

MINUTES
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION
5:30 p.m.
Thursday, September 25, 2019
City Council Chamber, Historic Federal Building

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Emily Hilgendorf; Commissioners John McAndrews, Melissa Daykin-Cassill, Dave Klavitter, Christina Monk, Rick Stuter, and Joseph Rapp.

Commissioners Excused: Brandi Clark

Commissioners Unexcused: n/a

Staff Members Present: Chris Happ Olson and Laura Carstens.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Hilgendorf at 5:33 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:

Regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission, Thursday, June 20, 2019. Motion by Monk, seconded by Daykin-Cassill, to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2019 meeting as submitted. Dave Klavitter noted that he had notified staff of his inability to attend the June 20, 2019 meeting prior to the meeting and staff noted they would change his attendance record to "excused". Motion carried by the following vote 7-0: Aye – McAndrews, Rapp, Daykin-Cassill, Klavitter, Monk, Stuter and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Meeting of the HPC Preservation Fair Committee, Thursday, July 18, 2019. Motion by Monk, seconded by Rapp, to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2019 meeting as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote 7-0: Aye – McAndrews, Rapp, Daykin-Cassill, Klavitter, Monk, Stuter and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Meeting of the HPC Preservation Fair Committee, Thursday, August 15, 2019.

Motion by Monk, seconded by Daykin-Cassill, to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2019 meeting as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote 7-0: Aye – McAndrews, Rapp, Daykin-Cassill, Klavitter, Monk, Stuter and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Design Review:

Applicant: Gary & Chris Stelpflug
Address 407-409 Loras Boulevard
Project: Installation of metal standing seam roof
District: W. 11th Street Historic District

Staff Member Carstens reviewed the staff report, restating the significance of the property, referring to the property and neighborhood photographs from 2016, showing the previous roof, and pointing to the contemporary August 2019 photographs, after the installation of a new metal standing seam roof installed by the owner without a permit. Ms. Carstens noted that the edges of the new roof are largely concealed due to the restoration of the Yankee Gutter, which obscures the termination at the gutter. Ms. Carstens noted the proximity of the property to the sidewalk and intersection of Loras Boulevard and Bluff Streets.

Ms. Carstens read from the staff report, first noting the recent alterations and activity. In August, 2019, the current owners reroofed the property using their own funds, serving as their own contractor, and operating without a permit. The roofing system is a prefabricated, heavy duty metal system that is custom installed, mimicking a standing seam roof. The material has a textured matte finish and is in a medium-dark slate grey color. (Ms. Carstens circulated a piece of the metal roofing supplied by the applicant.) Roof edges are largely concealed by the fact that the Yankee gutters were restored during the previous historic tax credit project and the edges terminate below the level of the edge of the gutter. She noted the owners said they wanted a long-lasting durable roof, especially in light of the proximity to Bluff Street and Loras Boulevard which are busy and difficult to work from. They desired to not have to reroof the house anytime in the near future. Permission to change roofing materials was not requested at that time.

Ms. Carstens continued to read from the staff report, regarding the analysis and the project's relationship to the City of Dubuque's Architectural Guidelines. The applicants Gary & Chris Stelpflug are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the already installed metal roof to stay in place. No other solutions have been suggested by the applicant.

Ms. Carstens went on to read the relationship to Architectural Guidelines. She stated the Roof Policy: Roof form, material and detail are important features that contribute to the significance of a historic structure. The character of a historic roof should be preserved, including its form and materials, whenever feasible.

Ms. Carstens then went through the applicable guidelines and how the project relates to them:

For Guideline 1.19 - Preserve the original roof form of a historic structure.

This project meets this guideline because it did not alter the original roof form and continued to maintain the distinctive Yankee gutter system that had been restored during the previous tax credit project.

For Guideline 11.20 - Preserve the original eave depth on sloped roofs of a historic structure.

This project meets this guideline.

For Guideline 11.21- Preserve distinctive roof features.

This project meets this guideline because the original Yankee gutter system, projecting cornices, soffits, fascia and distinctive brackets and trim have been preserved and restored.

For Guideline 11.22 - Preserve original roof materials.

There was no original roof material to maintain.

For Guideline 11.23 - Preserve historically significant downspouts and gutters.

Care was taken to preserve and restore the Yankee gutter system, projecting cornices, soffits, fascia and distinctive brackets and trim.

For Guideline 11.24 - New or replacement roof materials should convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.

- Composite shingles work best for many types of buildings that have sloped roofs. Fiberglass may also be considered.
- Roof materials should generally be earth tones and have a matte, non-reflective finish.
- The new material should be consistent with the history style of the property.
- When using a new asphalt, fiberglass or similar composition roof material, match the original in color and finish to the extent feasible. (Some alternative colors may be considered, however, when doing so is part of a coordinated energy conservation scheme.)

This is a replacement roofing material that is not compatible with the previous roof, a non-original, asphalt tab shingle system. It is unclear what the original roofing system was. The new roof meets the suggestion for earth tones and a matte, non-reflective finish. The new roof has a distinctive standing seam, which is an attempt to replicate a system was not uncommon in Dubuque and the region, but also not documented for this structure. The project marginally meets this guideline.

Ms. Carstens reviewed the Role of the Commission and the appeal process, finishing the staff report. Chairperson Hilgendorf requested for anyone representing the project to

come forward. Gary and Chris Stelpflug of 7693 Pigeon River Road, Lancaster, WI 53813, stepped up to the podium.

Mr. Stelpflug stated he purchased the building in 2010. He stated it was supposed to be a new asphalt roof at that time, but they experienced problems from the start. He stated he knew asphalt wasn't original and then went ahead with the roofing project. He noted they did it without permission and he said that it was "his call" to move ahead with the work.

Chairperson Hilgendorf asked the Commission if they had questions for the applicant. Commissioner Monk asked if the roof was performing, and Ms. Stelpflug said yes it was, and the tenants have confirmed it, which means they can go back and do the plaster repair inside.

Commissioner Klavitter asked how the roof tied into the gutter system. Staff Member Olson stated that it wasn't tied in, but the edge was obscured by the gutter from the street view. Commissioner Klavitter stated that metal roofs can have the same kind of reflectivity issues similar to solar panel arrays, mentioning other issues of scale and color. Discussion followed about how the particular installation was well done, and that the color and texture meet the guidelines.

Motion by Klavitter, seconded by Stuter, to approve the application as presented. Motion carried 7-0 by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Daykin-Cassill, Monk, McAndrews, Stuter, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Design Review

Applicant:	Larry Jackson
Owner:	Eric Esser Construction LLC
Address:	1243 Walnut
Project:	Installation of 7 windows on non-primary facades
District:	West 11 th Street Historic District

Commissioner Monk abstained from participation and left the room, due to a professional relationship with the owner.

Ms. Carstens review the significance of the property and read from the staff report. This is a largely intact stuccoed stone, vernacular Italianate revival style structure that predates 1872, from the early-Victorian era. The original structure has minimal setbacks at the corner of Walnut and Chestnut streets in the West 11th Street Historic District. The original stucco coating is carefully scored and is a very early treatment of this structure. It was unpainted until a major rehabilitation project was taken on in the Spring of 2019.

Ms. Carstens referred to the April 18, 2019 application for the statement of past alterations and recent work done by the owner, Mr. Esser. She referenced the

Commission's notice of decision, which is included in the staff report. She referred to the current application's site and previous photography of the structure, as well as the updated photography.

Ms. Carstens read from the staff report regarding recent alterations and activity regarding the structure. She stated that Mr. Esser made an application to the Historic Preservation Commission in April 2019 for various work including replacing most historic windows with vinyl pocket replacements. The request was denied to replace windows on four facades. Mr. Esser subsequently replaced seven windows without a permit on the non-primary south and west facades, and was cited for the work by the Building Services Department on August 22, 2019. An attachment in the packet includes the Notice of Violation, the physical location of the windows that were installed, and the window schedule with the seven windows identified.

She noted that Mr. Esser did not install new windows along the primary façades at Chestnut and Walnut Streets, which leaves the historic sash windows unchanged at those sides of the building. The new windows that were installed in the seven locations (along the south and west sides) are a vinyl pocket replacement in roughly the same size as the originals. The muntin system (grid pattern) is internally installed between the two layers of insulated glass and therefore cannot be removed. They have a non-historic grid pattern that does not match the original.

Ms. Carstens reviewed the ownership update from the staff report: Eric Esser, LLC is the owner of record of 1243 Walnut Street, Larry Jackson is the applicant who has expressed an intention to sign a land contract with Mr. Esser once a solution is reached regarding the windows. She noted that Mr. Esser is responsible for any Notice of Decision that is a result of the Commission's review at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Carstens presented the staff analysis, reading from the staff report: The applicant Larry Jackson is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to accept the seven said windows as-is, or approve another option for replacement of the seven windows.

Ms. Carstens reviewed the relationship of the application to the Architectural Guidelines. She stated that the Walnut Street façade facing east was of primary concern, that the north facing Chestnut façade was secondary, that the visible portions of the south and west façade were the next level of importance and the areas that are not visible along the rear of the property were not under review.

Ms. Carstens reviewed the window proposal in relationship to the window section of the Architectural Guidelines. She reviewed the policy first: A variety of window sizes, shapes and details exist among the historic resources of Dubuque. The character-defining features of a historic window and its distinct materials and placement should be preserved. In addition, a new window should be in character with the historic building.

Also, repairing, weather-stripping and/or insulating (perimeter window cavity) a window is more energy efficient, and less expensive than replacement.

She then related the project to the guidelines:

For Guideline 1.36 - Preserve the functional and decorative features of a historic window.

Features important to the character of a window include its frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, hoods, operation and groupings of windows. Repair frames and sashes rather than replacing them, whenever conditions permit.

The project leaves the primary facades intact, but requires replacement for non-primary facades with either non-conforming existing windows or new window replacement.

For Guideline 1.37 - Preserve the position, number and arrangement of historic windows in a building wall.

Enclosing a historic window opening is inappropriate, as is adding a new window opening. This is especially important because the historic ratio of solid-to-void is a character defining feature.

Greater flexibility in installing new windows may be considered on rear walls.

The proposed project meets this guideline without changing the fenestration openings or patterns, but introduces replacement windows at non-primary facades.

For Guideline 1.38 - Preserve the size and proportion of a historic window opening.

Reducing an original opening to accommodate a smaller window or increasing it to receive a larger window is inappropriate. Preserve a distinctive window opening shape, such as an arched top.

For the seven said windows, the proposed projects typically reduces the window by 1-2" in width or depth, because of the nature of a pocket replacement window installation.

For Guideline 1.39 - Preserve the historic ratio of window openings to solid wall on a primary facade.

Significantly increasing the amount of glass on a primary, character-defining wall will negatively affect the integrity of the structure.

The proposed project meets this guideline.

For Guideline 1.40 - Match a replacement window to the original in its design.

If the extant windows remain, they will not reflect the original design. Proposals for replacement with a properly mimicking grid system (muntins) would meet this guideline.

For Guideline 1.41 - In a replacement window, use materials that appear similar to the original.

Using the same material as the original is preferred, especially on character-defining facades. However, a substitute material may be considered if the appearance of the window components will match those of the original in dimension, profile and finish.

New glazing should convey the visual appearance of historic glazing. It should be clear. Metallic and reflective finishes are inappropriate. In some instances colored or tinted glass may be appropriate in commercial storefront transoms or residential windows.

Vinyl and unfinished metals are inappropriate window materials.

These are on non-primary facades. Vinyl windows do not mimic the original wood windows. Aluminum clad windows are paintable and would be more similar to the original windows.

Ms. Carstens referred to the City of Dubuque Window Policy, which was attached to the application. This policy provides additional guidelines that shows that replacement windows must match in type, size, shape, and style, but on buildings with neighborhood significance, there is flexibility to change the material.

Replacement of the seven vinyl windows with any of the proposals would meet this policy, as the structure is of neighborhood significance and these windows are on non-primary facades. The vinyl windows with a non-removable, incompatible grid system do not follow the policy.

Ms. Carstens reviewed the adopted City of Dubuque Window Policy which is included in the application packet, and stated that because of the structure's neighborhood significance and the allowance of changing materials on those non-primary facades, that the existing windows do not follow the policy only because of the grid pattern. She then reviewed the role of the Commission, reading from the staff report.

Chairperson Hilgendorf asked the Commission if they had questions for the staff. Ms. Carstens confirmed that the Historic Preservation Commission had denied Mr. Esser a certificate of appropriateness, but that he installed the windows anyway. A question regarding ownership arose and Ms. Carstens reviewed the report, reading verbatim. Chairperson Hilgendorf invited the applicant to approach the podium.

Larry Jackson, Jr., 1420 Central Avenue in Dubuque, approached the podium. Mr. Jackson explained that 1-2 months ago he contacted the property's realtor about a purchase and was unaware of the current issues. Before signing a purchase agreement for a land contract, a letter was sent to him about the window situation. He stated he was informed and was still interested in purchasing it. He continued he wants the situation to be easily rectified and wants to know his options and results. He saw an opportunity, with the land contract being more sensitive, to try to rectify the situation. He stated he didn't want to pay an arm and a leg and mentioned that Staff Member Chris Olson told him that his application was different from the previous application by Mr. Esser, and that replacement wasn't proposed on the major facades. He stated he is hoping to leave the back as it is.

Commission members thanked Mr. Jackson for coming and described the role of the Commission in historic districts. Mr. Jackson stated he wanted to preserve the integrity of the structure and asked for leniency in fixing it. There was further discussion about the role of historic windows and their importance on a historic structure. Chairperson Hilgendorf asked whether the original sash were still in the house, in storage, and Mr. Jackson confirmed that they were discarded.

Mr. Jackson talked about the different options put forth and his preference. Ms. Carstens read from the application with the options and presented the following:

- 1) Leave the seven windows with the current grid pattern that doesn't match the original
- 2) Replace with wood windows, from Adams Architectural
- 3) Replace with Aluminum Clad, from Adams Architectural
- 4) Replace with Aluminum Clad, from Spahn & Rose (1st option)
- 5) Replace with Aluminum Clad, from Spahn & Rose (2nd option)

She stated that the range was approximately \$8,000-\$10,000 cost for replacements, or no cost for Option #1.

Ms. Hilgendorf asked the Commission if there were any questions. Mr. Jackson answered Commission questions that there were people living in the building, and that there weren't any colors picked out for window replacement.

Chairperson Hilgendorf stated that there were three aluminum clad options, all pictured with the correct grid system. Ms. Carstens read from the Spahn and Rose proposals that clarified that the proposal includes simulated divided lites. She stated that quote # 2 meets the guidelines. Chairperson Hilgendorf shifted the process from questions to discussion at the Commission level.

Staff Member Olson stated that the Notice of Decision follows the property and that Mr. Esser and Mr. Jackson are responsible for it. Commissioner Klavitter noted that the first option suggested by Mr. Jackson was to retain the existing windows.

Further discussion followed regarding procedure to move forward in order to consider multiple options. Commissioner Klavitter asked about the time frame to make a decision. Ms. Carstens stated that within 60 days from the application, the Commission must consider the request. No permit would be issued until a Notice of Decision is made by the Commission. She stated the importance of making a decision today.

Further discussion on the issue was led by the Chairperson Hilgendorf, with a consensus that the best option was the second presented by the applicant.

Further discussion regarding the grid pattern of the divided lites followed, by clarification by Ms. Carstens that the guidelines and policy state that the pattern must match. She suggested that the color can help blend them in to the structure.

Commissioner Rapp asked who would be responsible, the owner or the applicant, to which Ms. Carstens replied that whomever is in charge of the project, working with the Building Services Department, and that Planning Services will work with them to ensure enforcement. Commissioner Rapp commented that 1243 “Locust” was listed by mistake on page 4 of the staff report.

Motion by Mr. Klavitter, second by Mr. Stuter, to approve the application as submitted, allowing for options that include a wood window or aluminum clad product, with the matching simulated divided lites matching the original window grid pattern and size, and that the color match as closely as possible the dark color on the original existing windows.

Motion carried 6-0-1 by the following vote: Aye – Klavitter, Daykin-Cassill, McAndrews, Stuter, Rapp and Hilgendorf; Nay – None; Abstain – Monk.

Ms. Monk rejoined the Commission.

ITEMS FROM PUBLIC: Commissioner Daykin-Cassill suggested that having a contractor on the commission might help with reviews. A discussion of the classification and requirements by law for types of representation and followed that the Commission has one open seat in the Jackson Park Historic District Neighborhood. Staff Member Olson said that although staff cannot recruit, Commissioners can.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSION: Chair Hilgendorf deferred to staff to summarize the Preservation Fair. Staff Member Olson reported on a series of events in partnership with Heritage Works, noting Bill Doyle, staff member at Heritage Works, in the audience. On Friday, September 6, 2019, the events began with the Wood Window Workshop leader

Bob Yapp and a meeting with multiple City Departments to discuss how to mitigate lead hazards in wood windows for City-led rehabilitation projects. It was followed by a 4-hour Wood Window Workshop led by Bob Yapp with about 30 participants. On Saturday and Sunday, Heritage Works and the True North Initiative sponsored a two-day intensive Wood Window Workshop at 2033 Washington, a True North property, training about 12-15 community members that were a mix of contractors and property owners. On Saturday morning, a Preservation Fair at Steeple Square took place with an expo in the morning and 2 classes in the afternoon. Chairperson Hilgendorf expressed that she believed the workshop was well attended and overall the event was good for this first time offering. Ms. Olson related that some people who were at the 2 day workshop also attended the Lead-Safe Worker and Contractor trainings the following week. She described some of the challenges with lead paint mitigation and the requirement for occupants to leave the structure for only 2 weeks while work is being done, compared with the need for glazing to cure for a minimum of 2 weeks during restoration. She expressed her belief that it the meeting and events were a good start.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Election of Officers: Staff Member Carstens introduced the process, stating that everyone is eligible to serve as Vice-Chair or Chair with the exception of Chairperson Hilgendorf who cannot serve as Chair. Anyone can nominate themselves or someone else who is eligible. Discussion of the elections and nominations followed, and Chairperson Hilgendorf explained her experience as Chair and the role with the Commission. Staff offered to provide help to the incoming Chair, consulting with the chair before meetings, meeting about particular cases or issues, and providing training. Discussion amongst the Commission continued and a desire to include all Commissioners in the discussion was expressed.

Motion by Monk, seconded by Stuter, to table the election until the beginning of the next meeting. Motioned carried 7-0, by the following vote: Aye – McAndrews, Klavitter, Rapp, Clark, Daykin-Cassill, Monk, Stuter and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

Update on 1038 Bluff Street Project: Staff Member Chris Olson reviewed the project update provided to Commissioners in the packet regarding the rehabilitation and rebuilding of the original porch at 1038 Bluff Street. She stated the project contractor persuaded the owner Dallas Kalmes to rehabilitate the porch as opposed to removing it and rebuilding a deck in its place. He took this approach because it was both an easier approach and he convinced the homeowner that they'd be happy with it. She stated that the decking system and handrail system that was previously approved is still in place, so the work will be a mix of rehabilitation, restoration and new detailing. The work is consistent with the Architectural Guidelines, so she is working with the applicant as they move forward.

Historic Preservation Resources and Training: Staff Member Olson referred to the enclosures in the end of the packet which outline:

- a workshop that helps meet our requirements as a Certified Local Government (CLG), and
- a research resources available to the Commission and to the public.

The items were sent from Iowa CLG Coordinator Paula Mohr. Ms. Olson noted that Commissioners interested in attending the training should contact Jane Glennon, Planning Secretary, to register by October 17, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Daykin-Cassill, seconded by Rapp, to adjourn the September 25, 2019 Commission meeting. Motion carried by the following vote 7-0: Aye – McAndrews, Klavitter, Rapp, Clark, Daykin-Cassill, Monk, Stuter and Hilgendorf; Nay – None.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Chris Happ Olson, Assistant Planner

02-06-2020

Adopted