

5/7/12 - Monday, May 7, 2012

**EAU CLAIRE
LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

Meeting of May 7, 2012

Members Present: Katrinka Bourne, Kathy Mitchell, Carrie Ronnander, Patrick Kurtenbach, Jim Seymour, Ken Ziehr

Members Absent: Karen Nusbaum

Minutes. The minutes of the April 2, 2012 meeting were approved as written.

The meeting was chaired by Katrinka Bourne and called to order at 4:30 p.m. in the North Conference Room.

1. Consideration of an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to Reside 1302 State Street.

Pat Ivory provided an overview of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness that was submitted by Mr. Ed Garlick to install vinyl siding on portions of his property located at 1302 State Street. The property in question is listed as a pivotal property within the Third Ward Historic Landmark District and its historic name is the Addison Cutter House, constructed in 1885-1889.

Mr. Garlick is proposing to remove the existing horizontal wood siding on the structure and replace it with vinyl siding. He stated in his application that all trim and decorative wood will remain as is and will be painted. He has stated that he is proposing to replace only the horizontal wood siding because of problems with the siding holding paint.

Mr. Garlick has indicated that the width of the siding would replicate the existing siding. In addition, the horizontal siding would be removed in order to retain the existing relief/depth between trim elements such as around the windows and doors. The color of the siding would be a light grey, similar to the existing paint color of the siding. Mr. Garlick also provided photographs of several other historic residential properties with his submittal that have been resided with either vinyl or aluminum. These include: 221 Washington Avenue, 620 Third Avenue, 244 Lake Street, and 404 Broadway Street.

Pat noted that when reviewing the application, the Commission should refer to the standards contained in the Landmarks Ordinance (Chapter 2.65) and the standards contained in the Third Ward Historic District Plan. The provisions state that the Commission shall follow the ten Secretary of the Interior™s Standards for Rehabilitation. Standards that are directly applicable to this review include:

- The distinguishing original qualities of character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
- Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity.
- Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

The ordinance provides further direction for properties in historic districts, stating, "For structures located within an historic district, the standards and guidelines adopted in district plans pursuant to Section 2.65.050 B shall apply, in addition to the criteria listed above (Secretary of Interior Standards). The significance assigned a property in a district plan as pivotal, contributing, or non-contributing shall be given decisive weight by the Commission when the Commission applies the district standards and guidelines to the proposed project. The Commission shall require greater conformance to such standards and guidelines for properties which are historically or architecturally significant and which contribute to or complement the district.

The Third Ward Historic Landmark District Plan also provides guidelines for residing projects, which state, "Residing with wood, masonite, aluminum, vinyl or steel is permitted only if the new siding imitates the width of the original siding within 1/8" or is no greater than 4" wide, and provided that all architectural details such as window trim, wood cornices, and ornaments either remain uncovered or are duplicated exactly in appearance. Siding that imitates wood grain is not permitted.

Pat noted that in review of the application, there appears to be some information that was not provided that could assist the Commission in their review; such as:

- Specifications or information about the proposed siding (i.e. brand, style, design, etc.)
- Information about why the existing siding cannot be painted, or what attempts have been made and the results
- What alternatives have been considered such as replacing the wood siding with new wood siding, or the use of other materials such as hardy board/concrete board siding

Mr. Ed Garlick, owner of the property was present at the meeting and provided an overview of the project noting that the plan was to replace only the horizontal siding and leave all the remaining decorative trim and siding as is. These features would be painted. He estimated that the building was painted in approximately 1998 and the paint is in poor condition. He noted that the wood siding itself is in extremely poor condition. He added that the reason for replacing the horizontal wood siding is related to the cost of repainting the siding versus installing siding that would not have to be painted.

The siding would come in 12" lengths, so some seams would be visible. A 1/4" layer of insulation would be installed under the siding. He added that the flared out siding at the foundation would be retained. He added that he plans to re-shingle the building this summer.

He referred to the other buildings listed in his submittal that had been resided where the ornamented detailing had been retained.

The Commission discussed the application with several members expressing concerns about the installation of the vinyl siding and noting that the previous paint job held up quite well if it was done around 1998. The Commission also expressed concerns as to: whether wall sheathing was present under the existing siding, how the siding would be installed on the rounded surfaces, and how the vinyl siding would be installed at some of the corner sections where there was no corner trim where the siding is just butted together.

Mr. Garlick indicated that the vertical trim piece would have to be installed at the corners where the current wood siding is butted together. He added that he felt that the siding could be applied to the rounded surfaces. If this would be a problem, he would re-use the wood siding.

The Commission also discussed how the siding would be attached on the ends next to the existing wood trim. Mr. Garlick explained how a cœj channel piece would be used, but would not extend beyond the trim. He noted several other houses using this installation, which is not visible from the street.

The Commission asked for more details or specifics about the actual siding proposed to be installed. Mr. Garlick did not have this information available.

The Commission continued their discussion noting the importance of this building in the Third Ward Historic Landmark District as well as its visibility along State Street. It was also mentioned that cost issues such as those mentioned, need to be a consideration of the Commission. Several Commission members stated that they felt that retaining the trim and decorative siding was a good compromise in this situation.

ACTION TAKEN: Kathy Mitchell moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted and discussed with the condition that Mr. Garlick bring back specific information about the siding proposed for installation for the Commission to approve. Jim Seymour seconded the motion. The motion carried with Pat Kurtenbach voting no.

Carrie Ronnander left the meeting.

2. Update on 310 Lake Street.

The Commission continued their discussion from the previous meeting regarding the restoration work occurring at 310 Lake Street specifically relating to the porch. The property was damaged by fire and the Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2010 to allow for the reconstruction/repair of the 6-plex to match the original design as close as possible.

Pat noted that he talked to Mr. Mogensen about the Commission™s recommendations concerning the railing. Mr. Mogensen indicated that he also preferred trying to repair the existing railing so that it could be kept at the existing height.

3. Update on Landmark Activities and Properties.

A. Discussion of Preservation Month Activities. Pat informed the Commission that the public open house discussed at the April meeting for 310 Lake Street would not be possible. The owner has concerns about large numbers of people walking through the building and the potential damage that could occur. However, the Landmarks Commission is still invited to tour the building when completed. Pat also noted that the City Council would be reading a proclamation for Preservation Month on May 8th. Katrinka will attend the meeting and mention some of the preservation activities occurring in the City, including the home tour sponsored by the HPF.

B. Update from Eau Claire Historic Preservation Foundation. Pat Kurtenbach provided an update of Foundation activities, which included the home tour on May 19th. He also noted some of the work that will be undertaken by the intern hired by the Foundation.

C. Update on City Hall Building Analysis/Grant Applications. Pat Ivory noted that he was nearing completion of the grant application to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

ACTION TAKEN: Ken Ziehr moved to adopt a resolution in support of the grant application to the National Trust for funding to assist in the building analysis. Pat Kurtenbach seconded the motion. All votes were in favor. Motion carried.

D. Lead Base Paint Provisions. The Commission discussed recent legislation (April 2010) regarding the painting of structures that contain lead base paint and practices that contactors are required to follow. It was noted that the enforcement of the provisions are self-policed, but substantial fines can be issued for violations.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Submitted by,

Patrick Kurtenbach, Secretary