

**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, July 23, 2018, commencing at 6:30 p.m. Chair Kotelnicki called the meeting to order.

A. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner (Chair)	Darlene Kotelnicki	Present
Commissioner	Sid Willson	Present
Commissioner	Frank Koch	Present
Commissioner (Plan. Comm. Rep)	Mike Flaata	Present
Commissioner	Dave Welker	Absent
Commissioner	Kateri Kormann	Absent
Commissioner	Kevin Hovey	Present

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS: None.

**II. MINUTES TO APPROVE –**

A. Historic Preservation Meeting - MOTION: To approve minutes from June 25, 2018 as submitted (Frank/Kevin/Passed Unanimously)

**III. PUBLIC HEARING – 210 Sibley Ave North**

- A. Open public hearing at 6:33 p.m.
- B. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None ex-parte: Darlene Kotelnicki reported she assisted the applicant in completing the COA.
- C. Review of Proper Notification - Published in the Independent Review
- D. Introduction of Completed Application by Commission
- E. Presentation by Applicant or Designee: Not present
- F. Comments from Other Interested Parties: None
- G. Closure of Public Hearing at 6:36 p.m.
- H. MOTION: Due process was followed ( Mike/Sid/Passed unanimously)
- I. Checklist: 9 Yes 0 No 1 N/A
- J. Findings of Fact: See attached
- K. MOTION: To approve the application as submitted (Frank/Sid/Passed unanimously)

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING – 129 Sibley Ave North**

- A. Open public hearing at 6:41 p.m.
- B. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: Kevin Hovey declared a conflict of interest, left the table, and sat in the audience ex-parte: None
- C. Review of Proper Notification - Published in the Independent Review
- D. Introduction of Completed Application by Commission

- E. Presentation by Applicant or Designee: Kevin Hovey Kevin explained that the awning will have no logo or flags as shown on the photo.
- F. Comments from Other Interested Parties: None
- G. Closure of Public Hearing at 6:48 p.m.
- H. MOTION: Due process was followed ( Frank/Mike/Passed unanimously)
- I. Checklist: 9 Yes 0 No 1 N/A
- J. Findings of Fact: See attached
- K. MOTION: To approve the application as amended with the awning on east facade being marine blue or dark green and maybe retractable or fixed (Mike/Sid/Passed Unanimously)

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS –

- A. SIGN ISSUES – Frank stated they will meet this month.
- B. MN HISTORICAL SOCIETY CONFERENCE – Kevin and Darlene can attend. Frank, Mike, and Sid cannot.
- C. CEMETERY TOUR - Darlene reported attendance was down probably due to the heat. We have been asked to participate in Harvest Madness again and they would like us to consider repeating the cemetery tour but in Central Park. The cemetery committee meets Friday. Sid felt the MCHS may want to do something since there would be an event in Central Park; he will ask. We would need props and LCT has some. The commissioners felt we should try this option and then not do living history characters.
- D. HIGHWAY 12 PROJECT - Darlene stated she had a call from Sue Graniger about the final report. It will be sent electronically in about two weeks. Sue stated it is 175 pages long due to the number of properties reviewed. The Wells Fargo building should be considered for the Register; the exterior of the Family Services could also. Darlene talked to Wells-Fargo and they requested and email they could forward to the corporate office. Commissioners also suggested a black metal sign explaining the significance of the property. The commissioners requested Darlene send an email to Wells-Fargo and verbally talk to the county about the Family Services Building.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS –

- A. ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER – see D above under Old Business
- B. CRITERIA FOR ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED COAS - Darlene reported she was asked by a property owner about using a color of paint off the historic pallet and the COA being administratively approved. This was a new question. City Administrator Dave Cziok requested the HPC discuss this. His memo is included. Sid asked what the choice and the vision of the property was and how would this be known. Kevin felt that possibly trim could be but if the whole building was being painted that would be expecting too much from staff to make a decision.

July 23, 2018

Mike felt strongly that there needed to be input outside from the city administrator. The commissioners discussed this at length and there was a strong consensus that additional staff/contracted staff is needed. Mike used the example of the Planning Commission and review by Hannah R. before items come to commission.

Darlene expressed the need for a professional opinion since we are now getting into building issues not just doors, signs, and windows. She stated the ordinance allows for a professional opinion, if needed.

Frank stated we want to work on these parameters to meet the property owner's needs but that we have a responsibility for getting public input also.

Darlene stated we could have a special meeting but in the past, those have been reserved for emergency issues. The commissioners felt they did not want to start special meetings for this reason.

Property owner Kim Olson spoke and requested even approving six building colors and six trim colors that could be administratively approved to streamline the process. She said it is hard to wait a month to paint. Darlene suggested this could be part of the tax credit process.

The commissioners were unified in the decision that there would be no changes to the administratively approved criteria at this meeting. Darlene will send out the form and color pallet for the next meeting. They directed Darlene to report to the council that the city administrator's time is better spent on other city business and that a professional opinion should be considered.

C. GOALS FOR 2019 - The HPC discussed possible goals for 2019. Kevin pointed out that our newspaper articles are done through March 2019 (education). Frank suggested a tour of the buildings that have had COAs. The commissioners liked this idea and felt a "Tour of COAs" could be done in May which is Preservation Month (promotion). Discussion about having a class for contractors with Joe Lawncziak from WI presenting. One of our goals for protection could be to streamline the COA process. We can continue the recognition program for a person, place, and event (promotion). Depending on the cemetery tour in Central Park, we could continue living history characters and/or cemetery tours. Darlene will draft something for the next meeting.

**VI. REPORTS –**

A. MEEKER COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY –

B. MN HISTORICAL SOCIETY -

**VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS –**

A. Next meeting will be Monday, August 27, 2018 at 6:30 p.m .in City Hall

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT – At 8 PM by chair**

---

DARLENE KOTELNICKI  
CHAIRPERSON

PLN 27-0726-008

page 1 of 2  
7/23/18

City of Litchfield  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Certificate of Appropriateness Checklist

1. Will the property be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal changes to its distinctive features, spaces, or spatial relationships?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

2. Will the historic character of the property be retained and preserved? The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

same color paint

3. Will the property be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use? Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

4. Will changes to the property that have acquired historic significance in their own right, be retained and preserved?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

repaint mangues

5. Will distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property be preserved?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

see #4

6. Will deteriorated historic features be repaired rather than replaced? Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Yes

No

N/A

Comments:

Repainting

7. Will chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, be undertaken using the gentlest means possible? Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Yes

No

N/A

Comments:

8. Will archeological resources be protected and preserved in place? If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Yes

No

N/A

Comments:

9. The new additions, exterior alternations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property? The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Yes

No

N/A

Comments:

10. Will new additions and adjacent or related new construction be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired?

Yes

No

N/A

Comments:

9x  
1 NA

PIN 27-0726-000  
7/23/18  
Page 1 of 1

Litchfield Heritage Preservation Commission

Findings of Fact

1. Completed application and necessary supporting documents on file within the proper time frame?  Yes  No
2. Proper notification of adjacent property owners?  Yes  No
3. Applicant, or written permission designee, is available for the public hearing?  Yes  No
4. Other communication or comments?  Yes  No
5. Checklist completed and score? Yes Score 9 No Score 0  
N/A Score 1
6. Does the project meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historical Places?  Yes  No Reason  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. HPC action of Certificate of Appropriateness.  
approve as submitted
8. Comments:

Attach original to application

*Dorlene Kotelnicki, Chair*

PIN 27-0197-000

page 1 of 2

7/23/18

City of Litchfield  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Certificate of Appropriateness Checklist

1. Will the property be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal changes to its distinctive features, spaces, or spatial relationships?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

changes to west facade to accomodate electrical box inside

2. Will the historic character of the property be retained and preserved? The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

3. Will the property be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use? Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

4. Will changes to the property that have acquired historic significance in their own right, be retained and preserved?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

awning

5. Will distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property be preserved?

Yes      No      N/A

Comments:

6. Will deteriorated historic features be repaired rather than replaced? Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Yes      No      N/A  
Comments:

reporting if needed

7. Will chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, be undertaken using the gentlest means possible? Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Yes      No      N/A  
Comments:

8. Will archeological resources be protected and preserved in place? If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Yes      No       N/A  
Comments:

9. The new additions, exterior alternations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property? The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Yes      No      N/A  
Comments:

10. Will new additions and adjacent or related new construction be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired?

Yes      No      N/A  
Comments:

keeping transom on west facade



PLN 21-0797-000  
Page 1 of 1  
7/23/18

Litchfield Heritage Preservation Commission

Findings of Fact

1. Completed application and necessary supporting documents on file within the proper time frame?  Yes No

2. Proper notification of adjacent property owners?  Yes No

3. Applicant, or written permission designee, is available for the public hearing?  Yes No

4. Other communication or comments? Yes  No

5. Checklist completed and score? Yes Score 9 No Score 0

N/A Score 1

6. Does the project meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historical Places?  Yes No Reason

7. HPC action of Certificate of Appropriateness.

approve with east facade awning

8. Comments: marine blue or green, no logo or flags  
retractable or fixed

Attach original to application

Darlene Kolbnicki Chair

# Memo to HPC



Date: July 23, 2018

Meeting Date: July 23, 2018

From: Administrator Cziok

**Subject:** *HPC Administratively Approved List*

## **History/Background**

It is always a balancing act between meeting the public's needs and expectation in a speedy manner and allowing for public feedback in order to consider alternate views. COA's process is very much the same way. The Administratively approved list allows for speedy response but does not allow for oversight from the HPC or the public. The public hearing process allows for oversight but takes considerable time.

## **Administration's Review**

Over the past couple years pressure to expedite the COA process has increased, felt not only by the HPC but city staff as well. Administration has some concerns that if the administratively approved list continues to grow the ability for the HPC or public to provide input will diminish. City staff isn't currently prepared for or responsible for holding any applicant to the HPC's expectations. Administration has included the following considerations for HPC discussion:

- A. Keep the Administratively Approved list short acknowledging the delay to projects that change the face of the Historic District.
- B. Expand the Administratively Approved list acknowledging that some changes will be made to the face of the Historic District without public or HPC oversight.
- C. Request the City Council authorize administration & the city attorney to explore alternatives to the COA process that would allow for HPC &/or Council oversight without the public hearing process.