

**EAU CLAIRE
LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

Meeting of July 1, 2013

Members Present: Katrinka Bourne, Ken Ziehr, Patrick Kurtenbach, Dave Strobel

Members Absent: Carrie Ronnander, Karen Nusbaum, Jim Seymour

Minutes. The minutes of the June 3, 2013 meeting were approved as written.

The meeting was chaired by Katrinka Bourne and called to order at 4:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of Applications for Certificate of Appropriateness, including:

A. Installation of Siding at 1302 State Street. Pat Ivory provided an overview of an amended application to install wood siding at 1302 State Street, which is located within the Third Ward Historic Landmark District. Mr. Ed Garlick, owner of the property, had submitted a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness in 2012 to install vinyl siding on the building, replacing the horizontal wood siding that was in deteriorated condition. The Commission approved the project contingent that Mr. Garlick bring back specific information about the proposed siding and its installation for Commission approval.

Mr. Garlick is now proposing to install a wood composite siding called “smartside” instead of the vinyl. The siding would replace the horizontal wood siding. The decorative siding, such as the fish-scale siding in the gables and curved walls, would not be changed and would be painted.

Mr. Garlick was present at the meeting to discuss the proposed work with the Commission. He noted that all the decorative trim on the building would be retained and eventually painted. Some of the deteriorated trim elements will be replaced with wood, crafted to match the trim to be replaced.

Mr. Garlick provided samples of the siding, noting that the siding would be primed and painted by the manufacturer. He also discussed the installation techniques and advantages over the cement fiber board siding.

The Commission noted that the siding had a fairly pronounced wood grain appearance and questioned whether the siding would be available with a smooth finish. Mr. Garlick indicated that he would contact the manufacturer to determine whether the flat or smooth finish would be available.

The Commission also discussed the proposed work in relation to the guidelines contained the Landmarks Ordinance and District Plan.

ACTION TAKEN: Ken Ziehr moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that Mr. Garlick inquire with the siding manufacturer as to whether a smooth finish is available. If available, the smooth finish would be installed. If not available, siding with the wood grain finish could be installed. Dave Strobel seconded the motion. The motion carried with Pat Kurtenbach voting no.

- B. Window Modifications at 1302 State Street.** Pat Ivory provided an overview of an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to make some window changes on the southwest and northeast corners of the building located at 1302 State Street, which is in the Third Ward Historic Landmark District. Pat noted that the proposed changes on the southwest corner of the building involved work on a second floor sun room area that presently includes 4 windows in the west elevation and 3 windows in the south elevation. Mr. Garlick, the owner of the property, has indicated that the windows are deteriorated and would like to remove the windows and replace them with 2 windows on the west elevation and 2 windows on the south elevation.

The windows would be double hung and of similar width to the windows on the south elevation and of similar height to those being replaced. The decorative trim below the eave would be retained and the “smartside” siding would be installed around the windows to match the other siding on the house.

For the northeast portion of the house, Mr. Garlick is proposing to remove the decorative windows and install the wood siding as a replacement. The existing operable window would be retained. The decorative trim above the windows and below would be retained, as well as the decorative vertical columns shown in the photo. This area is a hallway in the house connecting a bedroom on the left with a bedroom on the right. Only the double hung window is functional; the remainder of the windows have been sheet-rocked over from the inside.

Mr. Garlick was present at the meeting to discuss the proposed work. In regards to the second floor windows located in the southwest portion of the building, Mr. Garlick indicated that the far left window on the west elevation was in very deteriorated condition because of drainage from the roof. He stated that he would like to eliminate that one window (far left on west side) and replace the other six windows at part of the siding replacement project. He indicated that he hoped to install two windows on each side of the sun room.

In regards to the windows located in the northeast portion of the building, Mr. Garlick stated that the wall below the windows was deteriorated and needed to be replaced. Since he would be working on the supporting wall beneath the windows, Mr. Garlick indicated that he would like to remove the decorative windows as part of the reconstruction work since they are non-functioning windows.

The Commission discussed the changes in relation to the ordinance and plan guidelines and expressed concern that the proposed work would dramatically change the appearance of the building and remove several distinctive decorative elements. In particular, the Commission noted that the northeast windows were very visible from the street and their removal would alter the character of the north side of the building. In regards to the windows on the southwest corner, the Commission questioned why the configuration of the six sunroom windows should be changed, noting that replacement windows of a similar design could be utilized.

ACTION TAKEN: Dave Strobel moved to approve the removal of the one window on the far left side of the west elevation and left of the sun room, and that plans for the replacement of the six windows in the sunroom area should be brought back to the Commission for further consideration. The northeast decorative windows should not be removed, but the siding can be installed below the windows where the deteriorated plywood exists. Ken Ziehr seconded the motion. The motion carried with Pat Kurtenbach voting no.

2. **Discussion and Comment on City Hall South Entrance.** The Commission reviewed three alternative designs related to the reconstruction of the south entrance to City Hall that was damaged earlier in the year. One option proposes a ramp system on the south side of the building connecting to a one-story structure located in the same general location as the original entrance. This option would retain the existing window above the doorway. The second alternative would involve an entrance addition with a similar foot print as the original entrance with the entrance door facing Grand Avenue. The height of the roofline of the entrance would be approximately 3' higher than the first option, therefore blocking a portion of the window above the doorway. The third alternative would have the entry door on the east side with people entering from the parking lot to the east of the building. The structure would be high enough to completely block the window above the existing doorway. The second and third alternatives include an interior lift system.

Pat noted that each option had advantages and disadvantages. In addition to attempting to make the new entrance complementary to the City Hall building, other considerations are necessary to consider such as: ADA accessibility, location of the handicapped parking, security issues related to access of the building, and employee and public accessibility to the Inspections/Planning offices.

The Commission discussed the options and indicated that retaining the window above the current entrance doorway should be a priority. They also indicated that the installation of such an extensive ramping system as shown in the first alternative should be avoided. The need for ADA accessibility was also discussed, with other long-range accessibility options being considered for other portions of the building.

Pat noted that the architect hired by the City would be developing a more specific design for the entrance, which will be brought to the Commission for consideration.

3. Update on Landmark Activities and Properties.

- A. Update from Eau Claire Historic Preservation Foundation.** Pat Kurtenbach indicated that he didn't have any update regarding HPF activities.
- B. Discussion of the Landmarks Commission's Report on the Confluence Project.** Dave Strobel discussed the report that the Commission had prepared last fall outlining the Commission's concerns about the Confluence Redevelopment Project. Dave stated that he felt that the report did a good job outlining the concerns of the Commission but stated that he felt that the last paragraph noting the Commission's recommendation conflicted with the overall intent of the report. He also noted that no presentation was given to the City Council outlining the findings of the report. He added that the membership on the City Council has changed since last fall, and several of the new members on the Council have not read the report.

Dave also noted that the scope of the project has been reduced based on reports in the media. He questioned whether these changes may make the preservation of the buildings along South Barstow more feasible. Ken Ziehr noted that he was not aware of any information indicating that the footprint of the project had been reduced as a result of these changes. He suggested that the developer inform the Commission about the scope of the changes.

The Commission also discussed the possibility of presenting the findings of the report to the City Council at some time in the future.

ACTION TAKEN: Dave Strobel moved to update the Commission's report by deleting the last paragraph of the report and asking the Commission Chairperson to forward a copy of the report to the City Manager for distribution to the City Council, and that the developer be asked to attend a future Commission meeting to discuss the current scope of the project. Pat Kurtenbach seconded the motion. All votes were in favor. Motion carried.

- C. Internship Project Updates.** This item was postponed until the August meeting.
- D. Landmark Designation Request for 212 McKinley Avenue.** This item was postponed until the August meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Submitted by,

Patrick Kurtenbach, Secretary