

City of Sidney Historic Preservation Board
Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 12:03 by Chairperson of the Board, Kay Hicks.

Members Responding to Roll call: Greg Huck, Bruce Leypoldt, Kathy Wilson, Rich Phillips, Kay Hicks, Jake Vickery. Members absent included: Scott Williams. Additional attendees: J Leef, Gary Person, Brad Rowan, Megan McGown, Doug Meier, and Tammy Nelsen.

Approval of minutes from December 17, 2014: Phillips made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Leypoldt seconded the motion and the motion carried with all members present voting yeas.

Hicks opened the hearing at 12:05pm regarding the nomination for landmark designation of the following property:

1941 Former Municipal Swimming Pool in Legion Park (Sec. 6-13-49 PT NE/4 Lands Inside Sidney).

Hicks explained the procedures for the hearing and asked for comments.

Person represented the City/Applicant and stated that as per the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Board during the December 17 meeting has nominated the 1941 former municipal pool/Living Memorial Gardens for local landmark designation. He explained the significance of the property, citing that it was the first municipal pool for the Sidney. Research shows that Sidney leaders hired a firm to design something similar to a concept that Kearney had. It was during the time of the WPA, which helped with matching funds for the project. The pool was open until 1976 when the Bertrum O'Connor pool was built. Person provided many supporting documents as to the significance of the site and encouraged the Preservation Board to recommend the Landmark Designation.

With no additional comments, the public hearing closed at 12:11pm

Recommend approval/disapproval/modification of the Designation of Landmarks of the 1941 Former Municipal Swimming Pool.

Hicks called for discussion and/or a motion regarding the designation of the 1941 Former Municipal Swimming Pool.

Leypoldt made a motion to approve the local landmark designation based on the statements of significance 1, 2, 3 as outlined in Ordinance 1282.06 (b). Huck seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Huck - yes, Leypoldt - yes, Wilson - yes, Phillips - yes, Hicks - yes and Vickery - yes. Motion passed.

Hicks noted that all 9 properties will go before council next Tuesday, January 27th. McGown explained that the next step is transmittal to Council. The Designation is by Ordinance and Leef will write the ordinance to include all 9 properties. Ordinances require 3 readings unless waived by Council. Person also noted that McGown has

City of Sidney Historic Preservation Board
Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2015

met individually with several of the Councilmen to ensure they understand what a Landmark Designation means for properties.

Reimbursement Request: Meier requested reimbursement for work completed at 940 10th Ave. Wilson asked about vinyl and reflective and whether or not it was against the guidelines. Wilson stated that according to the guidelines, vinyl and reflective are against the guidelines, she read the applicable guideline to the board.

Nelsen noted the date of publication of the guidelines is 2007 and would have been in place at the time of Meier's application in 2011. She also noted the board members at the time in 2007.

Hicks said that the windows have not been replaced, they have been covered up. She stated that the plywood is still there as are the original windows. Meier said that the idea was to protect what was already there, but to make it look better than boarded up windows. Wilson asked why the boards weren't removed to open the windows up. Meier explained that the original windows were walled off on the inside as well as covered by bookshelves. They would have had to do a total remodel to the interior plus obscure the glass somehow due to the store setup. Hicks compared it to a storm window. Huck stated that when the issue was originally addressed, replacing the window wasn't really an option due to the store set up and the walls on the inside and the extent of the remodel.

Wilson also asked about the time element. It was stated on the application that the project would be completed in 60-120 days. The guidelines state that the project needs to be started within 3 months or it's null and void unless waived by the HPB.

Leef stated that the application was approved in 2011 and that if the project was started within 3 months, then the approval should stand. If the project was not started in 3 months of application, the HPB can decide whether or not to waive that requirement.

Vickery asked questions regarding the timeline and why that stipulation was made in the guidelines in the first place. McGown explained that the timeline was put place in case grant funds should run low. The board did not want to reserve funds for a project that might not start for several months but rather use the reserved funds for projects starting in the more immediate future.

Vickery stated that what was done to the building was more compatible with the building compared with what was there, stating that it is an improvement to the building. Since the original windows are still intact, the preservation hasn't been compromised. The original openings have been preserved. He further stated that he believes the HPB should waive the 3 month time frame. He did state that the HPB should have held it to a different standard back in 2011, but it is an improvement and putting additional obstacles in place doesn't make sense.

City of Sidney Historic Preservation Board
Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2015

Vickery suggested for the future to assign a project to a HPB member to monitor. He also suggested that more details be gathered up front, such as more exact specifications, samples of the glass, the trim, the replacement material, etc. McGown will note this topic for a future meeting.

Hicks asked for a motion to waive the 3 month time frame - Huck made the motion to waive the 90 day requirement of beginning the project. Leypoldt seconded the motion. The motion carried with five members voting yeas and Wilson voting against the motion.

Hicks called for a motion to approve the reimbursement request of \$3,143.66. Phillips made a motion to approve the reimbursement. Huck seconded the motion. The motion carried with the majority voting yeas and Wilson voting against the motion.

Reimbursement Request 1013-1023. Only the upper floor has been done at this time; the lower windows will be considered a new project at a later date if Meier should decide to replace them. Leef said the board has the option to change materials and scope at that time.

Vickery asked about the condition of the original windows. Meier stated that they were in bad disrepair.

Wilson noted that the application submitted by Meier does not state "vinyl" in the description. She questioned that if the material is not noted, does that mean that vinyl was approved? Records do not indicate if a material was stated. She also read from page 5 of the Design Guidelines where it stated that like materials should be used to replace.

Hicks stated that since the original application had been approved in 2011, that the issue being decided was whether or not to grant an extension.

Meier noted that on the front of the building there are aluminum-clad windows and the windows on the side are vinyl and this was done due to cost.

Hicks asked for a motion to waive the 90 day requirement. Huck made a motion to waive the 3 month waiver. Leypoldt seconded the motion. The motion passed with the majority voting yeas and Wilson opposing.

Hicks called for a motion regarding the reimbursement request on the \$896.56. Huck made a motion to approve the reimbursement. Phillips seconded the motion and the motion carried with five members voting in favor and Wilson opposing.

McGown stated to Meier that a new application will be required for the lower floor window replacement project.

City of Sidney Historic Preservation Board
Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2015

Adopt timeline for COA - McGown recommended changing the existing guidelines from 3 months to 180 days start date and completion by one year. Wilson noted that we need to have a procedure in place and we need to follow it. She also stated that we need to have a formal inspection following the work to ensure that the project was completed as applied for. McGown has asked Rowan, the Chief Building Official if he would perform an inspection and take a photo and sign off on the improvements. She will create a form and present it for approval at the next meeting.

Vickery suggested adding in the phrase "or as otherwise approved by the board" to allow for extensions. Rowan suggested still having status updates in place to ensure that the project is conforming to the original COA.

Vickery made a motion to amend the guidelines to state that the project must be commenced within 6 months and completed in 12 months. Any extension must be made in writing and the extension, if granted, will be stated in writing along with the extension time that was approved. Huck seconded the motion and the motion carried with all members present voting yeas.

Local Landmark Designation Update – McGown reminded the board that the first reading of the landmark designation ordinance for all 9 nominated properties will be the first item on the agenda on January 27. She encouraged attendance.

Upper floor feasibility - Scott Day and his team will be at the next HPB meeting on Feb 10 to present the final report to the board and the public.

Comments by board: Vickery asked that the minutes reflect the list of valuable items to follow up on at upcoming meetings: vinyl issue, samples and other required supplemental items to be submitted with each COA application (such as elevation), assigning a monitor for each project, clarification of start of work, reference made to the actual opening, handbook approval

Wilson spoke about Deadwood and how their preservation efforts have been a great benefit to the community and to the state.

Comments by the Public: Nelsen said that with the local landmark issue coming forward, she encouraged the board to be a Preservation board and exhibit the true nature of preservation rather than beautification.

With all business being addressed, the meeting adjourned at 1:30