MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION
5:30 p.m.
Thursday, April 21, 2016
City Council Chamber, Historic Federal Building

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

Commissioners Excused: Bob McDonell.

Commissioners Unexcused: None.

Staff Members Present: Laura Carstens, David Johnson and Ose Akinlotan,

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 by Hilgendorf, seconded by Klavitter, to approve the minutes of the, March 17, 2016 meeting as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Design Review (Tabled from March 17, 2016): Application of Dennis Willett, Advantage Sheet Metal, Inc. for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install louvered vents in the storefront transoms at 299 Main Street in the Old Main Historic District.

The Commission stated the applicant has submitted a written request to withdraw the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 299 Main Street.

Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Kopcyzk, to withdraw the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 299 Main Street at the applicant’s request. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Demolition Permit: Application of Adam Johnson, Adam Johnson Architecture, for a demolition permit to demolish an existing garage, covered patio and broken concrete between the house and garage at 1208 Jackson Street District in the Washington Neighborhood Conservation District.
Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He stated the proposed garage to be demolished lost nearly all of its original detail or it has been obscured. He stated the building has been extensively modified and obscured by vinyl siding and there are no additional characteristics to note other than the dimensions documented in the historic Sanborn maps. He reviewed the chronology of Sanborn maps with respect to the garage footprint. He reviewed alterations that have happened to the garage and the Commission’s role in reviewing the application. He explained the building was identified as a contributing building to a potential National Register District by Jacobsen in 2015; however, the garage, when surveyed in 1979, was found to be non-supportive according to Kriviskey.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the approach to the garage is sloped too steeply and therefore a car cannot use it. He explained the garage appears to be in poor condition and has no architectural or historic significance according to the applicant. He stated the applicant noted although a building footprint on early Sanborn maps may be similar to the existing footprint, the original building was probably lost and replaced with the current structure over a period of years.

Staff Member Johnson stated the Commission must determine whether the garage has historic or architectural significance, noting the City of Dubuque’s Historic Property Inventory and architectural and historic surveys and evaluations and nominations to the National Register of Historic Places are standards for review. He reviewed the definition of an architecturally significant building and noted the conflicting historic evaluations by consultants between 1979 and 2015.

Staff Member Johnson explained the consultant who evaluated the building in 2015 did so without the benefit of access to the garage. He explained consultants are often left with historic documentation, such as Sanborn maps, as well as exterior views of buildings only in making their determinations. He clarified Planning Services staff has visited the site and cannot confirm whether the garage or its components are original or have historic value. He explained if the Commission believes the garage does have historic or architectural significance, the Commission should deny the demolition permit. He stated that if the Commission feels the garage does not have historic or architectural significance, the Commission should approve the demolition permit.

Adam Johnson, 211 4th Street, Galena, Illinois, agent for the property owner of 1208 Jackson Street, presented the application. Mr. Johnson noted he is the architect for the property and provided an analysis of the current materials and condition of the garage.

The Commission reviewed the request. The Commission questioned other styles of garages along the same alley. Staff Member Johnson noted the conflicting survey information. He explained the survey indicates the garage is a concrete block garage whereas the proposed garage to be demolished is clearly a framed garage. He stated most garages along the alley are a concrete block garage with gable roofs.
Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Nieto, to approve the Demolition Permit as presented, noting the garage does not have architectural or historic significance. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

**Design Review**: Application of Patrick & Amy Greener, 490 Alpine Street, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing window with a Full-Lite door for access to a proposed deck in the Langworthy Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He reviewed the significance of the building and proposed alterations. He explained the proposed project is located on the rear of the home, is not highly visible, and is reversible. He noted the project appears to be consistent with the preservation priorities and will not detract from the rear façade of the building. He stated the expanded deck will not obscure any architectural features of the home and the project can be considered consistent with the architectural guidelines.

Patrick Greener, 490 Alpine Street, presented the application. He stated he is the owner of the property but has a professional contractor doing the work. He explained the building is under renovation, noting the kitchen is being relocated to the rear of the home and the property owners would like to replace the existing window with a door to allow access to a rear deck. He reviewed the scope of work, noting all brick removed for the new door will be salvaged and stored at the home and the project can be considered completely reversible in the event a future property owner would like to restore the window.

The Commission noted it is fortunate the current window opening is wide enough for the proposed door. The Commission discussed with the applicant the choice of door. Mr. Greener noted it will be a wood full-lite door to match the existing windows.

The Commission discussed the size and footprint of the proposed deck. Staff Member Johnson noted the applicant did not provide specific details on the railing; however, he will work directly with the property owner and contractor on acceptable historic railing materials and designs. Mr. Greener requested the Commission consider composite decking as an option for the project. He stated the remainder of the deck will be constructed of cedar. The Commission explained decks and porches on historic buildings would traditionally be made of wood and painted or solid stained. Staff Member Johnson explained there is a quality wood which is naturally resistant to rot and decay and insects. He explained cedar is a high quality wood and using transparent or semi-transparent stain would be considered acceptable as well. Mr. Greener stated he would purchase a composite decking material to match the finished color of the cedar wood. The Commission discussed the durability of cedar decking and use of composite decking to match the cedar.
The Commission questioned whether the concrete steps would be removed as part of the project. Mr. Greener confirmed they would be removed and replaced with new steps leading up to the deck.

Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Hilgendorf, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness as presented noting the decking can be a composite material provided it matches the color of the cedar wood and the railings and fenestration should be cedar and compatible with the Tudor style home. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None

**Design Review:** Application of BTE Holdings, LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows at 409 Bluff Street in the Cathedral Historic District.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He reviewed the building’s style and significance. He reviewed alterations to the property, noting the current windows appear to be original. He explained the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing 6:1 divided-light double-hung wood windows with Renewal by Andersen double-hung replacement windows. He stated the new windows are a composite material which combines wood fibers and polymers. He noted the City of Dubuque Historic Preservation Commission window policy allows windows to be replaced provided they are the same type, size, shape and style as the original windows. He explained buildings that are evaluated as city, state, or nationally significant are required to replace with new wood windows. He stated buildings that are considered neighborhood supportive and non-supportive may replace with wood, aluminum clad, or composite materials. Staff Member Johnson explained the property was evaluated and considered to be supportive.

Staff Member Johnson explained the request before the Commission is not whether the applicant can replace the windows with a composite material, the request is whether they are allowed to deviate from the original window style. He stated the original style is a 6:1, true divided light, double-hung window. He reviewed the applicant would like to install windows that are 6:1 double-hung windows with grilles between the glass instead of on the outside of the glass. He noted locating the grilles between the glass offers a different appearance and are considered a different style than true divided light windows, and therefore the request is something the Historic Preservation Commission must review. He noted Andersen does offer a true divided light option.

The Commission requested Staff Member Johnson provide the summary of the compliance with guidelines. Staff Member Johnson stated the proposed windows have grilles between the glass impacting the windows profile and appearance; true divided lights were used historically and are the preferred option; and the strips of material inserted between the glass can be considered inconsistent with the guidelines.
Steve Kennedy, 1800 Kennedy Road, stated he is the owner of the property. He noted the current windows and storm windows are in poor condition and he would like to replace the windows which will improve his energy bills. He explained he has considered other options and the proposed windows appear to be the best choice.

Paul Wagner, Zephyr Aluminum, presented a window cross-section sample. He reviewed the window components, materials and profiles.

The Commission discussed the proposed window frame and profile. Mr. Kennedy explained the grilles between the glass would allow for easier maintenance. The Commission asked whether there was a cost difference between the true divided light and grilles between the glass. Mr. Kennedy explained the true divided lights add an additional $200 per window. The Commission asked whether Mr. Kennedy had received any bids to restore the current windows. Mr. Kennedy noted he did receive a quote from Adams Architectural Millwork and noted a comparable cost for replacement.

The Commission strongly encouraged Mr. Kennedy give greater consideration to restoring the original windows. The Commission provided studies showing the economic and environmental benefits of repairing wood windows versus replacing wood windows with composite materials. The Commission noted wood can be repaired, whereas composite materials can only be disposed of. Commissioner Klavitter stated he had made the mistake early in replacing original wood windows on his home, noting his regret in doing so. He stated he could have saved a lot of money and improved the appearance of the window by repairing it instead of replacing it.

The Commission discussed the proposed composite windows. The Commission acknowledged locating the grilles between the glass does change the style and appearance of the window, especially as light hits the window during different times of day. Mr. Kennedy reviewed other window replacement projects in the neighborhood, specifically noting the buildings adjacent to his property. Staff Member Johnson noted every design review application is considered on its own merit, and past projects do not set precedence. He explained every building is different and every project is different. He stated he is unaware of specific alterations to specific buildings in the neighborhood; however, the dormer windows with divided lights in the adjacent buildings are true divided lights. He noted other windows do not have divided lights and they are simply a one-over-one double-hung window.

The Commission and applicant discussed the relationship of the subject building to the adjacent buildings, noting the porches seem to continue and connect the properties. Staff Member Johnson stated the party wall separating Mr. Kennedy’s building from the adjacent buildings is a good indication that his building was built separate from the adjacent buildings and they merely abut each other. The Commission suggested Mr. Kennedy consult with Heritage Works for additional guidance on repairing wood
windows. The Commission noted the City and Commission cannot make recommendations on contractors, but Heritage Works can.

Motion by Nieto, seconded by Klavitter, to approve the application as submitted. Motion failed by the following vote: Aye – McAndrews; Nay - Klavitter, Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Abstain – None. The application was denied.

Staff Member Johnson explained to Mr. Kennedy the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness does not prevent him from replacing the windows with the desired composite materials. He stated the style of the window must have the muntons on the outside of the glass and not the inside. He clarified Mr. Kennedy has the option of repairing the windows without any additional approval if true divided lights are used.

**Demolition Permit:** Application of Gronen Restoration to demolish the building at 803 Main Street in the Downtown Neighborhood Conservation District.

Commissioner Klavitter addressed an indirect relationship with the property owner and therefore excused himself from review and discussion in this case.

Staff Member Johnson reviewed the staff report. He noted the building was evaluated in 1979 and found to be non-supportive and again evaluated in 2003 and found to be non-contributing. He explained the building was constructed in 1958 and remodeled in the 1970s. He explained the application states the building has been vacant for many years and it is in poor condition with no redeeming historic or architectural qualities. He stated the building is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. He reviewed the role of the Commission and definition of architectural significance.

Motion by Nieto, seconded by Hilgendorf, to approve the Demolition Permit as presented, noting the building is not architecturally or historically significant. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Nieto, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None; Abstain – Klavitter.

**ITEMS FROM PUBLIC:** None.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSION:**

**Work Plan Update:** Staff Member Johnson provided an update for the work plan items. He noted Planning Services staff has collected and mapped data on the City’s section 106 reviews and will be preparing a map shortly for Commissioners Monk and Rapp’s consideration.

Commissioner Rapp noted Planning Services staff had prepared and forwarded maps of the City of Dubuque Green Alley projects for the Commission’s consideration. He requested the Commission hold onto those maps for future consideration.
Staff Member Carstens suggested the Commission could request to have City Engineer Jon Dienst attend a future Commission meeting and provide information on the Green Alley projects if they were interested. The Commission indicated they would be interested in a presentation. Commissioner Klavitter suggested Building Services Manager Todd Carr also come to a future Commission meeting to allow the Commission the opportunity to introduce themselves.

Commissioner Klavitter asked about the status of the Historic District signs. Commissioner Kopcyzk noted Alliant Energy has not gotten back to him yet on funding the project.

City Council Goal Setting: Planning Services staff facilitated the City Council goal setting exercise.

National Historic Preservation Month: Staff Member Johnson provided the Commission with an update on the Historic Tax Credit Workshop. He reviewed all of the avenues for promotion. The Commission asked whether a formal media release will be prepared. Staff Member Carstens stated she would prepare a media release. The Commission discussed cross-promoting the event with the Dubuque Old House Enthusiasts. Staff Member Carstens noted she has reached out numerous times to representatives from the Dubuque Old House Enthusiasts and no one has gotten back to her.

The Commission reviewed the timing of the Dubuque Old House Enthusiasts Tour, and the Historic Tax Credit Workshop. Staff Member Johnson noted it may be best to wait on promoting the event at the Dubuque Old House Enthusiasts tour in case is there is not enough availability to accommodate additional interested people. Staff Member Johnson stated he would coordinate with Commissioner Klavitter closer to the Dubuque Old House Enthusiasts event.

Staff Member Johnson noted the Commission also requested a Historic Preservation Month proclamation be prepared for the City Council meeting on May 2nd. He noted the proclamation is prepared and Chairperson Monk has agreed to accept the proclamation on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission and preservation community. He stated other Commissioners are encouraged to attend the City Council meeting and accept the proclamation with Chairperson Monk; however, the City Clerk has requested only one person speak. He stated the City Clerk has also requested any comments be brief due to limited time.

Staff Member Akinlotan provided a brief update on the Historic Tax Credit Workshop. The Commission requested Staff Member Akinlotan register them for the Historic Tax Credit Workshop. Staff Member Carstens noted reminders will be sent to the Commission for the Historic Preservation Month activities.
Building Services Historic Preservation Enforcement Report: Staff Member Johnson noted updates to the enforcement activities are provided in bold. Commissioners noted there are a lot of pending actions. Staff Member Johnson explained the remaining cases on the enforcement report are all in the court system at this point. He explained these cases will likely remain in the courts for some time.

Staff Approvals: The Commission questioned the demolition permit on Dodge Street. Staff Member Johnson noted that was a mistake and should not have appeared on the report. He explained that demolition permit was issued for Perkin’s, which was not a historic building or located in a historic district.

ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Hilgendorf, seconded by Rapp, to adjourn the April 21, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Kopcyzk, Monk, McAndrews, Nieto, Rapp, and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Carstens, Planning Services Manager

Adopted