

I. CALL TO ORDER –

A regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held in the City Council Chambers at the City Hall on Monday, May 22, 2017, commencing at 6:30 p.m. Chair Kotelnicki called the meeting to order.

A. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner (Chair)	Darlene Kotelnicki	Present
Commissioner	Arlene Howanski	Present
Commissioner	Frank Koch	Present
Commissioner (Plan. Comm. Rep)	Mike Flaata	Present
Commissioner	Robyn Richardson	Present
Commissioner	Kateri Kormann	Present (at 7 PM)

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS: None.

II. MINUTES TO APPROVE –

A. Historic Preservation Meeting - Minutes enclosed were from the March meeting, no action

III. PUBLIC HEARING – 226 N Sibley PIN 27-0723-000 COA 17-05-05

A. Open public hearing at 6:33 p.m.
B. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or ex-parte- None reported
C. Review of Proper Notification - Published in the Independent Review
D. Introduction of Completed Application by Commission
E. Presentation by Applicant or Designee: (Mike Lee present)
F. Comments from Other Interested Parties- None present or in writing
G. Closure of Public Hearing, with option to question applicant or parties at 6:36
H. Action on due process (MOTION: Mike/Robyn/passes unanimously)
I. Checklist: 7 Yes 0 No 3 N/A
J. Findings of Fact: Completed
K. Action on the application by the Commission: Approved as submitted and forwarded to the Litchfield City Council (MOTION: Robyn R./ Arlene H./ passed unanimously). Chair Kotelnicki requested the applicant review sign with city staff prior to the council meeting 6/3/17 and applicant stated he would.

IV. OLD BUSINESS –

A. MN DOT PRESENTATION - Sue Grainger, Gemini Research; Chris Cooley, Bolton & Menk (contracted by MN DOT); Lowell Flatten MN DOT were present to discuss the Highway 12 project. Discussion centered only around lighting. There were three options for the

commission to review. Chris reported there will be 14 MN DOT roadway lights in all three options. The commissioners had no questions about this. Chris reviewed all three options with option #1 being five globe lights, option #2 acorn lights, and option #3 cobra lights.

Option #1, the five globe lights would be LED and aluminum. Sue reported that these are very specific lights and no longer made today and not commonly found. A commercially available pole and base with custom a custom top would be acceptable. Based on information available these were installed about 1912 and believed to have been ordered from a company based in New York (Niland Company pole and base submitted as a possible example with LED lights and made from aluminum). Chris reported plans call for 18 five globe lights in the two block area of the 100 and 200 blocks of North Sibley Avenue. A preliminary cost estimate of the city's share of this lighting is \$211,000.

Option #2, the acorn lights, will have the same base and pole as option #1. Sue reported that historic photos and the original light at the southeast corner of intersection of Sibley Avenue and 5th Street were used as a guide. Sue reported acorn lights were installed about 1930 and the example shown would meet historic standards. A Visco Series light was shown as a possible example. There are 18 lights proposed in the two block area of North Sibley, 100 and 200 blocks. Chris reported the preliminary city share of the cost of this lighting would be \$112,000.

Option #3 is a MN DOT approved cobra light fixture. Chris reported there would be 24 total for the project or 14 at the intersection like options #1 and #2. The mid-block lighting would require 10 lights. The preliminary city share of this lighting would be \$40,000.

Lowell pointed out that there may be a cost to paint these brown or black; this is unknown at this time. He also discussed there is a fund for "aesthetics" that is about \$54,000.

DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION:

Option #1 was discussed. Two commissioners (Flaata and Koch) felt this was a second choice for them. Four commissioners (Kotelnicki, Richardson, Korman, Howlanski) stated they would like this option eliminated for these reasons:

- 1) This would actually be a "step backward" historically since we already have cobra lighting and have psuedo-acorn lights attached (Korman)
- 2) There was a concern expressed that the second floor apartments could have glare due to the height of the lighting (Korman).
- 3) There was a concern that public opinion strongly wanted five globe lights and anything else would be perceived as not meeting the requests of the public (Richardson).
- 4) Due to the height of these lights, a concern was expressed that the tree issue would come up again. This was already voted down by the commission (Korman, Richardson).

Option #2 was discussed. Two commissioners (Flaata, Koch) felt this was their first choice and four commissioners felt that this was their second choice. It was felt by the four who favored this as a second choice that again, there would be significant complaints from the public with these lights (Kotelnicki, Korman, Richardson, Howanski).

Option #3 was discussed and four commissioners felt this was their number one choice (Kotelnicki, Korman, Richardson, Howanski). Discussion included that when voting, the public did not know the cost (Koch). A concern about having one shot at doing this right "in the eyes of the public" was supported by the majority of the commission.

GENERAL COMMENTS: As a way to "soften" the five globe light costs, commissioners felt that the aesthetic money, \$54,000, should be applied to the cost of these lights. Considerable discussion about other possible expenses like poles for Christmas decorations, trees, benches, garbage containers and scored sidewalks. The commissioners agreed by consensus that scored sidewalks are not a priority due to minimal visual impact for people driving through the community. Benches and garbage containers could be added by the city in the future. Trees were voted down once already. A concern was raised about only having two blocks to work with and the possibility of being too crowded if several amenities were added. Chair Kotelnicki asked the presenters if they wanted a motion or recommendation. All presenters felt a "direction to go" would be sufficient.

RECOMMENDATION TO FORWARD TO THE LITCHFIELD CITY COUNCIL: The HPC agreed that all could "live with" option #1 or #2, although the majority clearly wanted the five globe lights (option #1). They felt that aesthetic monies should be put into lighting due to high visual impact to people driving through the community.

B. 225 N SIBLEY AVE – Chair Kotelnicki reported that the building evaluation is in process. There will be a special meeting of the Litchfield City Council and the HPC and Meeker County Commissioners will be invited. Collaborative Designs will be giving their preliminary report and take questions.

C. PROCEDURES FOR HPC / CITY OF LITCHFIELD- omitted, on agenda by error

V. NEW BUSINESS –

A. 202 North Sibley Avenue- Owner John Braun was present and explained the next steps for his building. He had submitted a COA but this missed the publication deadline. The HPC heard his COA and voted; however, no public hearing was held and the findings of fact were not completed. The public hearing will be at the next Litchfield City Council meeting and the owner is aware. The checklist was seven supportive and zero not supportive. There were three not applicable. **This will be COA # 17-06-06.**

B. 215 North Sibley Avenue- Owner John Braun was present and explained the initial steps for his building. He plans to remove the 1960 lower storefront and restore this to the original to include centered entry and transom windows. He had submitted a COA but this missed the publication deadline. The HPC heard his COA and voted on the checklist; however, no public hearing was held and the findings of fact were not completed. The public hearing will be at the next Litchfield City Council meeting and the owner is aware. The checklist was eight supportive and zero not supportive. There were two not applicable. **This will be COA #17-06-07.**

May 22, 2017

C. GAR HALL ADDITION- Chair Kotelnicki corrected this to say it should say GAR Hall evaluation NOT addition. Collaborative Designs has been hired to evaluate the envelope, roof, and major systems of the 1960 addition.

VI. REPORTS –

A. MEEKER COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY –

Robyn reported the GAR Hall will have its Memorial Day picnic and pie and ice cream social. This was started in 1885 and continues today. Cost is \$7 and serving is from 11 am to 2 pm.

B. MN HISTORICAL SOCIETY -

Darlene reported the partnership grant has been submitted for Meeker County and we will hear sometime in May if we are approved.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS –

A. Next meeting will be Monday, June 26, 2017 at 6:30 pm in City Hall.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – (MOTION: Kateri Korman)

DARLENE KOTELNICKI
CHAIRPERSON