches the color of the sandstone on the building. However, when the building is cleaned, they color may be different. Mr. Kowski stated that he had tried to find synthetic materials similar to the sandstone, and checked with a stone company out of Mosinee who could possibly make some type of sandstone block, but it would have to be stained and cut into panels. Panels will break in the process which will have to be paid for by the applicant. Commissioner Kruthoff stated that it is a replacement, and a fake replacement that is a better material than the existing vitrolite. Mr. Kowski stated that staining stone does not ensure it will not fade and will eventually need re-staining. He thought that the granite would hold its natural color better. Chairperson Beveridge asked about the vitrolite to the right of the entry door and the plans for removing it. Mr. Kowski stated that they don't know what is behind there, and they will have to have someone cut a panel out. Mr. Kearns stated that all the bids do include the replacement of that vitrolite next to the door. Commissioner Kruthoff asked if there was some way for the removed vitrolite to be stored somewhere so that if there is another place downtown or someone that could use it, it would be available. Mr. Kowski stated there are probably 8-10 panels that are in good shape.

Mr. Kowski asked if the panel comes off and there is brick behind it, do they stay with the brick, and possibly tuckpoint or install the granite. Chairperson Beveridge stated it would be a nice effect to have the brick carry right to the doorway, and it would look nice if it was cleaned off. Mr. Kearns asked if that was a condition that the commission would want, to which Chairperson Beveridge stated that staff and the chair could approve it after they remove the vitrolite.

Economic Development Specialist Kyle Kearns reiterated the conditions outlined in the staff report and suggested by the Commission.

**Motion by Commissioner Kruthoff to approve request from Jerome Kowski for façade improvement grant funds in the amount of \$10,960.52 and design review for exterior building work, including the replacement of windows, storefront awning, and significant masonry work at 1059 Main Street with the following conditions:**

- **HP/DRC Chair and the designated agent shall approve any changes that would be made to the backing behind the awning.**
- **The applicant shall investigate necessary services to identify the backing behind the awning and obtain bids for proposed work to be approved by the HP/DRC Chair and designated agent.**
- **The applicant shall work with staff to research proper cleaning methods relating to the Bayfield sandstone, which would be approved by the HP/DRC Chair and designated agent.**

- **HP/DRC Chair and designated agent shall review and/or approve the granite installation along the entryway once the applicant has identified the material behind the existing vitrolite.**
- **First floor and second floor window trim shall match.**
- **If possible, windows shall be made of wood and permitted to have an aluminum exterior, matching the color of the first floor.**
- **Awning dimensions and logo renderings shall be submitted and reviewed by the Commission if they change in color or design from the existing.**
- **Tuckpointing shall match to the greatest extent possible the original mortar color and spacing on the building.**
- **All work shall be completed within one year.**
- **Project must adhere to Façade Improvement Grant Program Guidelines.**
- **No funds shall be disbursed until project is fully completed.**
- **The maximum City participation shall not exceed \$10,960.52 and no individual costs shall exceed the following:**

<b>Improvements</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Proposed Matching Grant Assistance</b>
Masonry	Tuckpointing	Don Dulak & Son Masonry - \$3,740	<b>\$1,870</b>
	Granite Cost	Stone Innovations Inc. - \$4,926.50	<b>\$2,465.25</b>
	Granite Installation	Don Dulak & Son Masonry - \$2,200	\$1,100
		Mark Check Masonry - \$1,900	<b>\$950</b>
Windows	Commercial	Precision Glass & Door - \$4,482	<b>\$2,241</b>
	Second Story	Area Glass - \$5,482	\$2,741
		Precision Glass & Door - \$4,520 + \$280 Paint	<b>\$2,400</b>
		Area Glass - \$5,109 + \$313.58 Paint	\$2,711.29
Awning	Front Awning	Baraboo Tent Awning - \$2,388 Pain Company	\$1,194
		Duralum Siding, Windows & Sunrooms - \$2,068.53	<b>\$1,034.27</b>
<b>TOTAL (Lowest Bid)</b>		<b>\$21,917.03</b>	<b>\$10,960.52</b>

**Seconded by Commissioner Siebert. Motion carried 4-0.**

Commissioner Kruthoff added that when working with the awning if for some reason that you decide to change to the older triangle awning instead, we would favor that. Mr. Kowski asked what the triangle awning would be, to which Mr. Kearns stated it would be like the previous applicant Mr. Fang's building, where it a triangle awning that recesses in and out, sloped down from the building to the overhang over the sidewalk. Chairperson Beveridge stated that Mr. Kowski has a balloon awning and the Commission is trying to promote the old fashioned types, such as triangle awnings. Mr. Kowski stated that he has a book that has numerous types of awnings, fabrics, colors that he can review, but will have to look into cost differences with the contractors. Commissioner Kruthoff stated that if the cost is comparable the Commission encourages the applicant to install the triangle awning. Mr. Kearns stated that the triangle

awning may use less fabric. Chairperson Beveridge stated that there are clearance restrictions within the historic guidelines that require awnings to be not less than eight feet. Mr. Kowski stated he would look into the other type awning. Chairperson Beveridge pointed out that the floors are so high inside that the awning may block the view if you are inside the building and looking out. Mr. Kowski stated that he thinks the granite tile is three feet high, so that would be about what the inside floor level would be. Chairperson Beveridge reviewed the condition related to the awning outlined in the staff report, and advised Mr. Kowski to research the awning and look into the other design.

Mr. Kearns stated that this can be added as a condition, to research the awning. Alderperson Stroik asked that if Mr. Kowski went to the triangle awning, where would the store name go, to which Commissioner Siebert stated usually across the lower awning or flap.

**Commissioner Kruthoff and Commissioner Seibert agreed to amend the motion to have the applicant research the triangle style awning and get a bid to be approved by the Chairperson of the HP/DRC and the designated agent, which may change the award reimbursement. Motion carried 4-0.**

6. Adjourn.

**Motion by Chairperson Beveridge to adjourn; seconded by Commissioner Siebert. Motion carried 4-0. Meeting adjourned at 6:21 PM.**