

**I. CALL TO ORDER –**

A special meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held in the City Council Chambers at the City Hall on Friday, May 17, 2019 commencing at 5:30 p.m. Chair Kotelnicki called the meeting to order.

**A. ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner (Chair)	Darlene Kotelnicki	Present
Commissioner	Kevin Hovey	Present
Commissioner	Frank Koch	Absent
Commissioner (Plan. Comm. Rep)	Mike Flaata	Present
Commissioner	Dave Welker	Absent
Commissioner	Kateri Kormann	Present
Commissioner	Sid Willson	Present
Non-voting	Bill Hicks	Present
City Staff	Dave Cziok	Present

**II. PUBLIC HEARING – 226 N Sibley** The public hearing for this COA was held at the regularly scheduled meeting on April 22, 2019. This agenda was completed up to item H. Action on this application was tabled until an engineer's opinion was obtained.

- A. Open public
- B. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or ex-parte
- C. Review of Proper Notification
- D. Introduction of Completed Application by Commission
- E. Presentation by Applicant or Designee
- F. Comments from Other Interested Parties
- G. Closure of Public Hearing, with option to question applicant or parties
- H. Action on due process
- I. Checklist: Yes: 0 No: 8 NA: 2
- J. Findings of Fact:: completed
- K. Action on the application by the Commission: See below

The applicant, Ed Olson, took a chair next to the chair to facilitate his hearing the discussion. Chair Kotelnicki reviewed the progress so far on this application and the applicant stated he understood. Chair Kotelnicki asked each member of the commission to give their opinion.

1. Kevin H. stated he called the MN Historical Society and talked to Amy Spong, Director. She stated the building would need to be returned to the previous condition and the MN State Historic Architect would need to review the plans. Kevin felt that the building has been deteriorating for many years. It would have been cheaper to fix the building when it was first noticed. Also, the city had attempted to contact the property owner about this issue.

2. Sid agreed with Kevin. He stated buildings need to be taken care of. It should have been mended 20 years ago. He questioned how the stability of a new parapet would be completed and the east facade work. He would like to see an engineer's opinion.

May 17, 2019

3. Mike felt this is not a new problem and should have been dealt with. He felt it needed to be returned to its original condition.

4. Kateri has a hard time saying demo and leave it. She said the building is a contributing building and has good historic integrity based on the MN Historical Society Inventory forms. She felt since this is a triple building, the demoed part of the building could adversely affect the property values of the other two properties. This is not an individual, stand alone structure.

5. Darlene felt that this is a contributing building and it is important to restore it. The Secretary of Interior Standards need to be followed. She is concerned about the stability of the front (east) facade. She would like to see an engineer's opinion so it is fixed right and the property owner does not have this problem in another 5 years or so.

6. Dave stated that after the bricks had fallen, the city needed to act for public safety purposes. The owner had an opinion from a masonry contractor who could restore the parapet. The contractor suggested putting 4 inch concrete block for the back part and the original bricks in the front. The concrete block would add stability and not be seen by the public.

7. Bill strongly recommended an engineer's opinion to ensure vertical stability. He also suggested the engineer look at the east facade. This is a life/safety issue for the public and he felt the city needed to get the proper evaluations before authorizing work.

Discussion then centered on how to best handle the COA without an engineer's evaluation. It was decided that since the demo has taken care of the public safety issue, there is no danger to people inside the building, and the contractor assured the property owner that the building would be weather tight, the engineer's opinion can be obtained by the property owner.

The checklist was completed with no yea votes, 8 no votes and 2 not applicable.

MOTION: To deny the application based on the following two concerns, that being the application is not clear about returning the parapet to the original condition to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. Also, there is lack of a structural engineer written report with plans to return the brick to the original condition. as requested by Bolton & Menk. (Kateri/Kevin/Passed unanimously). The applicant is to contact a structural engineer and submit report plus an updated COA. He is directed to ask the engineer, or an architect, to contact the Stat Historic Architect prior to asking the HPC to act on the COA. Bill Hicks offered to assist the property owner in this process.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT** – 5:30 p.m. Next meeting Tuesday, May 28, 2019 at 7 p.m.  
Note date and time change

---

DARLENE KOTELNICKI  
CHAIRPERSON