

Chilton, Wisconsin
July 9, 2014

The regular meeting of the City of Chilton Redevelopment Authority was called to order at 4:00 p.m. with Vice-Chairman Dexter Sattler presiding in the council chambers at the Chilton City Hall.

AGENDA POSTING:

On 7/3/2014, copies of the agenda were delivered to the Chairman, Members, City Department Heads, was made available to the media, and posted on the City Hall bulletin board and city web page.

ROLL CALL: REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY:

Vice -Chairman Dexter Sattler and four members of the Authority were present at roll call:

Greg Garton Gerald Vanne Linda Bangart Bonita Rowland

Absent and excused were Steve Mueller and Wm. D. Engler, Jr.

Other city officials present were Council Member Richard Bosshardt, Director of Public Works Todd Schwarz and City Clerk Helen Schmidkofer.

General attendance: Scott and Sue Salzsieder.

Those in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Moved by Vanne, seconded by Rowland and carried to approve the May 14, 2014 minutes.

Audience Participation – No comments were received at this time.

Review and Approve Preliminary Plan to Repair the Building at 107 W. Main Street to Include Conditions of Building Permit and a Timeline

Sattler stated the Authority is required to review a preliminary plan to repair the building at 107 W. Main Street. Members were provided a copy of the building permit along with a sketch of the proposed plan.

Sattler requested Salzsieder to give an overview of what they plan to do.

Scott stated that in September of 2011 part of the wall blew in and were informed by the City that the building needed to be fixed. We had a meeting with DPW Schwarz, Development Director Reilly and Building Inspector Birschbach at that time; several communications followed and by November it was approved for them to proceed and acquire a building permit for replacing the whole building with a frame structure with vinyl siding and a steel roof. Due to the fact this was late in the construction season and also due to the fact I needed to leave the City to stay with my mother. Plans were to complete this project the next spring but had problems with my mother again and needed to be out of the City. I could not come back to complete any of the work. Now that I am back we got the letter this spring to fix; we put in a request from Bill Parsons which we figured could handle this sort of thing. To completely re-do the entire building

was too much, we would not be able to afford that. That is an awful lot of extra work so we modified the plan to take off the eastern 19 feet which would leave a 5 block retaining wall there so people would not fall off into the river. Then reconstruct the rest of the building which would end up being 30 X 30 feet. So it is basically made out of the same materials it was before; salvage block from the part that is being removed and the part that had fallen into the river that we pulled out. It gets windows along the river side and a door like it used to have and an overhead garage door for access from the north wall and a doorway that leads on to that part that ends up being like a patio. (The slab with a wall around it.) There was a platform on the river side that was the full length of the building and that will be replaced. So the materials are about the same – the roof is steel (the original roof was tar and that is not a good idea.) The building itself will have steel doors so that it is secure. We did have some problems with people breaking in when I was not around last year. Basically that is the construction idea to replace the majority of it on the same footprint, in the same place. This is needed for storage for my buildings because there is no place to put ladders or lawnmowers or anything for those buildings that I own there and also needed for working on larger things, when you need more floor space.

Sattler questioned the block construction; if the same block would be used for the project.

Salzsieder stated he would use some replacement block because some of the blocks are not usable and special blocks that are used for the window and door areas. So those Parsons will replace with something that looks essentially the same.

Sattler questioned the wall around the eastern section, is this going to be the same block?

Salzsieder stated same block and essentially just the lower part of the wall that will be there, we will be removing the upper part. Platform and railing - not sure on the materials and open to suggestions. Would like low maintenance and strong and durable.

After a brief discussion it was noted that Salzsieder does not like composite or compressed lumber. Platform material itself would be something more durable that can handle weight.

DPW Schwarz informed the RDA that Salzsieder would be required to follow the guidelines set by the RDA for the materials and as far as the building itself being in the shoreland zoning the 50% rule was thrown out so myself and Birschbach did find out he is able to do this project. The smaller footprint is acceptable.

Vanne noted that the slab is the same but the building will be different. I don't know what you call a footprint the building or what.

Salzsieder noted the short wall that goes around is the outside of the existing building, so the footprint is the same if you consider that part of the project. The whole height walls are only 60% on the west side. In general my idea of the footprint is that as long as it is no bigger than it was. I believe that is why they have the rules in the first place.

Sattler questioned a timeline for the project. I realize you had some complications in the past.

Salzsieder stated that in talking with Parsons earlier in the season when this first came up he could do it fairly soon. Now it would take 2 to 3 months to complete because of Parsons workload but could be completed this year yet. Salzsieder thought he would be able to have plans but not sure of a completion date for the August RDA meeting. This is a complicated building and not sure regarding the windows and doors. Not sure on timeline but would think Parsons should be able to complete.

Moved by Vanne, seconded by Bangart to accept preliminary sketch and then within a 45 day timeline submit final plans for this project and completion of construction must be by December 1, 2014 or continuance of City's public nuisance action is recommended. Roll call vote.

Bangart - aye

Rowland - aye

Vanne - aye

Garton - aye

Sattler - abstain

5 votes cast. 4 votes aye. Motion carried.

Discussion followed which identified for Salzsieder that he would need to indicate the type of materials on the detailed plans. The RDA is responsible for determining what is acceptable as defined by the guidelines. Further review determined the additional information needs to be turned into the city hall.

Review Central Business District Architectural and Design Guidelines

Dialogue took place among the members that the guidelines require updating to include sub-committee appointments. Sattler requested this item be placed on the next agenda.

Review Revisions to 48 W. Main Street

Rowland provided current pictures of the recently completed project that was approved at the May 2014 RDA meeting.

Vanne noted that the RDA did not follow the Central Business District guidelines because the window that is in there should have a full window. The application did indicate the size of the window and the RDA approved that. The only thing the RDA did not approve was the screen door. The door indicated is installed but we did not approve the screen door and there is a question about that.

Rowland stated the screen door was put in if you have an inspector come in and you have the door open you can get insects in and for this reason they like screen doors put on.

As far as the window, if you look at the interior alterations this is the only way the window could have been installed. (It was impossible to install a window per original design.) Consensus of the RDA was that the window is acceptable.

The window and screen door shall remain as installed after further debate.

Redevelopment Authority

Regarding the building permit for 48 W. Main Street: for the record the RDA was in error reference the size of window that was approved however due to construction conditions of the property this was the only allowable size that could be installed. It was further noted that in the future the Design Committee will review requests and provide recommendations to the RDA.

Update on 46 West Main Street - Exterior

Vanne noted that he contacted the owner and by the end of this month he will paint and tuck point the front of the building. (This will not require a building permit)

Moved by Vanne, seconded by Rowland to adjourn at 4:35 p.m. Motion carried.

Helen Schmidlkofer

Helen Schmidlkofer, MMC
Recording Secretary