

CITY OF WOODSTOCK  
**Historic Preservation Commission**  
September 8, 2014  
City Council Chambers

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The special meeting of the Woodstock Historic Preservation Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Allen Stebbins on Monday, September 8, 2014 in Council Chambers at City Hall.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rodney Paglialong, Chairman Allen Stebbins, Erica Wilson

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jodie Kurtz-Osborne

**STAFF PRESENT:** City Planner Nancy Baker

**OTHERS PRESENT:** City Clerk Dianne Mitchell

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by R. Paglialong, second by E. Wilson to approve the July 28, 2014 minutes of the Woodstock HPC as submitted. Ayes: Chairman Stebbins, R. Paglialong, E. Wilson. Nays: None. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No comments from public.

**IV. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**A. 101 N. Johnson Street—Certificate of Appropriateness to replace ground floor entrance door and install trim**

Kathryn Lopprino, 668 W. South St, Woodstock, reported that at this time they are just going for the approval of the door and not the build-out around it. She stated that she included a door drawing with the COA application and advised that it will fall in line with the architecture of the building. She advised that it is all wood and glass noting that the transom above will be crafted in two separate pieces and join them so it will look like it was years back. She reported that Blue Ribbon will be doing the install.

E. Wilson questioned if the opening will remain the same size and K. Lopprino affirmed. A. Stebbins questioned if the door will be painted or a wood door. K. Lopprino stated that she prefers that it stays wood noting that it why they had discussed coverage so the sun doesn't beat on it constantly. A. Stebbins questioned if there is a color stain for it. K. Lopprino advised that there isn't and noted that they are open to guidance on it.

R. Paglialong questioned if the glass will be clear or frosted. K. Lopprino advised that it will be clear with their logo on the glass. A. Stebbins questioned the transom and she stated that it will be opaque. A. Stebbins stated that it will be dark glass because the ceiling comes down below the transoms and there is wood behind there. K. Lopprino advised that they can mimic window but there can't actually be glass so they talked about doing a dark opaque glass. R. Paglialong questioned if a solid piece of glass would look better and K. Lopprino advised that the one with the two pieces mimics what is already there.

E. Wilson referenced the top photo on Page 3 and questioned the time period it falls in and whether it is within the target time period for restoration. N. Baker stated that it is early 1900's. E. Wilson stated that she likes the glass in the door, but wanted to bring up the fact that the door in the photo which falls within the time period doesn't have glass in the lower part of the door. K. Lopprino stated that looking at the space they are looking at providing in there having glass would be keynote for having a hostess and greeting.

R. Paglialong advised that he doesn't have a problem with it being glass as opposed to a solid paneled door. E. Wilson stated that there are other doors on the building that have glass but noted that she felt she should bring it up. A. Stebbins referenced the photo on Page 4 with the windbreak entrance and stated that it looks like there were wood panels below with glass on the top. In response to A. Stebbins, N. Baker stated that it is 1960's. E. Wilson stated that on the picture she was talking about, the main doors of the Old Courthouse have a bottom that is opaque with glass above so she thinks it would be fine.

R. Paglialong questioned if the Commission has any concerns or preference regarding staining or painting on the door. K. Lopprino stated that it won't be painted. E. Wilson stated that it was painted in the historic photo. R. Paglialong stated that he thinks paint would be better noting that paint will last much longer than stain. K. Lopprino advised that they are open to whatever the color scheme is going to be for the other doors on the building.

A. Stebbins noted that the Commission is approving the door only and the group discussed the findings of fact. A. Stebbins noted that they recommend paint as it is more durable than stain. The group felt the new door and materials meet the design guidelines and will have a positive impact on the building, the neighboring buildings, the surrounding area and the historic district.

Motion by R. Paglialong, second by E. Wilson to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 101 N. Johnson Street to replace ground floor entrance door with the recommendation to paint the door. Ayes: Chairman Stebbins, R. Paglialong, E. Wilson. Nays: None. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

**B. 125 E. Calhoun Street—Certificate of Appropriateness to install stone on the front façade**

The petitioner for Barbecue King did not show up for the meeting.

**C. 107-109 Van Buren Street—Certificate of Appropriateness to replace second and third story windows**

Cary Cook, 2515 Raycraft Rd, Woodstock, stated that the new windows were quoted to replace the existing style that is there now but without grills. He advised that they will be a wood interior with aluminum clad on the outside. He reported that they started the project with the fire that occurred at 109 Van Buren which is when they started a project to change the window style to a dark bronze; he provided the Commission with a sample of the color. He advised that their color change request is to go to a dark bronze that will make the lower level color.

C. Cook stated that there are two sets of windows in each opening and noted that they would be taken out and there will be a frame necessary built around the sides. He noted that they will insert the windows into the existing opens with no changes to the façade. He advised that the existing windows are built behind the brick façade that was applied to the building in the past so they have to be dug out which will create a cavity that will be filled with Windsor pine which has

a rot preventative in it. He stated that the windows will be more contemporary and energy efficient and still maintain the integrity of the historical aspect of the building for that time period. He noted that it is a 6-8 week order time which puts them at the end of November.

E. Wilson questioned if the sills will be affected and C. Cook advised that they will not. R. Paglialong recommended that the lintels be scraped and painted. C. Cook advised that it is part of the quote.

A. Stebbins questioned when the vinyl windows were replaced and N. Baker believes it was the early 1990's. A. Stebbins stated that this is a classic example of why vinyl windows aren't approved in the district because of what happened to this building. R. Paglialong stated that they do not last. E. Wilson added that they were installed poorly as well. A. Stebbins advised that the only alternative is replacement windows.

E. Wilson stated that she thinks it is fine without the grills on the windows and noted that it is too bad that since they are being replaced it is too bad that they can't be how they originally were with the three windows. C. Cook advised that they did present that to the owner; however, his feeling was that the reduction in size on the windows would limit some air flow. E. Wilson stated that her only consideration would be to try to look as much like the original windows that were installed. She stated that a lot of the upper windows on the Square are similar but whether it is correct or not is debatable.

A. Stebbins questioned if in the 1950's when it was remodeled were they always apartments or were they offices. He stated that the idea of the Chicago style windows evokes a professional office type of look where as the use is now residential apartment. He would go for the project as presented without the imitation grills because it comes closer to simulating that expansive glass from the Chicago style window but gives the residents the opportunity to raise the windows for air flow. E. Wilson stated that she is fine with it, but she thinks it is something the Commission should discuss. She stated that the use of the spaces has changed and this lends itself more to a residential type of use.

The Commission completed the findings of fact stated that the new windows meet the design guidelines and the proposed project will have a positive impact on the building, the neighboring buildings, the surrounding area and the overall historic district.

Motion by E. Wilson, second by R. Paglialong to approve the COA for 107-109 Van Buren Street to replace second and third story windows. Ayes: Chairman Stebbins, R. Paglialong, E. Wilson. Nays: None. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

**D. 112-114 Cass Street—Certificate of Appropriateness to replace second story windows on Main Street side and Discussion of future window replacement on Cass Street side**

C. Cook stated that the windows on both sides of the building are deteriorating; the glazing, caulking, sills, sashes and paint. E. Wilson questioned if they are original windows and C. Cook advised that they are fairly original but he believes the building was changed and modified. N. Baker thinks they are early 20<sup>th</sup> century windows based on comparing them to original photos. C. Cook stated that the windows are painted shut so they don't allow any functionality and he noted that the wood is split. He advised that you can put all the paint you want it but there will be holes back in the wood and paint deteriorating. He stated that it looks like the surface of it in the past was only skimmed painted and none of the problems were corrected.

E. Wilson questioned the condition of the wood and C. Cook stated that the wood is rotting out in corners. He stated that sashes are rotting out and where the sashes come together are sinking. He stated that because of rot water is infiltrating down behind the glazing. R. Paglialong advised that he just did work in the office and noted that they had to replace the drywall on the soffit above the window which may be coming from the window above. He stated that all the soffits had mold. C. Cook discussed the leakage and rot issues of the building and the steps they have taken.

A. Stebbins stated that the request is for the aluminum clad wood windows and advised that they are proposing the same windows as the Van Buren property but he thinks this particular window is too modern looking on the profile. C. Cook stated that it is a flat profile and provided a sample of the frame to the Commission. E. Wilson asked if they looked into having the windows repaired. C. Cook advised that they looked into it for the front but it was costly. He noted that you can do some repair but advised that it is going to be very difficult to maintain them.

A. Stebbins questioned if the decorative arch above the window won't be changed. C. Cook advised that they are going to try to preserve the decorative arch. He stated that it looks like it doesn't get as much abuse so when they bring it down they will assess the condition but the intent is to put it back up there. He stated that the other option is to get an aluminum piece and redo the shapes that exist on the arch. R. Paglialong asked if the material is currently wood and C. Cook believes it is wood. A. Stebbins stated that it is carved and advised that he wouldn't want to see it changed at all noting that if a piece broke during repair it needs be restored and replicated because they are defining features of that building.

E. Wilson questioned if the windows will change in size because they are putting a frame all around it. C. Cook advised that they will not because the board that is there right now is about the same. He reviewed how the frame would be constructed.

R. Paglialong questioned how the area where the window meets the bottom of the arch will be sealed and whether there will need to be some flashing. C. Cook advised that it will need some flashing or a drip edge noting that it looks like a 3/8" gap which might allow a bead of caulk. E. Wilson questioned if the metal will be forward and C. Cook advised that it will either be butted up against the bottom or be formed out behind the transom and come out to have a drip edge. He noted that they will be using the company Classic who is very concerned with drip points and will design something that will work for them.

A. Stebbins questioned if he had an estimate for restoration of the windows and C. Cook advised that he only has it for the front side; the Cass St. side. C. Cook advised that the quote from Renaissance for the east side is for the same window that Classic is presenting but their bid was more. He stated that they would restore the wood on the framing but they would replace it with a sash that is aluminum clad and cover the exposed side with aluminum wrap. He stated that it is the same thing that Classic is going to do, retain the framing, put the window in the existing sash opening and clad the outside with aluminum.

The Commission discussed the preservation estimate from Renaissance. A. Stebbins stated that E. Wilson raised the question that since these are historic windows, was there an estimate to restore the windows; do and actual historic restoration. He stated that Renaissance is proposing a partial restoration which is twice the cost of what Classic is doing. He noted that he isn't one to

replace historic windows but in this instance the windows are pretty severely deteriorated and there is the issue with winter coming.

E. Wilson advised that she has seen pictures of case studies that look worse and they are able to be repaired, but she knows it comes down to cost. C. Cook stated that when you are talking about the whole sill and the bottom has cracks, in his opinion it is a disaster waiting for happen. In response to E. Wilson, C. Cook stated that he doesn't know how long the windows have been like this and noted that from day one that he has worked on the building he has indicated to the owner that he has serious window problems. He stated that he thinks the owner has been in there for fifteen years. E. Wilson stated that in theory even if he had replaced one window a year he could have fixed all his windows for not a whole lot of money over time.

C. Cook advised that the windows have been painted, glazed and caulked in the past but if they are not repaired properly the water continues to come. R. Paglialong guessed that it would be about \$1500 to repair each window. He stated that based on what he sees the windows are beyond repair noting that he isn't one to replace historical windows. He stated that he is not opposed to replacement windows in this instance. He questioned if the Commission wants to have him bring an estimate for repair. He stated that it could be repaired but noted the checking in the wood and jam and that he sees a lot of rot.

In response to E. Wilson, N. Baker stated that the east half of the building was built in 1881. E. Wilson referenced the historical photos and advised that these are the original windows from 1881 and noted that we don't have many buildings left that have their true, original windows. N. Baker referenced the photo and stated that it doesn't look like there is the same brick mold that is on the current windows and the rails look thinner. A. Stebbins stated that it almost looks like it was built up on the outside with wood at some point later on and he is seeing a brick recess. The Commission reviewed the different photos of the windows and they believe that the windows are original and the outside pieces were added later to accommodate a storm window.

E. Wilson stated that her concern is if these are original windows on one of the oldest building on the Square should they be demolished because of negligence. She stated that it is a contributing building in the historic district. A. Stebbins thinks the building has two primary facades.

The Commission reviewed the findings of fact. They believe the proposed construction will destroy historic materials or exterior features that characterize the property. In response to the question of whether alternative measures and designs were investigated, they felt somewhat noting that they don't have a cost for a complete window restoration. In response to whether the Commission is aware of alternative measures of products that should be utilized, the Commission affirmed that they discussed restoration of original windows. The Commission believes the proposed project would have a negative impact on the preservation and conservation of the structure because it would remove historic material. They believe the proposed project would have a neutral impact on adjoining structures and the proposed project will be a major alteration to the structure. A. Stebbins believes with photographic evidence the windows are original. They believe the new windows do meet the design guidelines as an alternative.

In response to the question of what the overall impact of the proposed project will have on the building, E. Wilson stated that historically negative, but as far as for the building positive. A. Stebbins advised that they are talking about the proposed project which is to remove historic windows and stated that it will have a negative impact on the building. E. Wilson felt the project

will have a neutral impact on the surrounding buildings and some felt it would be a negative impact to the surrounding area because losing a prominent feature of the building lessens the overall quality of the historic district. R. Paglialong believes it is neutral and stated that they have one quote to replace them for \$15,000 and another quote to repair and replace the sashes for \$30,000 and he imagines that to restore them would cost a lot more. He questioned if restoration is something they want to force the owner to do.

E. Wilson stated that they can't force them to do anything but as a Commission it is their job is to look at the historical viewpoint even though they recognize the other viewpoints. She stated that these are original windows on one of the older buildings on the Square and it is worth preserving if it can be preserved. She questioned if all the windows are at an equal amount of disrepair and whether it could be phased so that the cost wouldn't be so great all at once. C. Cook stated that they are not all in the same condition, but noted that the issue with phasing is time. He advised that the window on the front side in between the time the vendors came to bid the project and now, the window has collapsed. He stated that this is an example of time where water infiltration and doing nothing about them is going to be a detriment.

A. Stebbins stated that the Commission doesn't have a cost estimate for a restoration of the windows; they have a partial restoration. He advised that the question is getting an estimate to restore the original windows and phase it starting with the most severely deteriorated windows. C. Cook advised that they have similar windows on the front side and they have an estimated cost to do those so being the same type of windows and configuration he would extrapolate that and say it is going to be very expensive. He advised that the bid for the windows on the front side is \$50,000 for total restoration. He advised that they estimated that the restoration would take 2-3 months noting that they are heading into winter.

E. Wilson questioned if he thought the owner would even entertain the idea of restoration even in phasing and C. Cook stated that the cost is an issue. R. Paglialong stated that the space upstairs has been vacant for almost a year and no one is going to want to rent that space with old windows. He stated that we have an opportunity for somebody who wants to replace the windows. He advised that it is a great idea to preserve the original windows but someone is willing to make it better right now and he questioned if they are going to delay having that space not being rented because of the windows. E. Wilson stated that she doesn't think they are delaying it and noted that window repairs could have started a year ago or anytime in the last decade. R. Paglialong stated that it's here and now and advised that if the Commission denies having it happen they are going to exasperate the time; nothing will be able to get done by winter. E. Wilson doesn't think nothing can be done and advised that there are some short term repairs that can be done to hold them over the winter.

A. Stebbins questioned if C. Cook talked to the owner about the federal tax credits and C. Cook advised that the owner is going to look into it. He stated that the other issue is the impact on the lower level tenants and stated that there issues will come back until they get a solution to the issues of what is really causing it and everyone feels that it is the windows. The group discussed the water infiltration. A. Stebbins questioned if it is going to take about eight weeks to get the windows and C. Cook stated that they will be here in the middle of November. A. Stebbins stated that there is a real risk that this is going to go into next year, he questioned if in the meantime nothing will be done to the windows. C. Cook advised that they are having a company come in to see if they can put a protection on the outside of the front window just for the winter.

A. Stebbins stated that they are dealing with a building with original windows in it and the Commission is charged with preserving original features in the historic district. He noted that they don't have before them a firm estimate for restoration of windows on the Main St. side. He stated that C. Cook indicated that the owner is looking into the federal historic tax credits and this project may qualify along with energy efficiency tax credits both with restoration and with replacement windows. He stated that until he has all of the information in front of him he would be erring on the side of restoring the windows. He stated that as proposed, the impact on the surrounding area and the overall historic district would be negative noting that they have to look at it from the standpoint of removing original elements from a historic structure.

R. Paglialong stated that the owner is going to choose what is most cost effective and he sees an opportunity for the owner to take action. E. Wilson stated it is at the expense of losing something historic in our district. R. Paglialong doesn't think that even with the idea of repairing it it's not going to be as cost effective as the other choices. He is making the assumption that it is going to be more expensive and noted that they are also making the assumption that they are historic windows. A. Stebbins stated that they know for a fact, according to Staff, they were put in the 1920's so they have gained historic stature. A. Stebbins stated that looking at restoration in phasing while stabilizing what they have as they are proposing on the Cass St. side is an option that bears looking into. He stated that until we have exhausted that it's not possible, he is erring on the side of preserving the historic elements of the property.

C. Cook believes the owner would be willing to entertain options on the front side as well and submit applications. He reviewed a portion of the quote regarding partial restoration. He stated that they can do the temporary fixes to the worse ones now. He stated that it allows them the opportunity to look at the restoration of the most appealing feature of the windows which is the top transoms. A. Stebbins stated that based on the historic record the windows have gained historical significance. He stated that they don't have an estimate for a restoration noting that they recognize it is a large project and a costly project. He stated that the owner is committed to spending in excess of \$32,000 for replacement windows, but noted that we don't know what the total restoration cost would be or if he can avail himself of the historic tax credits, façade improvement funds and an energy tax credit. He stated that without having all the information in front of him, he can't say yes to tearing out historic features of a building.

Motion by E. Wilson, second by R. Paglialong to approve the COA for 112-114 Cass Street to replace second story windows on Main Street side and Discussion of future window replacement on Cass Street side with the condition that the decorative arch element be preserved and retained and if in the process it is damaged or destroyed it will be replicated and put back up in place. Ayes: R. Paglialong. Nays: Chairman Stebbins, E. Wilson. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motioned failed.

**E. 116-118 N. Benton Street—Certificate of Appropriateness to replace entry door to upper level and Discussion of future exterior carpeting replacement at entryways**

A. Stebbins stated that C. Cook presented this to the Façade Improvement Committee and this particular project is regarding the band above the storefront that is deteriorating and leaking causing moisture and rot on the front fascia.

C. Cook stated that the design of the flashing allows the caulk to crack and water then goes down behind the fascia and deteriorates the inside of the building. He reported that it was repaired ten

years ago and since then it has done the same thing. He advised that their proposal is to keep the current flashing, secure it, caulk it, put a coating on it and then flip a real drip edge underneath the existing flashing so that it comes off the face of the fascia board and doesn't drip down it. He stated that they will replace the fascia board and advised that their contractor is suggesting Windsor pine with rot preservative because they have problems with Hardie Board chipping and expanding on the ends. R. Paglialong advised that he has seen it and that it starts to delaminate.

E. Wilson questioned how they are going to secure the existing flashing. C. Cook advised that on the backside it is secured to the building but the caulk is starting to break-away so they will re-caulk on the backside where it meets the brick and on the front side there will be a flashing piece put up underneath it and the existing flashing is lipped a 1/2" over the drip edge. E. Wilson questioned if the problem is that the caulk isn't repaired often enough and C. Cook advised that it breaks almost immediately because of the angle of the board that goes up.

E. Wilson questioned if it hits into masonry and C. Cook advised that it does not and noted that he is talking about the front edge. The group discussed the flashing and angled construction of the area in question. C. Cook stated that normally it is plywood which deteriorates first but underneath that because the way the board sits you can't put a bead of caulk that will hold the joint together. He advised that they will put a traditional drip edge that lips out so it will miss the whole board as well which is why they don't have a problem using the Windsor pine. E. Wilson questioned if there are any issues with where it meets the building itself and C. Cook advised that if water gets in there it starts to rot the joists behind the whole structure. E. Wilson stated that the water is infiltrating from the front and the sides and C. Cook stated that it is from the front.

A. Stebbins questioned if Windsor pine is pressure treated and C. Cook advised that they can get it with a rot type of preservative and noted that it costs the same as Hardie Board. E. Wilson questioned how long it is rated to last and C. Cook advised that it depends on the surface prep and how well you maintain it. E. Wilson questioned if the material with the anti-rot treatment is better than other pressure treated or rot treated wood. C. Cook advised that more importantly the lip on the top side with the drip edge is going to prevent any water running down so in the future the board will get a limited amount of water on it.

A. Stebbins stated that this part of the project is not listed on the COA request and questioned if it is an add-on or if it was approved administratively; N. Baker advised that it was approved administratively. A. Stebbins stated that C. Cook is just informing the Commission of what is happening. He stated that the request is for the door which is a steel, residential door. He noted that there was discussion in the Façade meeting that the owner liked the wood door by Lloyd's.

C. Cook reported that they got proposals for the door and noted that they were going to replace it with wood or steel. He stated that Marvin Blue Ribbon Millwork quoted based on the Lloyd's door which is a Simpson door. He advised that it is the same type of a door and advised that there are three proposals, one for wood, one for steel and one for fiberglass. The Commission reviewed the quotes.

A. Stebbins stated that the question is which one. C. Cook advised that their request is for a fiberglass one which will provide more durability and can be made to look like a wood door stain wise. He noted that maintenance is less and advised that a fiberglass door isn't going to rot. He advised that there is no warranty on a wood door in this location because the overhang is only

18". He reiterated that they would prefer to go with fiberglass and provided pictures of the proposed doors to the Commission.

E. Wilson stated that the historical pictures show a half-light with two panels. C. Cook stated that the current door has two vertical panels on the bottom half of the door. The Commission consulted the design guidelines for material use and reviewed the photographs to determine the panels on the doors. C. Cook stated that they don't have a preference for panels and affirmed that any of the door options could have any configuration of panels.

R. Paglialong stated that in his experience working with exterior doors, he doesn't like how the stain holds up on the fiberglass doors and advised that you have to completely strip it down. He stated that he would do wood because it holds the stain better than fiberglass and it would last longer as far as maintaining it. C. Cook advised that they can do any one of those options. R. Paglialong stated that Lloyd's door which is a Simpson door is well made. C. Cook stated that Blue Ribbon indicated that about every five years you will have to do maintenance on the wood door which has been his experience as well. He stated that their concern is with the traffic flow that goes through apartment doors and noted that fiberglass can take a little more abuse.

E. Wilson questioned if there is a significant difference in how often a fiberglass door needs maintenance. R. Paglialong stated that to him it seems like a fiberglass door needs more maintenance and advised that he would not let anything go more than 5 years but it depends on the environment. He has seen uglier looking doors that were fiberglass and noted that in his experience there has been more work done on fiberglass doors than on wood doors. He suggested that 3-5 years is appropriate for maintenance. A. Stebbins questioned if the Lloyd's door is wood or fiberglass and R. Paglialong stated that is wood. C. Cook stated that Blue Ribbon's recommendation was fiberglass because the ease of restoring it is a little easier.

A. Stebbins questioned if, whatever door it is, if they are going to paint the door. C. Cook stated that if it is a wood door it will be stained and the other two options would be painted to match the façade front or contrast the façade front. A. Stebbins stated that it is a National Registered District and there is a wood door at Lloyd's and next door there are original wood doors. He would prefer to see a wood door continued in that location. The Commission conceded.

C. Cook advised that he couldn't guarantee it will be a Simpson brand if it is a wood door. A. Stebbins stated that if they did the wood door, the idea of the four panels would be the preferred type of look on the bottom which matches the Lloyd's door and honors the historic doors at Tom Doherty's building. C. Cook advised that he would be receptive to that.

The Commission agreed that the new doors and materials meet the design guidelines and improve energy efficiency. The Commission did the findings of fact and stated that with wood doors the impact of the project would be positive for the building, the neighboring buildings, the surrounding area and the overall historic district.

Motion by E. Wilson, second by R. Paglialong to approve the COA for 116-118 N. Benton Street to replace entry door to upper level with the condition of having a wood door with four panels at the bottom and the glass at the top as presented. Ayes: Chairman Stebbins, R. Paglialong, E. Wilson. Nays: None. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

The group began a discussion regarding the entrances to the building. A. Stebbins advised that three of them are terrazzo type of material and the third one is indoor/outdoor carpeting which is deteriorating. E. Wilson asked what was underneath the carpeting and A. Stebbins advised that it is terrazzo. A. Stebbins advised that the owner wants to replace the indoor/outdoor carpeting on all entryways and noted that it is an inappropriate material for use in the district. He advised that the owner is looking for some guidance.

R. Paglialong asked if the terrazzo could be repaired and C. Cook advised that is one option they are looking at but noted that they haven't found anyone willing to do it. He stated that he did get a ballpark for quarry tile with a membrane underneath to absorb the crack.

R. Paglialong suggested using an epoxy coating and advised that there is a company in Woodstock called Designing Concrete which does a commercial grade epoxy. C. Cook advised that there are a couple of places in town that put covering on tile but it became a maintenance issue and it all came off over time. R. Paglialong advised that they guarantee their product for life but he doesn't know if they would guarantee it going over the terrazzo. He advised that when finished it is 20 mil so it is a thick coating and is very durable. C. Cook stated that one of the issues they have with the two pads on either side of the apartment entry is that they are beveled with an incline so they would become very slippery and he would be concerned with the enameled paint. R. Paglialong stated that the stuff he has seen almost looks like terrazzo.

E. Wilson questioned if they are having issues at the joints where the terrazzo is meeting the building. C. Cook advised that they can caulk the joints on the bottom side. He advised that the value they found with the carpet is that it is rubber backed so the water infiltration through them doesn't occur. He advised that the entry that is carpeted has been there for more than 15 years and there is only one space on the front side that has attempted to come loose.

A. Stebbins advised that it is an inappropriate material in the historic district. He suggested exploring R. Paglialong's suggestion to see if it is a viable option and asked him to come back with detailed information. C. Cook stated that the terrazzo is repairable but would be fairly expensive and noted that the fact that is cracking now indicates that the surface below is cracked.

## **V. OTHER UPDATES**

Nancy Baker reviewed pictures showing the deterioration of the Old Courthouse roof. She reported that they have sent out bids for the front stairs noting that they did spec a railing for the Sheriff's house from a couple of companies willing to forge their own.

A. Stebbins stated that people in the community ask him about the Courthouse and he wondered if it would be helpful to post pictures on the City's Facebook page. N. Baker stated that she discussed that today and she expects to see some on there soon.

N. Baker advised that she had a meeting with the owner 100-108 Benton Street, Jim Prindiville, to talk about a project. She put a couple of photos up for the Commission to review and advised that J. Prindiville is thinking about taking out the modern look from the banking area and putting in two more traditional fronts. She stated that before he gets contractors and puts numbers together, he is asking for feedback from the Commission regarding the angled look he is want to achieve. A. Stebbins advised that it wasn't published on the agenda and suggested J. Prindiville send a sketch via email and then the Commission can give general feedback.

A. Stebbins referred to an article from the Chicago Tribune regarding the Chicago Motor Club building downtown using the federal tax credit and how the program is still on the chopping block. He stated that he hopes that City Council is making some inroads in contacting Congressman Hultgren and our two senators to advocate for keeping the federal historic tax credit noting that if it goes away it is a huge impact on historic preservation as well as a huge impact directly in Woodstock with regard to the Old Courthouse.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by E. Wilson, second by R. Paglialong to adjourn to the next regular meeting of the Woodstock Historic Preservation Commission. Ayes: Chairman Stebbins, R. Paglialong, E. Wilson. Nays: None. Absentees: J. Kurtz-Osborne. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Dianne Mitchell – City Clerk