

8/16/10 - Monday, August 16, 2010

**EAU CLAIRE
LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

Meeting of August 16, 2010

Members Present: Jenny Ebert, Katrinka Bourne, Ken Fulgione, Carrie Ronnander, David Klinkhammer, Barbara Lozar

Members Absent: Sue Nelson

Minutes. The minutes of the August 2, 2010 meeting were approved as written.

The meeting was chaired by Jenny Ebert.

1. Consideration of an application for Certificate of Appropriateness to repair fire damage and install egress windows at 310 Lake Street.

Pat Ivory provided an overview of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair fire damage and install egress windows at 310 Lake Street. The property is listed as a pivotal property within the Randall Park Historic Landmark District. It is a nonconforming use in that it was a 6-plex with R-2 zoning. The repairs to the damaged building are anticipated to exceed 50% of its fair market value. Section 18.35.050 H. of City Zoning Code provides provisions for consideration of the substantial repair or restoration of such landmark properties. These provisions state:

18.35.050 H. Damaged Landmarked Properties. Districts allowed: all residential districts. Provisions:

1. The purpose of these provisions is to allow and encourage the repair and preservation of landmarked residential property substantially damaged by fire, natural disaster, neglect, or third party action while maintaining the original structure to the maximum extent possible, but not the replacement of the structure, in furtherance of the purpose of this title and Chapter 2.65.
2. These provisions shall only apply to individual landmarked properties and properties within a landmarked district that are pivotal or contributing, but shall not apply to noncontributing properties as defined in Chapter 2.65.
3. Applicant shall apply for and must receive Landmarks Commission approval of the repairs to the damaged property pursuant to Chapter 2.65 either prior to application to the Commission or as a condition of the grant of the conditional use.
4. Applicant shall not raze the structure nor deconstruct any more of the structure than is reasonably necessary to allow for the overall repair.
5. Applicant may not extend or intensify any nonconforming use through the repair and reuse of the damaged property, but may, or, if made a condition by the Commission, shall change the use to one that is more restrictive based on the provisions of Section 18.40.020 E.

For this request, Mr. Mogensen is proposing to repair the building as a 6-plex, which was the previous use of the building and allowed under Section 5 of the previously noted provisions. There would be 4 three-bedroom units and 2 efficiencies. The required parking is 10 stalls. There are 4 garage stalls on the site now and 3 surface parking stalls. Mr. Mogensen states that they will expand this parking lot to the west of the building to provide the required parking.

Mr. MogensenTMs letter included with the application notes the repair they anticipate with the building. Worst case would be the removal of the entire second floor and rebuilding up. They will attempt to save as much of the second floor as possible. He also notes the possibility of needing some flexibility about adding or moving windows.

The request was considered by the Plan Commission on August 2nd as a conditional use permit and was approved by the Commission.

In addition to the repair work related to the fire damage, Mr. Mogensen is proposing to have two bedrooms and a living room in the lower level for each of two units that are on the first floor. To accommodate egress code requirements for these bedrooms, Mr. Mogensen is proposing to install egress windows. Existing windows would be utilized, but they would have to be extended below grade to comply with the code. He has indicated a total of ten windows would be opened up for egress windows and the design would be the same as approved for his property located to the southeast of the intersection at 617 Third Avenue.

Mr. John Mogensen was present at the meeting in support of the application. Mr. Mogensen stated that the fire damage was extensive, but planned on rebuilding the house to replicate the exterior appearance of the property as closely as possible. He noted that he did not know how much of the structure could be salvaged until he began the demolition process. In addition, he would not have an exact floor plan until the demolition was complete. He noted that room sizes could change due to the location of structural supports, walls, etc. He indicated that he could submit an exact floor plan further into the remodeling process.

He stated that the roof would have to be completely replaced and a worst case scenario could also result in having to remove the entire second floor. However, he noted that he would attempt to retain as much of the existing structure as possible. He noted that in rebuilding the structure that he would add fire rated ceilings, and fire separation between units as well as sprinklering the building.

He stated that his plan was to complete the repairs and rebuilding, which included rebuilding the roof to match its original design and configuration, installing new windows to match the existing in style and configuration, installing similar detailing below the eaves (dentils and brackets) as the original and installing the decorative scalloping in the gable ends of the roof. He noted that the dentils and brackets may involve non-wood materials.

He added that he may need to install a couple additional windows to meet code requirements for the bedrooms. These windows would match the existing in style and shape.

The Commission stated that the design and symmetry of any additional windows should be considered in relation of the other windows on that particular side of the structure and that the Commission would need to review these changes before they were undertaken.

Mr. Mogensen also questioned whether the installation of vinyl siding could be an option.

The Commission stated that because the property is a pivotal property within the district that wood siding would be the preferred choice. Cement fiberboard siding would be an option that could be considered.

(Carrie Ronnander left the meeting.)

Mr. Mogensen also discussed the design of the egress windows. He stated that the existing window openings would be utilized. Their width would not change, but that they would be extended below grade approximately two feet to meet the exiting code requirements. The windows would be double-hung. The egress well would be concrete or brick and be screened from view of the streets with landscaping.

ACTION TAKEN: Ken Fulgione moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 310 Lake Street to allow the substantial repair of the fire damaged property and installation of egress windows as proposed by Mr. Mogensen and discussed with the Commission, which includes the necessary demolition of the damaged elements of the building including the roof and all or portions of the second floor. Such approval is contingent that detailed plans of the reconstruction be submitted to and approved by the Commission prior to initiating the reconstruction which shows floor plans, window placement, and any necessary building elevations where exterior changes are proposed. Further that the siding be made of wood to match as closely as possible the existing siding. Barbara Lozar seconded the motion. All votes were in favor motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m. and the Commission then toured the landmark home located at 751 Second Avenue.

Submitted by,

Sue Nelson, Secretary