



Approved

**MINUTES**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR SESSION**  
5:30 p.m.  
Thursday, January 20, 2011  
City Council Chamber, Historic Federal Building

**Commissioners Present:** Chairperson Michael Knight; Commissioners David Klavitter, Chris Olson, John Whalen, Mary Loney Bichell, Joseph Rapp, Chris Wand and Peggy Stover.

**Commissioners Excused:** Commissioner Bob McDonell.

**Staff Members Present:** David Johnson and Laura Carstens.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Knight at 5:32 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.

**PUBLIC HEARING EXPANSION OF WASHINGTON NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICT:** Application of City of Dubuque to expand the Washington Neighborhood Conservation District.

The public hearing was opened at 5:34 p.m. Planning Services Manager Laura Carstens and Housing and Community Director David Harris presented an overview of the proposed conservation district expansion. Staff Member Harris reviewed the Washington Neighborhood Strategic Plan and Staff Member Carstens discussed the process for expanding the district.

Staff Member Harris explained the proposed conservation district expansion is an element of the Washington Neighborhood Strategic Plan. He reviewed the strategies outlined in the plan. He described the architectural survey, vision process, planning process and stabilization process as well as investments in the Washington Neighborhood. He noted over \$31,000,000 in public and private funds have been invested in the Washington Neighborhood. He reviewed the porch projects and upper Central Avenue Corridor Initiative. He reviewed the Safe Communities Task Force recommendation, which encourages homeownership, mixed income housing opportunities and historic character. He noted the negative impact demolitions have had on the character and redevelopment of the Washington Neighborhood.

Commissioner Whalen arrived at 5:38 p.m.

Staff Member Carstens described the mechanics of the conservation district expansion. She reviewed what a conservation district is and why historic buildings are important to preserve. She reviewed the historical and architectural significance maps. She noted the

Washington Neighborhood is one of the most established and diverse residential areas of Dubuque and many buildings within the neighborhood are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. She explained much of the building stock was built prior to the 1920s. She reviewed conservation planning areas and the differences between conservation districts and historic districts. She reviewed the process for the review of demolition permits. She noted the criteria used to review demolition permit applications. She explained if a property is found to have historic or architectural significance and denying a permit would not prevent the property owner from earning a reasonable economic return on the property, then the Commission must deny a demolition permit application. She explained if a building does not have historic or architectural significance or if the Commission finds that denying the demolition permit would prevent the property owner from earning a reasonable economic return on the property, then the Commission must approve the demolition permit.

Staff Member Carstens noted additional funding opportunities and financial incentives for properties that are located in conservation districts. She reviewed the benefits of being located in a conservation district, noting they protect the architectural significance of buildings and neighborhoods. She stated conservation districts stabilize property values, protect investment and promote the long-term economic health and historical and architectural integrity of neighborhoods. She explained conservation districts also help retain a sense of place and pride for neighborhoods in the community.

Chairperson Knight opened the hearing for public comment.

Max Smith, 514 Woodland Ct., East Dubuque, IL, spoke about his concern that he would not be able to buy additional property that he would like to demolish for future business expansion along Elm Street. He noted one building is left on the half block that could be considered historic. He noted he does not own the building, but is hopeful to have an opportunity to purchase it in the future to expand his business. He was concerned that he may not be able to demolish the building in the future, if needed to expand his business. The Commission explained it's impossible to know the likelihood of a demolition permit being approved without certain information. The Commission reviewed the criteria for evaluating a demolition permit, and noted appeals of their decision can be made to City Council. They noted demolition requests are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Jacque Schroeder, 1760 Radford Road, questioned whether the City has the ability to require maintenance for properties in conservation districts. The Commission noted the City can enforce on properties anywhere in the city that are in a state of neglect, regardless of what district they are in. The Commission elaborated that exterior changes or improvements are not reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission in conservation districts. The Commission explained only demolition permits are reviewed by the Commission in conservation districts.

The Commission explained a conservation district is not a precursor to a historic district. The Commission noted most conservation districts in the city will never be a historic district.

Ms. Schroeder asked whether the conservation district expansion would prohibit downtown schools from being demolished. Staff noted the only school in the proposed district is Prescott. Ms. Schroeder explained the importance of maintaining downtown schools. The Commission noted they already reviewed and forwarded recommendations to the City Council in support of rehabbing and adapting downtown schools.

The Commission again reviewed financial incentives to assist property owners in making improvements in conservation district. The Commission noted the conservation districts would also preserve the fabric of neighborhoods and promote sustainable concepts.

Al Blum, 3051 Arbor Oaks Drive, explained he owns the scrap yard at 411 E. 15<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Blum explained he believes his property as well as other industrial properties should not be included in the district expansion. He explained his scrap yard has always served as a buffer between the Washington Neighborhood and heavier industrial uses. He explained his property as well as other adjacent industrial uses should be omitted because they don't fit in with the neighborhood. Mr. Blum acknowledged that a portion of his building may be historic, but believes the portion depicted on the map was incorrect. He explained the condition of the building and stated the building cannot be adapted to anything else and prohibiting the demolition of those properties will affect his ability to sell the property someday. He again requested his property be omitted from the district expansion.

No other members of the public chose to speak. The public hearing was closed at 6:05 p.m.

Staff Member Carstens addressed some of the issues raised. She reviewed the process for establishing a conservation district and noted it is an implementation step of the Washington Neighborhood's Strategic Plan. She explained Legal Services has provided an opinion that the Historic Preservation Commission does not have the ability to revise the proposed boundary expansion, but they may make an additional recommendation as a separate motion to the City Council. Staff Member Carstens noted the map depicting the building stock and age of the buildings. She reviewed the Commission's options for consideration.

The Commission questioned the boundary. Staff Member Carstens explained the district is proposed to be expanded to the most recent Washington Neighborhood Association boundary, which is logical since the expansion is connected to the Washington Neighborhood Strategic Plan. She explained the Washington Neighborhood is a mixed-use neighborhood with a plan that emphasizes residential and commercial uses. She explained even industrial businesses are important, viable, active businesses in the neighborhood. She reviewed the role of the Commission, noting they are advisory to the City Council.

The Commission noted they did not determine the proposed boundary and their role is to determine whether the proposed conservation district expansion has historical or architectural significance to the community.

Motion by Whalen, seconded by Bichell, to recommend approval of the Washington Neighborhood Conservation District Expansion as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – Knight; Abstain – None.

Staff Member Carstens noted the proposed expansion will be placed on the February 7, 2011 City Council agenda. The Commission discussed the importance of City Council also hosting a public hearing to allow neighborhood residents an opportunity to voice their concerns since the Commission is only advisory in this role. By consensus the Commission recommended the City Council host a public hearing.

**MINUTES:** Motion by Wand, seconded by Stover, to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2010 meeting as written. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye - Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Knight, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Nan Colin for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new garage doors located at 1454 Iowa Street in the Jackson Park Historic Preservation District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He noted the applicant has provided a floor plan map which shows a total of six garage doors that will be replaced. He noted the garage door locations and that they provide shelter and parking for VNA cars. He explained the existing garage doors are wood and the exact date they were installed is unknown. He stated the applicant has explained the doors are rotted beyond repair, and need to be replaced. He noted the new doors will be metal, 1 3/8" thick, overhead, insulated garage doors. He directed the Commission to the manufacturer's brochure, which depicts the door panels, and explained the door will not have any hardware shown in the picture or the window pattern shown in the picture. He noted the divided lights in the door will mimic the divided lights on the current doors, which are also void of any hardware. He noted the proposed doors were chosen in an effort to install a door which complements the style and materials of the building. He directed the Commission to the sample color and door that will be used.

Nan Colin, VNA, 1454 Iowa Street, responded to Commission questions about the age and condition of the doors.

Motion by Stover, seconded by Wand, to approve the application as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Knight, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Joseph Robertson/Jeffrey Manternach for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows, reopen the 2<sup>nd</sup> story front balcony, and construct an addition and an attached garage for property located at 995 Grove Terrace in the W. 11<sup>th</sup> Street Historic Preservation District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the project as presented in the application. He noted the craftsman style building is evaluated as being supportive and contributing to the district. He explained the applicant will replace all the existing windows with new aluminum clad windows sized to match the existing windows and original openings.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the proposed and existing window styles and patterns. He noted the proposed window replacement is consistent with the Historic Preservation Commission Window Policy for buildings with neighborhood significance. He explained the project involves reopening the second story front balcony. He stated he was unable to find historical documentation that the balcony existed, and noted limitations and available data and pictures. He stated there appears to have been a number of early changes. He reviewed the architectural clues detailed by the applicant which supports the space having previously been a balcony. Staff reviewed the details of the proposed balcony and noted it will be opened-up on the east and south side of the home. He explained it's designed to mimic the dimensions and proportions of the first floor porch.

Staff Member Johnson explained the two-story addition. He stated the existing one-story addition on the rear of the house will be removed and replaced with a new two-story addition. He reviewed the details of the new addition.

Staff Member Johnson next reviewed the proposed one-story addition which connects the new two-story addition and a proposed garage which fronts Alice Street. He noted the one-story addition will also be off-set and will align with the north side of the historic core and two-story addition. He reviewed the footprint and size of the proposed one-story addition. He noted the optional upper deck depicted in the plans will not be constructed; rather the roofline of the garage will continue over to the two-story addition. He stated the proposed 12-light door accessing the living space may be replaced with a French door and windows in the future. He noted that the alteration would not be visible from a public right-of-way.

Staff Member Johnson next reviewed the proposed garage. He noted the two-car attached garage is in the rear of the property and will face Alice Street. He explained the garage is off-set to align with the core of the home as well as the additions. He reviewed the garage dimensions and footprint. He reviewed the architectural details of the garage. He noted the garage proposed in the plans depicts two overhead metal garage doors and the applicants would like to use a single approximately 20-foot wide metal garage door in the same design to improve their ability pull in and out of the garage.

Joseph Robertson and Jeffrey Manternach were present. They circulated photos of the second story balcony's architectural clues to the Commission. The Commission discussed the proposal, noting the scale and mass of the historic core and its relationship to Grove Terrace and Alice Street as well as the overly large scale and mass of the proposed additions to the rear of the property and how that relates to Alice Street. The Commission further discussed the project details. The Commission noted the proposed 8" lap reveal for the cement board siding is too large. The Commission discussed the appropriateness of siding on the two-story addition, and noted stucco may be more appropriate as a transition

from the historic core to the additions. The Commission explained two separate garage doors would be more appropriate than the proposed large single garage door. The Commission noted examples of appropriate garages in the historic district.

The applicants reviewed their rationale for the siding reveal and exterior finishes as well as the lot's orientation to Alice Street. They explained their intent is to restore the historic character of the home's core while providing needed modernized spaces in the additions in the rear of the property. They want to create modern space while honoring the historic core portion of the property and the neighborhood.

The Commission explained the property has two street frontages and therefore also has two primary facades where design is important. The Commission discussed options with the applicant, such as scaling back the addition and garage or detaching the garage. The Commission noted redesigning the breezeway so it is less visual may help break up the large massing of the additions and garage.

Mr. Robertson asked for clarification on what redesigns the Commission would like to see. Commissioners clarified they would like to see a redesign of the garage that offers the appearance of being detached and two garage doors instead of the proposed single garage door. The Commission stated the breezeway will need to be redesigned to achieve the detached appearance.

The Commission questioned the proposed window alterations. Staff Member Johnson clarified that the existing windows are predominantly wood, and would be replaced with aluminum clad windows that are the same size, shape and style as the original windows and openings. He explained this is consistent with the Historic Preservation Commission window policy.

The Commission discussed the siding. Commissioners noted stucco or a siding reveal of 4" would be more appropriate to help scale down the building. Commissioners noted the smooth fiber cement siding was acceptable.

The Commission and applicants discussed the roof condition, replacement and visibility. The Commission noted the roof materials are asphalt, and the proposed asphalt roof materials will not have any effect.

Motion by Stover, seconded by Bichell, to approve the alterations to the existing structure, including the demolition of the one-story addition as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Knight, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Stover, to table the proposed additions and garage for redesign to the next meeting. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Knight, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

The Commissioners encouraged the applicants work with Planning Staff on the redesign.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Matthew Lundh/Gary Carner for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the Franklin School Building located at 39 Bluff Street in the Cathedral Historic Preservation District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the rehabilitation project and noted it is in planned to be a historic tax credit project. He explained the delivery ramp located on the rear of the property will be removed as well as the adjacent metal shed and 4' by 8' concrete entrance. He noted all windows in the building will be replaced with new wood windows and all window openings will be restored to their original size. He explained the eave and cornice of the building will be restored to its original appearance. He stated the main doors at the front and rear of the building will be removed, the original woodwork above the doors will be restored, and new wood entrances and doors to match the originals will be installed. He explained the metal door at the basement level on the west elevation will be removed and replaced with a new wood door. He explained that entrance will serve as the ADA entrance. He noted the dormers once present on the front of the building will be restored and the 8' by 10' skylight depicted in the original drawings on the west side of the core hip roof will be restored. He noted four smaller 4' by 7' skylights are proposed. He noted a flagpole and mount on the front elevation will be reconstructed based on the original drawings.

Matthew Lundh, 2678 Marywood, and Gary Carner, 1290 Jackson, were present for the application. Mr. Lundh discussed the historic tax credit process. He explained the details of the proposed rehabilitation and restoration work. He noted that the project is in process and several aspects are not fully developed, so any Commission input is welcome. He reviewed the architectural clues and historic records he has been able to obtain. He noted he is confident that original drawings reflect the original architecture, specifically noting the dormers. He discussed and clarified the proposed skylights, wood windows and doors.

The Commission discussed the project components. Staff Member Johnson suggested if the Commission supports the project as presented by Mr. Lundh, the Commission can approve the project as submitted, and thereby give the applicant the flexibility to bring back changes as a result of the tax credit review.

The Commissioners discussed the dormer design. Mr. Carner clarified that the building will be renovated for 21 apartments.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Stover, to approve the application as submitted with the pattern of the windows on the dormers to match the original diamond pattern, and recommend siding on the dormers to match the original slate appearance. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Knight, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

Chairperson Knight left the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Matthew Lundh/Judy Davison for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof, windows, doors, the rear porch, stairs, and retaining wall at 1132-1134 Locust Street in the Jackson Park Historic Preservation District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the project. He reviewed the physical characteristics and modifications and additions that have been made to the property. He noted there were numerous modifications that have been made to the rear of the property. He noted the application is to replace the roof, windows, doors, rear porch, stairs and retaining wall, and provide off-street parking. He clarified all exterior work to the buildings is limited to 1132 Locust, but the proposed parking will encroach on both properties. He explained the applicant would like to replace the existing asphalt shingles with new asphalt shingles. He noted all existing windows and doors will be replaced with new windows and doors. He explained the proposed windows are one-over-one double-hung windows sized to fit the original openings, and the details for the new doors are unknown at this time. He explained the existing enclosed frame rear porch and stairs will be removed and replaced with a new open porch and egress stair. He noted the alternatives for hand and guard rail designs provided by the architect. He reviewed the existing limestone block retaining wall fronting the alley. He explained the property owner would like to reconstruct a new retaining wall approximately 21 feet from the alley in order to provide off-street parking. He noted the project architect has provided four alternatives for replacing the retaining wall.

Matthew Lundh, 2678 Marywood, was present. He noted the stairway may not be needed on the rear of the property. He asked for the Commission's approval to proceed with demolition and rehabilitation work. He explained the roof would be asphalt shingles and the dormer siding would be cement board to match the brick courses and railing. He reviewed the proposed alternatives for the retaining wall.

The Commission discussed the project. Mr. Lundh discussed the original entrances to the row houses and changes over time. He clarified the project will remain as two separate properties. Mr. Lundh and the Commission discussed the original door locations and flexibility for the future rehabilitation of 1134 Locust. Commissioners discussed the limestone retaining wall. The Commission noted the approved alternative is to retain the existing limestone block wall. Mr. Lundh clarified the retaining wall will be over four feet and therefore require a building permit and structural analysis. The Commission discussed the wall and parking spaces with Mr. Lundh. Mr. Lundh explained the property owner has sold the limestone material to someone else. Mr. Lundh suggested the limestone veneer as a compromise.

Motion by Whalen, seconded by Bichell, to approve:

- 1) the new windows as presented,
- 2) the rear porch as presented with the simplified wood railing depicted in Option #2 on Sheet A-3,
- 3) the dormer as presented,



- 4) the relocation of the retaining wall to create parking off the alley with the retaining wall to remain limestone or veneer that matches the size and texture of the existing limestone as an option.

Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Bichell, Rapp, Wand, Whalen and Stover; Nay – None.

Commissioner Whalen left the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

Mr. Lundh stated he will approach the property owner with the recommended alternatives for the retaining wall and will resubmit information in the future.

**EDUCATION TASK FORCE:**

Update on Public Outreach and Education Program: Commissioner Klavitter reported on the new “Benefits of Historic Preservation” brochure. He noted the brochure has been produced and presented to the City Council. He explained the brochure will be posted on the website. Staff Member Johnson noted he is in the process of working with the Public Information Officer on updating the brochure’s appearance; however, the sequence of information and content will not change.

Staff Member Carstens reported the brochure and historic preservation programs were presented to the Board of Realtors on January 20<sup>th</sup>.

The Commission thanked the Task Force for getting historic districts noted on the City Assessor’s website and discussed the important effects it will have.

Minutes for Previous Meeting(s): The Commission noted corrections needed to the January Education Task Force minutes.

**ITEMS FROM PUBLIC:** Peter and Jacque Schroeder of Ja-Mar Restoration Inc., 1760 Radford Road, thanked the Commission for the work they do. Mr. Schroeder explained his company makes cast resin, cast metals and other replications. He noted the company is very interested in historic preservation and has worked on a number of restoration projects in the city, such as the Roshek Building, Security Building and Town Clock building. He explained he is working on promoting the business and making sure people in the tri-state area are aware of his services. He distributed the contact information for the business.

The Commission complimented Mr. Schroeder on his company’s work and thanked him for attending the meeting.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:**

HPC Education Opportunities: The Commission noted this item has been incorporated into the roles and responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission Education Task Force, and no longer needs to be placed on the agenda for discussion.

HPC Bylaws Update: Staff reviewed the updates to the By-Laws.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Olson, to approve the By-Laws as presented and place them on the next agenda for final approval. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

Carnegie-South Public Library Signs: Staff Member Carstens explained the status of the installed Library signs and the oversight of design review for the signs. She reported that the Library Director Susan Henricks and her staff had met with both the sign contractor and general contractor, and reminded them that the Carnegie Stout Public Library was in a historic district prior to beginning work on new signs. She noted that Ms. Henricks stated the sign contractor told her they would handle the permit and reviews. Staff Member Carstens said the sign contractor did not obtain approved permits or consult with the Planning Services Department. She noted the sign contractor is aware of historic preservation design guidelines.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Stover, to have the Carnegie Stout Public Library signs presented to the Historic Preservation Commission for design review and recommend that the sign contractor be present to answer questions. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Olson, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None.

Window Replacement Policy: Commissioners discussed the window replacement policy with staff and how the policy is applied to buildings with different levels of significance. Staff Member Johnson clarified how different standards apply to properties based on their level of significance and whether historic preservation funding is being requested.

**ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

Building Services Historic Preservation Enforcement Report Update: Staff Member Johnson noted the updates are shown in bold. He reviewed the status of 1163 Highland. The Commission discussed showing previous owners for long standing cases that have changed ownership.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Johnson, Assistant Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adopted—February 17, 2011