



Approved

**MINUTES  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION**

5:30 p.m.

Thursday, February 17, 2011  
Carnegie Stout Public Library Auditorium

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

**Commissioners Excused:** None.

**Staff Members Present:** Laura Carstens, David Johnson, Guy Hemenway, and Susan Henricks.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Knight at 5:35 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:** The Commission requested an addition to paragraph 3 on page 6, to reflect discussion regarding the property at 995 Grove Terrace having two street frontages and therefore also having two primary facades where design is important. Motion by Wand, seconded by Stover, to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2011 meeting as amended. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Knight, Klavitter, Olson, Bichell, Rapp, Wand and Stover; Nay – None; Abstain – McDonell and Whalen.

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

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He noted the applicants received a Certificate of Appropriateness at the January 20, 2011 Commission meeting to make improvements to the historic portion of the home and demolish the one-story rear addition. He stated the draft minutes from the meeting as well as the approved Certificate of Appropriateness are enclosed for the Commission's review.

He explained the current application includes three sets of drawings as well as a detailed description of the project provided by the applicant. He noted drawings A and B depict construction alternatives with A being the preferred alternative. He explained drawing C is the drawing provided with the January 20<sup>th</sup> application. He explained the application describes a number of options considered by the property owners to address the

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 2

Commission's concerns at the January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding the additions, mass, garage, and materials of the proposed improvements.

Staff Member Johnson noted the proposed improvements outlined in the applicants' preferred alternatives depicted in drawing A. He explained the Commission's design review will be specific to those items tabled at the January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. He reviewed the proposed two-story addition, breezeway, garage and siding. He described the design and materials for the improvements. He reviewed the changes from the previous application.

Joseph Robertson and Jeffrey Manternach, 995 Grove Terrace, were present to present the request and answer any questions. Mr. Robertson explained they addressed the various concerns discussed at the January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting in their new plans. The applicants reviewed the changes made to the addition, breezeway and garage to help scale down the appearance of the building and give the garage a more detached appearance. The applicants clarified the windows on the breezeway. They explained window and door sets on the south elevation of the breezeway will be similar to the windows and doors labeled as Group A in the image on page 3 of the technical preservation services brief provided. They clarified that the window set on the north elevation of the breezeway will be similar to the windows depicted as Group B in the image on page 3 of the brief.

The Commission discussed the proposal. Commissioners noted the massing was helped by the changes to the addition, breezeway, roofs and garage. The Commission noted the proposed changes to the two-story addition better compliment the historic core of the building. They noted removing the one-story porch component and expanding the footprint so it is uniform was a significant improvement. The Commission stated lowering the roofline and adding the windows to the breezeway are more appropriate for a breezeway and help to give a detached appearance for the garage.

The Commission discussed the garage. The applicants explained the limitations with locating the garage as well as their choices for the style of garage door. The applicants explained the location of the large retaining wall along Alice Street significantly limits their ability to access a two-stall garage. They explained Alice Street does not allow a turning radius adequate enough for a two-stall garage. The Commission reviewed single garage door options that would be appropriate for the district. The Commission explained the proposed stucco on the garage also adds to the detached appearance. The Commission noted the new garage door should include multiple panes of glass in a rhythm and style which complements the windows on the main structure. The Commission stated the deck, stairs and railing on the south elevation should be painted or opaque stained.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Whalen, to approve the application as submitted and noted as Alternative A, which includes the breezeway with a pitched roof, with the condition that the deck be painted or opaque stained and a separate piece of trim be installed between the breezeway and two-story addition. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Knight, Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Bichell, Rapp, Wand, Stover and McDonell; Nay – None.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Carnegie Stout Public Library for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing aluminum signs with new aluminum signs for property located at W. 11<sup>th</sup>, Bluff and Locust Streets in the Jackson Park Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He explained the request is to allow two after-the-fact freestanding internally illuminated aluminum signs that were installed without an approved building permit and without the Commission's review. He said that the new signs were installed as part of the Library renovation project and that they replaced two freestanding internally illuminated aluminum signs. He referred to the plans provided by Lange Sign Group contained in the application.

Staff Member Johnson explained the Library Plaza renovation was presented to the Commission for review in 2009. He said that the City Council agreed with the recommendation of the Commission and approved the Library Plaza Renovation at the June 15, 2009 City Council meeting. He explained the plans presented for review and approval in 2009 as part the renovation project noted the new sign locations but did not include a design. Staff explained the 2009 staff report noted the design of any new signs for the facility required review by the Commission at a future meeting. Staff stated the new signs were installed on September 13, 2010 without the benefit of an approved permit application and HPC design review.

Staff Member Carstens explained a memo has been prepared and distributed to Commissioners which details the history of signage at the Library as well as the review process for the new signs. She explained the installation of the new signs appears to have been an oversight in the review process for the Library entry plaza renovation. She noted the Carnegie Stout Public Library Director Susan Henricks has consulted with Planning and City staff numerous times on components of the renovation.

Chairperson Knight noted this issue was initially raised by the Commission. The Commission noted concerns regarding the size and scale of the sign. The Commission questioned whether the sign size and height were under their purview. Staff members Carstens and Hemenway explained that specific standards regarding sign height and area are typically addressed through zoning regulations. Staff Member Johnson explained the City of Dubuque Architectural Guidelines for signs typically address style, design, materials and illumination.

Staff Member Hemenway said that signs located in the Office Residential zoning district are limited to 16 square feet in area and six feet in height. He stated exemptions are given for educational institutions. He noted when the sign permit was applied for; the proposed Carnegie Stout Public Library signs were in excess of the allowed 16 square feet and six feet in height. He noted the permit required research but assumed the Library was classified as an educational institution when the original permit was applied for in 1989, which explains why a 32 square foot and 10 foot high sign was allowed.

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 4

The Commission said that they felt that the attempt to integrate design elements from the original building into the sign was not successful and that the attempt to make the material match the color of limestone failed. The Commission said that the color of the sign is greatly different than the color of the limestone in the building and; therefore, the signs stand out. The Commission stated the proportions of the sign are not appropriate.

The Commission and staff discussed the ability to regulate the bulk standards for the sign. Staff Member Carstens noted the enabling legislation at the state level is different for zoning and historic preservation, and therefore, their ability to do so is somewhat limited. Staff clarified that the Zoning Ordinance would also regulate the type of sign but not the design or materials of the sign. Staff noted the Historic Preservation Commission would review the design and materials of sign.

The Commission noted the existing signs use classical design elements but in a way that does not make a lot of sense. They noted the signs attempt to look like a building. The Commission said that they felt removing the columns and locating the signs on top of a solid stone or concrete surface close to the ground would be more appropriate. The Commission felt painting the sign to be more in keeping with the color of the limestone on the Library would be an improvement.

The Commission reviewed the Architectural Guidelines for signs in Historic Districts. Commissioners noted the guidelines suggest signs be compatible with the scale, style and period of the building in the district. Commissioners noted new signs should be composed of traditional materials such as wood, copper or bronze. The Commission noted plastic, plywood and internally illuminated signs are not recommended. Commissioner Stover stated the existing signs have a Las Vegas appearance that cheapens the look of the Library, the restoration effort that went into the Library, and the money invested in the Library.

Rick Droleske, Lange Sign Group, discussed the signs with the Commission. Mr. Droleske noted he started the project over 18 months ago. He stated that the Library's input was considered and a concept for the design of the Library signs was developed that emulated the building to some degree. He noted that neither he nor the designer were aware that the Historic Preservation Commission would be involved in reviewing the sign designs. He said the previous signs were boxy, metal and internally illuminated freestanding signs that did not match the Commission's current vision for the appropriate signage for the building. He said the proportions of the signs would have been considered if Lange Sign had known the Commission would review the project. He stated the Library selected the sign colors. Mr. Droleske took issue with Commissioner Stover's opinion that the sign looks like one that would belong in Las Vegas.

The Commission reiterated that they feel that the sign is not an appropriate representation of the building. Mr. Droleske noted these issues were not brought to his attention when the permit was applied for in August, 2010. The Commission explained that as a professional

sign contractor, it is Mr. Lange's job to know or educate himself on the statutes and regulations in the City of Dubuque where he conducts business. Mr. Lange explained he was not aware the building was located in a historic district. The Commission further questioned Mr. Lange's knowledge of the design review requirements for signs proposed in historic districts. Mr. Lange noted he's been in the sign business for nine years and cannot recollect a sign project that he has undertaken in a historic district. Mr. Lange said that he has installed over 13,000 signs in the tri-state area and to the best of his memory, he has never installed a sign without a permit.

The Commission reiterated the proper procedures for installing signs in a historic district, and noted they are charged with reviewing an after-the-fact sign as if it was never installed. The Commission noted that because the previous signs were internally illuminated, they would be more amenable to internal illumination. They noted the signs before were metal and the current signs are metal; and therefore, less of an issue. The Commission noted the materials in general are not the issue; rather that they felt the style is inappropriate. The Commission discussed a design alternative that would omit the columns and locate the cabinet portion of the sign on top of a solid concrete or stone base fabricated with similar color and texture as the stone on the Library. The Commission discussed painting the components of the existing sign that are identified as color PMS9141 on the rendering with a color that is similar to the stone in the building. Commissioners reiterated that the base of the sign does not have to be stone, but, can be a smooth concrete material similar in appearance to the stone on the building.

Susan Henricks, Library Director, stated she is open to repainting the yellowish colored components of the sign to a more appropriate color. She said; however, that the changes proposed for the sign structure will require money that is not budgeted. She noted the signs were installed with funding from grants, and she would not know where to locate the additional funding necessary to make the changes. The Commission suggested the Library require Lange Sign Group to pay for the necessary changes to the sign, since they did not follow proper procedure. The Commission said that they felt that the professional sign contractor is responsible for following the appropriate procedures and obtaining the necessary permits and approval. The Commission noted that other businesses in the downtown have been able to follow the appropriate procedures required for installing signage.

Mr. Droleske explained Lange Sign did not fail in their responsibilities and checked with Zoning regarding what they were allowed to do. He noted Lange Sign Group submitted a drawing and application for a permit. Mr. Droleske said the first time they heard the sign was not approved was when they were given notice the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. The Commission asked Mr. Droleske whether he had an approved permit when the sign was installed. Mr. Droleske suggested the question be directed to the Planning Services Department and stated the City has a responsibility to respond to a building permit application within 20 or 30 days. Staff Member Carstens explained Mr. Droleske is incorrect, and there is not a time limit in responding to a building permit application. She

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 6

explained an application for a permit is not the same as a permit being issued. She stated Mr. Droleske should be aware of the sign regulations because Mr. Droleske is on record presenting signs for design review to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Droleske questioned which signs he presented. Staff Member Carstens stated he presented the Caroline's Restaurant sign attached to the Hotel Julien as well as the Platinum building sign. The Commission again questioned whether the Lange Sign Group is aware of design guidelines and review for signs in historic districts. Mr. Droleske acknowledged that he is aware of design guidelines in historic districts. The Commission questioned Mr. Droleske's or Lange Sign's knowledge that the Carnegie Stout Public Library is located in a historic district. He stated he is not from Dubuque and was not aware that the Library was located in a historic district. Staff Member Carstens stated that Library Director Susan Henricks had informed her that she explained to Mr. Droleske that the building was a historic structure.

Staff Member Hemenway reviewed the history of the Carnegie Stout Public Library signage and the timeframe of events regarding the installation of the new signs. He said that on August 9, 2010, Mr. Droleske submitted a sign permit application and on August 10, 2010 he spoke with Mr. Droleske regarding the issue, and stated the building was in a historic district. He stated that Mr. Droleske responded that the signs that were going to be removed were internally illuminated metal cabinetry signs, and that he felt that there should not be a problem with replacing them. He said that he explained to Mr. Droleske that the permit application would need to be researched since he could not locate any permit history for the prior Library signage. Staff Member Hemenway stated he could not find the Certificate of Appropriateness review history for the signs either. He stated that, after some time, he was able to locate the original permit information and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Library signage which he said had been misfiled in the archives located in the basement of the Historic Federal Building. He noted that Mr. Droleske said that the new signs had been in the design process for at least 18 months prior to the date they were installed. He explained the best course of action for a sign contractor is to include the Planning Services Department in the early stages of developing sign concepts so that zoning and design issues can be addressed. Mr. Droleske explained he felt Lange Sign Group did that, and by no means tried to circumvent the process.

The Commission explained that they do not feel the applicant intentionally circumvented the process; however, that does not change the fact that the proper process and guidelines were not followed.

Motion by Wand, seconded by Bichell, to approve the design as submitted without the columns and using a stone or concrete base raised no more than 12 inches above the ground and change the color of the painted parts of the sign to match the color of the building.

The Commission reviewed that most components of the sign can be retained. Mr. Droleske noted that had the sign been built as just approved by the Commission, the Library would

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 7

not have had the budget to construct it. The Commission reiterated that the base does not have to be stone; but, that it can be constructed of a concrete material. The Commission clarified that the metal cabinet portion of the sign with internal illumination is acceptable. The Commission stated the portions of the sign painted with PMS 9141 need to be repainted with a color that matches the building.

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

The Commission requested staff mail Mr. Droleske the Benefits of Historic Preservation Districts brochure and the architectural guidelines for signs in historic districts.

**DESIGN REVIEW:** Application of Michael Ruden / IIW Engineers & Surveyors, P.C. for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new siding and doors on the front addition for property located at 625 Bluff Street in the Cathedral Historic Preservation District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He noted Mike Ruden, IIW Engineers is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new siding and doors on the front, built-in, one-story enclosed porch addition. He noted the building is a non-contributing structure to the district. He stated that is most likely due to the degree of alterations to the building, noting the enclosed porch addition where the new doors and siding are proposed.

He explained the request will replace the existing metal doors and frame with two-30 inch, six panel doors. The doors will have one-half inch insulated glazing in the upper panels. The doors will be finished with faux wood paint. He referred to the drawings provided by the applicant. He noted the recent stairs and landing which appear in the staff report. He explained a building permit was issued for the stairs on October 13, 2009, and therefore the stairs were constructed legally but without the Commission's review. He stated he met with the Building Services Department back in 2009 to point out the error and reinforce the procedures for Historic Preservation Commission design review.

Mike Ruden, IIW Engineers, was present. He discussed the faux wood paint and other options for paint. The Commission stated a solid paint color would be more historically appropriate. Mr. Ruden indicated his clients do not have a preference for the finish and it would either be a wood finish or shop painted. Mr. Ruden explained his preference is that the doors not be white. The Commission agreed, but noted they cannot dictate color.

The Commission reviewed the proposed siding. Staff Member Johnson distributed manufacturer's brochures for LP SmartSide siding. He explained the applicant verbally indicated the texture of the siding would be smooth.

Motion by Wand, seconded by McDonell, to approve the application as submitted with the paint other than a faux wood paint and recommend the color not be white, but rather a color that would blend with the limestone steps. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye –

Knight, Klavitter, Olson, Whalen, Bichell, Rapp, Wand, Stover and McDonell; Nay – None.

**ITEMS FROM PUBLIC:**

Four Mounds Visitor Station: Commissioner Olson excused herself from the table as Executive Director of Four Mounds, 4900 Peru Road, to present concept drawings for the Four Mounds Foundation Visitor's Station. Ms. Olson requested input from the Commission. She noted the visitor's station will be located in front of the ropes course and situated within some trees. She said the visitor's station will have a two-stall bathroom serviced by a new septic field. She explained the drawings were prepared by Architect Jeff Morton. She explained Four Mounds is considering slightly elevating the structure on stilts to provide an approach walkway. She explained a bicycle rack will be located nearby. She explained natural colors are proposed for the building. She explained the intent of the design is for it to look like a structure you might find in a park in the 1930s. She explained the building will fit in with the trees and landscape of the Four Mounds Estate.

The Commission expressed their support. Staff Member Johnson noted the approved Historic District Public Improvement Program funding is still in place for the project; however, the design will need to be reviewed and approved by the Commission once finalized.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:**

NAPC CAMP return postcard discussion: Staff Member Johnson explained the Commission requested the item be placed on the February 2011 agenda. He stated the regional NAPC CAMP was held in October 2010, and Commissioners and staff filled out a CAMP postcard noting goals and objectives for the Commission to work on. He noted those postcards were recently returned to staff and Commissioners.

Staff Member Johnson referenced the memo provided to Commissioners which outlined the goals of the Commissioners who had provided postcard information. The Commission reviewed the list of goals. Chairperson Knight noted a number of the goals have already been accomplished, such as a public education outreach program. The Commission discussed the idea of separating design review from public education, surveying and historic district expansion efforts. The consensus of the Commission was to pursue a subcommittee approach rather than separate the Commission. The Commission noted it's important to have the entire Commission involved in Commission activities. The Commission also noted it benefits the Commission as a whole if members are informed on all the issues.

The Commission questioned whether the City already has survey areas in mind. Staff noted there are a number of areas the City would like to survey; however, funding is a big limitation. Staff noted that surveying and identifying historic resources are duties of the Historic Preservation Commission outlined in the Unified Development Code. By consensus, the Commission requested the formation of a Historic Resources

Subcommittee be placed on the next Commission agenda so the Commission may discuss in more detail the potential role of that subcommittee.

The Commission discussed surveys that have already been completed. Staff noted a survey has not been done in the last five years. Staff explained a number of applications have been made for funding to complete a Phase VI survey; however, Planning Services Staff has not been able to get the funding. Staff explained that the State Historic Preservation Office is beginning to encourage the City to update existing surveys and nominations; however, it is Staff's preference to pursue new surveys which identify and evaluate structures that haven't already been identified and evaluated. Staff Member Carstens explained the City of Dubuque undertakes Section 106 reviews for development projects located outside of the existing survey areas; and therefore, it is important to have that information in place. The Commission and Staff reviewed funding sources for survey and evaluation projects.

The Commission and staff discussed the areas of the City that have already been surveyed but are not historic districts, such as the Fenelon Place Neighborhood. Staff reviewed the primary challenge to establishing local historic districts is neighborhood support. The Commission noted recent projects in the Fenelon Place Neighborhood that the neighborhood did not like. The Commission explained design review guidelines would have managed the change and protected the historic neighborhood. Staff Member Johnson noted a number of residents have expressed interest in historic districts after the condominium project.

Staff noted that they would like a list of projects appropriate for staff to sign off on. Staff reviewed a number of projects that would not require HPC review, such as alterations to non-historic structures. The Commission requested Staff prepare the list based on past experiences and present the list to the Commission for review and adoption as a policy.

The Commission and Staff discussed signs as a possible project on the Staff sign-off list. Staff noted the Carnegie Stout Public Library signs were not reviewed by Staff or the Commission. Staff Member Carstens explained the fact that Lange Sign began design work on the Library signs 18 months prior to making a permit application indicates a disconnect in the review process. Staff noted they need to work with Lange Sign to assure that this does not happen again. Staff noted regardless of whether the project was in a historic district or not, a permit was never approved for the signs prior to their installation. The Commission noted work should not begin before a permit approved. Staff Member Carstens reiterated applying for a building permit is not the same as having it issued. Staff explained that sign permit applications are usually approved within a week; however, in the case of the Library signs, staff was required to do research to determine when original Library signs were allowed in the first place. Staff noted the needed amount of time to research the permit probably did not fit in with the Library's grand opening deadline. The Commission reiterated it is the responsibility of the contractor to assure they are following the law. The Commission explained they would have understood the significance of the

deadline and importance of the Library project and if needed, held a special meeting to review the signs.

The Commission and staff discussed conducting two votes on applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The first vote would be on the findings of fact and the second vote would be on the Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff Member Carstens noted it is a very formal process for quasi-judicial bodies and would not recommend it for the Historic Preservation Commission. Staff noted the Commission generally has a conversational dialogue regarding the details of a design review. She explained the dialogue approach is more helpful than confrontational and works well. The Commission agreed to not pursue votes on the findings of fact for a design review case.

**ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

2010 CLG and NPS Annual Reports: Staff Member Johnson explained the reports are forwarded annually to the Historic Preservation Commission for their information and no action is required. He noted the reports document the preservation activities of the City of Dubuque to the State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service.

2010 Ken Kringle Award Nominations and 2011 Preservation at Its Best Award Nominations: Staff reviewed the criteria for the awards and noted suggestions for projects that meet the nomination criteria.

The Commission discussed the suggestion to nominate the Carnegie Stout Public Library for a Ken Kringle Award. The Commission noted the Library project was an outstanding project and the signs were not the fault of the Library Director.

The Commission discussed the status of the project at 1109 Iowa Street. The Commission questioned whether the storefront was completed. Staff Member Johnson noted the storefront is completed; however, he believes it is the intent of the property owner to paint the wood above the door. The Commission questioned whether a transom was once located there. Staff Member Johnson reviewed why he recommended the project for a local award. He explained the project went from a rehabilitation project to a restoration project. He noted the finished project was greatly improved over the project initially applied for. Staff noted it showed a lot of flexibility both on the property owner's part and the Commission. The consensus of the Commission was to postpone nomination of the project until next year.

The Commission discussed nominating Cynthia and Peter Alt for the project at 658 Chestnut Street.

The Commission discussed nominating Julie Lott for her brick duplex project at 637 Arlington Street. Staff Member Johnson noted the multiple properties owned and rehabbed by Julie Lott on the north side of Arlington Street would make a better Preservation at its

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 11

Best Award Nomination next year. The Commission agreed the brick duplex at 637 Arlington Street would make a good Ken Kringle Award.

Commission Olson suggested nominating 1896 Washington for a Ken Kringle Award. She noted the rehabilitation was a HEART Project and graduating seniors would be available to accept the award.

The Commission discussed Preservation at its Best Award nominations. The Commission discussed nominating the Roshek Building under the Sustainability and Preservation Category rather than the Commercial category. The Commission noted the sustainability efforts in the Roshek Building restoration is a story that could be told nationally and the recycling effort was amazing. The Commission noted a Timmy Award may have already been received for that building.

The Commission discussed the Mason Dixon Saloon project at 163 Main Street. Staff Member Johnson stated he did not believe the project would rise to the level of a Preservation Iowa Award due to the storefront.

The Commission discussed nominating Chris Miller's project at 40-44 Main Street. Staff noted that project is incomplete at this time. The Commission discussed nominating the project next year.

By consensus, the Commission agreed the following projects are nominated for the 2010 Ken Kringle Historic Preservation Award:

- Residence, 658 Chestnut Street
- Residence, 637 Arlington Street
- Residence, 1896 Washington Street
- Carnegie Stout Public Library at 360 W. 11<sup>th</sup> Street
- Shot Tower, 1099 Commercial Street
- Cathedral Square Lofts, 205 Bluff Street
- Roshek Building, 700 Locust Street
- White Street Condominium Project, 1126-1134 White Street
- Indian Room and Bridge Complex, Eagle Point Park

By consensus, the Commission agreed the following are nominated for the 2011 Preservation at Its Best Award:

- Shot Tower in the Public Structure Category
- The White Street Condominium Project in the Residential Category
- The Roshek Building in the Sustainability and Preservation Category
- Cathedral Square Lofts in the Adaptive Re-use Category

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 12

Approval of By-Laws: Staff Member Carstens noted the proposed revisions to the by-laws are being forwarded to the Commission for approval. She explained the by-laws were presented to the Commission for their review and comment at the last meeting.

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

Historic Preservation Financial Programs Update: Staff Member Johnson reviewed the memorandum forwarding information on the Historic Preservation Revolving Loan Fund and Historic Preservation Housing Grant. He reviewed the backgrounds of the two programs. He explained Planning Services staff and Housing and Community Development staff have recently met to discuss ways to improve the administration of the two programs. Staff Member Johnson noted the Housing and Community Development Department performs all of the loan underwriting and the Planning Services Department facilitates the Historic Preservation Commission design review for the programs. He explained both departments are discussing ways to make the application process clearer and simpler. He explained there is no way to avoid the involvement of both departments in the application process.

He explained the Housing and Community Development Department discussed changing the name of the Historic Preservation Housing Grant Program to something that more accurately describes how the program functions as a forgivable loan. He noted the Housing and Community Development Department discussed naming the program the Historic Preservation Forgivable Loan Fund. He explained Planning Services staff's preference is to leave the name the same since the program has been successfully marketed as the Historic Preservation Housing Grant. He noted the Historic Preservation Housing Grant currently has a little over \$7,000 remaining. He stated that is enough money to fund one project entirely and partially fund another project.

Staff Member Johnson explained both financial incentive programs have performed well. He explained since the inception of the Historic Preservation Revolving Loan Fund in 2001, 33 loans were approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted the Historic Preservation Commission has approved \$519,109.08 since the program started. He explained there is currently \$356,074.35 in the loan fund and as of June 30, 2010, there are 15 active loans which total \$123,000. Staff Member Johnson stated a total of \$141,085 of principal and interest has been paid back into the Revolving Loan Fund since it started.

He explained the Housing and Community Development Department and Planning Services staff would like to develop a single application which addresses the questions needed to be asked by both the Housing and Community Development and Planning Services Departments. He noted changes to how the programs are administered have provided an opportunity to have the underwriting on a loan take place prior to the design review by the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted this has beneficial because

Minutes – Historic Preservation Commission

February 17, 2011

Page 13

financial records indicate some applicants have not followed through with loan applications and those balances exist on the books. He noted City staff estimates those applications not followed through on were most likely due to an applicant underwriting not being approved. He explained in the past, underwriting was performed after the Historic Preservation Commission approval of a design for a project because expenses incurred as a result of the underwriting and those expenses were rolled into the loan. He explained the new application would involve two steps, the first step being loan approval by the Housing and Community Development Department and the second step being design approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted step 2 would not be initiated without documentation that Part 1 of the application has been approved. Staff Member Johnson requested the Commission's support in proceeding with the revised application and process. By consensus, the Commission directed staff to proceed with the revised application and process.

The Commission noted it would be important for application materials and promotional materials to clearly state all direct and indirect requirements from utilizing the funding source. The Commission and Staff discussed some of the requirements, both state and federal, that are sometimes attached to these funding sources administered by the Housing and Community Development Department.

Historic Preservation Enforcement Report: Staff Member Johnson noted an updated enforcement report has not been provided to the Commission because staff did not have an opportunity to meet since the last meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
David Johnson, Assistant Planner

Adopted—March 17, 2011