Approved

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION
5:30 p.m.
Thursday, July 20, 2017
Room 250, Historic Federal Building

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Christina Monk; Commissioners Emily Hilgendorf, Leslie Terry, David Klavitter, John McAndrews, Juan Nieto, and Joseph Rapp.

Commissioners Excused: Commissioners Bob McDonell and Al Kopczyk.

Commissioners Unexcused: None.

Staff Members Present: Laura Carstens and David Johnson.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Monk at 5:30 p.m.

AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE: Staff presented an Affidavit of Compliance verifying the meeting was being held in compliance with the Iowa Open Meetings Law.

MINUTES: Motion Hilgendorf by, seconded by Terry, to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2017 meeting as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Terry, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – None

Historic Preservation Forgivable Loan: Application of Mark & Emily Smith for a Historic Preservation Forgivable Loan to paint the exterior of home and replace fascia boards, trim and gutters at 540 Wilbur Street in the West 11th Street Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the Staff Report. Mark Smith, property owner, explained they purchased the property two years ago. There is a substantial amount of work required and the forgivable loan will assist in hiring professional contractors to make the necessary improvements.

The Commission and applicant reviewed alterations made to the property. The applicant reviewed the ornamental features.

Motion by Hilgendorf, seconded by Nieto, to approve a Historic Preservation Forgivable

Loan in the amount of $5,000 to Mary and Emily Smith for improvements to their property at 540 Wilbur Street. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Terry, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – None.

Design Review/1298 Locust Street: Application of Zachery Bries for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a solar roof at 1298 Locust Street in the Jackson Park Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report, noting the slate on the roof is original to the home. He explained the average lifespan of the roof and noted the current roof is starting to show signs of flaking.

Commissioner Nieto stated he felt the original slate roof should be able to exist for its entire lifespan. Once it can no longer serve its purpose an alternative material can be considered. He noted the solar roofs are untested in the Midwest. Mr. Gries asked whether slate can be salvaged. The Commission stated slate can be salvaged or purchased new.

Commissioner Klavitter reviewed there is an environmental, historic and economic incentive to maintain the existing slate roof, noting the historic slate has embodied energy.

The Commission discussed the lifespan of the new solar tile and the return on investment. Mr. Gries explained the Tesla tiles have a lifetime warranty and a 30% tax rebate. He stated the project makes financial sense.

The Commission stated they would like to see an actual sample of the material when released. The Commission discussed other solar shingle projects, including the County Courthouse and Engine House Number 1. The Commission noted the roofs on those applications were sloped less and original materials were not present.

The Commission encouraged the applicant to allow the slate to live out its life. When the roof does need to be replaced, the Commission stated they would be open to solar options, but would like to see an actual sample when that time comes.

The Commission and Mr. Gries discussed the condition of the existing roof. Mr. Gries explained the roof will need some work but a thorough investigation has not been done. He mentioned some flaking has started. Staff Member Carstens stated the NPS Technical Park Services Brief states the traditional threshold for complete replacement is when 20% or more of the roof is need of replacement.

Commissioner Klavitter explained he would like to know more about the technology and whether the roof caps can be preserved. He is open to a progressive material as long as it maintains the character of the building. Commission Nieto stated he would vote no

so long as there is no need to replace the roof. Chairperson Monk reiterated other comments. Commission Hilgendorf explained she would like to know more information on the durability of the solar shingles in comparison to the historic material. She asked how the return on investment compares.

The applicant requested the Commission table the application to allow time to more thoroughly assess the condition of the slate and evaluate alternatives. Staff and the Commission discussed individuals licensed to operate drones to help with the roof evaluation.

Motion by Hilgendorf, seconded by Rapp, to table the application at the applicant's request. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Terry, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – Nieto.

Design Review/514 Loras Boulevard: Application of Christopher Winter for a Certificate of Appropriateness to enclose the storefront and add new windows at 514 Loras Boulevard located in the West 11th Street Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report for the "after the fact" work and proposed changes. Christopher Winter, property owner, represented the application. He explained he did not intentionally circumvent any process. He stated he did a lot of research, and the only economically feasible option was to convert the first floor laundromat to an apartment. He reiterated, his only error was not getting HPC review.

He explained he purchased the property approximately two years ago. He reviewed recent events to the property, including the impact of the new laundromat that has opened on University Avenue. He explained the storefront was replaced twice last year due to vandalism. He stated he put in a different window the third time it was broken and it went unnoticed. He stated it was only after speaking with Planning staff that he realized he needed HPC approval for exterior alterations, and the process was explained to him. Mr. Winter explained he thought the treatment approach was the best approach. He stated he felt the scope of work was discussed with City inspectors and thought everybody was on the same page. He stated it was an error that the exterior work was not included on the building permit.

He explained the new window on the east side cannot be centered because of the Rocco Buda concrete wall. He stated it will be painted. He explained on the west side of the property where there was a window, vent and duct, he wants to install two windows with a bathroom exhaust and furnace exhaust. He said it will be painted and will match. He noted the biggest issue is the facade along Loras. He noted the building was in terrible condition and the Police were called there frequently. The change he made addresses some of these issues.

He noted a transparent storefront was not practical for an apartment. He stated much of the wood materials were rotted. Mr. Winter stated the building was the only commercial

style building left on the street, and everything else is residential. He stated the rehabilitation makes the building more in keeping with the neighborhood. He explained the efforts made were to make the building viable and stay historic.

Commissioner Terry asked how much he has invested so far. He explained it is an approximate $50,000 project. He stated it would be approximately an additional $10,000 if he were to have to restore a storefront. Mr. Winter explained his building is one of the better buildings on the street after the changes.

Commissioner Nieto stated he was surprised to see how destroyed the building was. He wishes the error could have been caught earlier. He said a lack of knowledge and ignorance is not an excuse for the project. The Commission stated that when people move into historic areas they invest in their properties and the idea that things will be done properly and the historic fabric will be maintained. The Commission stated the original building was not the odd building on the block, rather it was a unique, contributing building to the district. The alteration was disappointing to see.

Mr. Winter clarified all original architectural features removed were lost. He explained all were in poor condition and could not be salvaged.

Staff Member Carstens noted the permit was for interior work only; therefore, Planning Services Staff was never contacted about it. Had the work been accurately represented on the permit, this could have been avoided. Staff Member Carstens also clarified staff posted on the Assessor's website all properties that are located in historic districts. Staff Member Johnson also explained many times historic districts are disclosures on real estate transactions.

The Commission asked whether they can vote on individual components of the application. Staff clarified they can, but it's important to note the egress window on the east side of the addition is mandatory for an apartment, and because of the property and grade, it cannot be located elsewhere. The Commission asked whether the egress window was located in response to vandalism and noise. Mr. Winter explained it was the only place an egress window can be located and it will reduce noise.

The Commission discussed the style and location of the egress window. They noted a double-hung window aligned vertically on the front facade would be better. Mr. Winter disagreed, noting the degree of vandalism. The Commission noted an existing window was already on that wall and can provide necessary egress. Mr. Winter stated a new double-hung would be disproportionate from the ones above because more space is needed. Staff inquired whether the units above were occupied. Mr. Winter confirmed they were. He stated he has a rental license for upstairs so they must comply.

The Commission discussed the request and noted the importance of adhering to the adopted Architectural Guidelines. The Commission reviewed the alteration on the west side of the building. Staff clarified there are two new windows and one window that was

boarded-up and has two-vents in it. Mr. Winter confirmed he will paint the wood. The Commission asked why the new windows cannot fill the entire opening. Mr. Winter said he felt the smaller windows were better looking. The Commission stated they feel new windows proportionate or matching the openings would look nicer. The Commission asked whether they were 4/1 windows. Mr. Winter stated they were not.

Motion by Nieto, seconded by Hilgendorf, to approve the west facade windows and vent, with the condition that two functional windows fill the whole opening and the boarded-up window be finished to match the adjacent building finish and the two functional windows be double-hung windows. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Terry, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – None.

The Commission discussed using a faux storefront. Staff Member Carstens noted there is a property on Rhomberg that accomplishes this. The Commission discussed using Lexan as a substitute material for glass. It is shatter proof, durable, single-pane, and can be customized for dimension and thickness. Commissioner Nieto stated there is a glass substitute that can be used that is transparent.

Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Terry, to approve the storefront design as submitted. Motion failed by the following vote: Aye – None; Nay - Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Terry, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Abstain - None.

The Commission discussed relocating the east facade window to the front facade where the top of the window meets the top of the current door opening as shown. Mr. Winter noted that would be ok to add since it wouldn't be paired like the windows above. He stated placing a window where that door was would look odd. Staff clarified the window is in a late addition and greater flexibility is given to additions. The Commission noted the window currently installed should at least be a double-hung window to match the entire property.

Motion by Rapp, seconded by Hilgendorf, to approve the egress window and infilled door on the 1999 addition as submitted with the condition the trim be painted red to match. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, McAndrews, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – Nieto, Klavitter, and Terry.

The Commission and Mr. Winter discussed design options for the storefront. The Commission explained a future application should include an angled recessed entry, glass or glass-like display windows such as Lexan, transparent or diffused light transforms, and a general appearance similar to what the storefront was. The Commission stated they would consider alternative materials to wood for the storefront such as aluminum clad trim and fiber cement. Staff and the Commission also noted the Architectural Guidelines would support replicating the original storefront in design and materials since the original storefront is documented.

ITEMS FROM PUBLIC: None

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:

Commissioner Terry left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Election of Officers: The Commission commended Chairperson Monk and Vice Chairperson Hilgendorf for their service.

Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Rapp to nominate Commissioner Hilgendorf as chairperson. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – None.

Motion by Monk, seconded by Rapp, to nominate Commissioner Nieto as Vice Chairperson. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Rapp, Klavitter, McAndrews, Nieto, Hilgendorf, and Monk; Nay – None.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Building Services Historic Preservation Enforcement Report: Staff Member Johnson reviewed the enforcement report. The Commission discussed the continued progress made at 1921 Madison and agreed monitoring is more appropriate at this time than enforcement. The consensus of the Commission was to remove 1921 Madison Street from the Enforcement report.

Staff Approvals: None

Oath's of Office: Chairperson Monk's Oath of Office was administered.

Commissioner McAndrews left the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Hilgendorf, seconded by Rapp to adjourn the July 20, 2017 Commission meeting. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Monk, Nieto, Rapp, and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____ _____

Laura Carstens, Planning Services Manager Adopted