

Rockford Historic Preservation Commission

May 19, 2004 (Special meeting)

6:00 PM

Rockford City Hall, Conference Room B

MEMBERS PRESENT: Val Olafson; Laura Bachelder; Jeanne Ludeke; Vickie Krueger; Scott Sanders

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ald. Jeff Holt; Frank St. Angel

STAFF: Ginny Gregory, Jackie Bernard

OTHERS: Don Bissell, Marge Bevers (applicants); Bob Russell (Gary Anderson & Assoc.); Lisa Doll (applicant)

The special HPC Meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Val Olafson.

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

► 201 West State Street (Richardson Building)

Applicants Don Bissell and Marge Bevers were present and explained their proposal and distributed previous and proposed pictures.

Marge Bevers began by giving some history regarding the property. B&B Properties is comprised of three neighbors, Marge and her husband, Kyle, along with Don Bissell. They live in the Morrissey Building. They purchased the Richardson Building on November 3, 2003. They began doing some research on the building at the Library and the Recorder's Office and discovered that this property was first owned by Hiram Richardson, who was one of the original settlers of Rockford. Mr. Richardson actually produced some of the bricks that are in the building. It was erected by the 1860s, possibly before the Civil War. The first false front on the building was put on between 1925 and 1930, about the time Wortham's Department Store opened their store there. They occupied 201, 203 and 205 West State Street. That is why the false front ran all the way across. Sometime in the late 1950s, the next iteration came out and that was originally marble. This was subsequently removed in 1974 and replaced with the porcelain enamel that is there now when the last of the Richardsons to own the building came back from Texas and took it back from the Wortham family. They had a 99 year lease, which was signed in 1912. It has an interesting story, interesting tenants, architects, people like Jesse Barloga actually worked on this building. Their intent is to bring it back as close to the era as possible, and their application addresses all of the pieces that are needed to restore it.

Don explained that the external changes include a lot of work on the storefront, as noted on the picture. They had an offer to begin to remove the panels in the front. The main reason to start on this now is so they can understand what is underneath and the conditions they may run into. That will be the most dramatic change to the building.

The metal panels currently cover up 10 windows, which are original windows. They will be repaired or replaced, and the brickwork re-arched as necessary and matched to the other windows in the building. There is a fair amount of work that may need to occur in the parapet. The condition of the brick is deteriorating and that is another reason it's important to know that early on.

Also, the elevator penthouse will be repaired on the outside and the roof on that portion will be replaced. The building will undergo complete roof replacement as well.

A couple of features toward the north end are a new entrance for the planned residential tenants of the building. Gary Anderson put together a double entrance which provides an entrance for the residential tenants as well as an emergency egress for the existing commercial tenant, the Subway Sandwich shop. Also, that entranceway will have an Italianate portico, or porch, that would approximate the era of the building.

Further toward the north end of the building, there is double 16-foot garage door that would serve for 2 vehicles. That would have period doors and possibly a cover to match the entrance.

Val wanted to know if they have any idea of what may be underneath the panels. Marge said that the contractor they are using has worked on the building previously, but he wasn't the one who did the restoration work. She thought there were problems at that time, with the original marble. There was a question of the building being condemned, and that was when the Richardsons resumed responsibility and control of the building from their tenants. Marge said they had repaired and re-affixed the siding. Don said they believed that the end of the arches have been shaved off, and they are planning to re-arch them. They do not know the condition of the brick or the condition of the parapet.

The canopies are metal and will be exposed and painted with a small finial that will go on top. It is not a heavy canopy, very light in appearance, but gives a definite appearance of the entrance.

They are debating on whether or not to put in the canopy above the garage door. It is shown in the photo, but it may not fit in the budget. If they go ahead with it, it will match the style of the residential entrance.

Val asked if the windows above the proposed garage door were original openings. Bob said they currently exist. With the one by the new entranceway, there is existing brick that has been patched in over the years. That's where they are proposing to put the entrance in and remove a lot of the patched brick.

Don stated that the window opening shown on the picture on the east side next to the entrance is not a window and should not be shown on there. He also said the garage door is only one door, but gives the appearance of two. It is actually a double garage door, which will be wood.

Scott questioned the corner plaster column. Bob said the column is there, but has been covered up by the Subway frontage. It is a cast iron column that they plan on repairing if necessary, and leaving there.

Marge commented that they have been working with Subway and they plan on being more present with their signage. Subway is very happy about all of the changes, and they have a historic sign that will be used. As far as the awnings, Gary Anderson was proposing the color green as in the picture, but if they find out Subway decides to go with new signage, they will have to come back to the Commission to get approval for that.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sander to **APPROVE** the Certificate as submitted, noting the inclusion of the garage door, and the inclusion of the portico canopies over the garage and entrance. Also, with the notation that if the corporate signage associated with the canopy differs from what we see, a new application will be needed.

Ginny will add to the certificate that the construction of the garage shall be subject to curb-cut permit from the City and/or IDOT.

The **MOTION** was seconded by Laura Bachelder and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

► **228 South First Street**

Applicant Lisa Doll was present to go over the application for the reconfiguration of the doors and windows in the one-story addition. She mentioned Steve Jaycox was unable to attend as he had another commitment.

She distributed photos to the Commission members. Jeanne commented that the windows on the north side are visible from the street.

Val asked Lisa how much different the windows were from the originals. Lisa said that they are trying to duplicate the originals as much as possible, but they have put a slight window space in between, to try to keep it consistent with the south side. If you look at the back of the house, on the upper level there is also a window with a space in between. Val reiterated that she was referring to original windows. Lisa said, referring to the pictures, that they are the same proportions, they have just been moved over and up a little, and they are the same opening size.

Val stated that what the Commission is asking is that if they are going to change the fenestration, at least go back to the original, which are the window openings on the south elevation, and they are more in keeping with the tall, thinner style.

Val said there is a way to do that and still redo the interior, but there would be a small bay. The counter height would be normal, but, from the exterior, the windows are done to look the same on the south side, so they would all look uniform. Val said that if the north side was visible from the street, she would want all of the windows to be consistent all the way around. Lisa's argument was that the north side is not totally visible from the street, only at an angle.

Val stated they should change the fenestration so it is consistent with south and north; the windows as they exist on the east elevation, but to match the proportion of the original windows on the south elevation.

Val suggested a compromise. If they go with the same width as the windows on the north and south elevation, so the caps of the windows remain the same height as the windows on the north and south elevation. Just raise them up so they stay consistent with the width. That would be a more pleasing look than having windows that are way up.

There was a lengthy discussion on the opinion of the window size and placement.

Scott said the intent was to match the height to width ratio of the north and south windows, not the existing east ones.

Lisa wanted to know if they stay consistent with the same size of the windows all the way around and matching the proportions at the same level.

Jeanne asked about the type of glass being used, noting that what's being proposed does not match the original. Ginny commented that the Commission has not discussed the type of glass used in windows in

the past. Val stated that the only time glass ever came into question was if it was etched, stained, leaded or beveled.

A brief discussion followed.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sanders to **APPROVE** the certificate as follows:

- ◆ **Approve** the changes as submitted to the south, which is the addition of a window that will match the existing window that exists on the south.
- ◆ **Deny** the original changes proposed to the north.
- ◆ **Approve** changes to the east that would involve the removal of the door and the reconfiguration/replacement of the windows that are currently there, to match in height, width, and vertical placement on the wall, the existing windows on the north and south elevations.

The **MOTION** was seconded by Vickie Krueger and **CARRIED** by a vote of 4-1 with Jeanne Ludeke voting no.

With no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jackie Bernard
Senior Clerk