1. Call to Order and Roll Call
   A. Voting Members
      Linda Anderson  
      Robert Braun   
      John Daly      
      Elizabeth DeLong  
      Paul Fessler   
      Addison Kimmel  
      Margaret Morse  
      Diane Oestreich  
      Mark Schwiebert  
   B. Associate Members
      Jeff Dismer  
      Deb Kuntzi  

2. Public Comment

3. Opening Items
   A. Approval of the Written Agenda for January 22, 2020  
   Recommended Motion: Move to approve the written agenda for January 22, 2020.
   B. Approval of the December 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes  
   Recommended Motion: Move to approve the meeting minutes for December 18, 2019.

4. Old Business
   None  

5. New Business
   A. Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Removal of Non-Original Front Porch at 816 20th Street
      Recommended Motion: Move to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as outlined in the application for Case 2020-01 with the stipulation that the applicant consult with the Inspections Division regarding the need for handrails and guards to be installed on both sides of the new front porch; and that if the Inspections Division requires installation of said handrails and guards that they be of a style as compatible as possible with the overall Italianate design.

6. Other Business

7. Adjournment
   Recommended Motion: Move to adjourn.
Rock Island Preservation Commission Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers
1528 3rd Avenue
December 18, 2019
5:00 PM

Voting Members Present
Linda Anderson
Robert Braun
John Daly
Elizabeth DeLong
Paul Fessler
Margaret Morse
Diane Oestreich
Mark Schwiebert

Voting Members Absent
Addison Kimmel

Associate Members Present
Jeff Dismer, Deb Kuntzi

Associate Members Absent

Staff Present
Miles Brainard

Call to Order and Roll Call
Chair DeLong called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM and read the roll call.

Public Comment
There were no comments from the public in attendance.

Approval of the Agenda
Schwiebert moved to approve the agenda. Fessler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 8 to 0.

Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes
Morse moved to approve the minutes for November 20, 2019. Braun seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 8 to 0.

Morse moved to approve the minutes for the November 25, 2019 meeting of the Preliminary Determination Committee. Fessler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 8 to 0.

Old Business
Update: 1918 Government Housing Multiple Property Document
Brainard said that the consultant had spent the last two days in the city beginning some of the initial research on the project. They would be keeping the Commission informed about their progress moving forward. The consultant, who also worked on the downtown National
Register district, had said that the updated nomination for that had been re-submitted to the National Park Service and they were hopeful that a response would be received before the end of the year.

**New Business**

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Replacement of Wooden Steps with Concrete Steps at 1620 22nd Street**

Schwiebert moved to approve the application and grant a certificate of appropriateness for the work as proposed. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 8 to 0.

**First National Bank Landmark Application**

Chair DeLong opened the public hearing. The applicant, Leslie W. O’Ryan, presented an opening statement explaining that the building meets criteria 1, 3, 4, and 5 for landmarking. The owner of record, Modern Woodmen of America, had three speakers present an opening statement. Jerald Lyphout, National Secretary and Chief Administrative Officer of Modern Woodmen spoke first saying that the building was not financially feasible to renovate and if the company was prohibited from proceeding with demolition the building would sit boarded up indefinitely. William Groh, AIA from Shive Hattery spoke second saying that the building was not a strong example of the International style nor is a representative work by the architect. Jonathon Fox, outside legal counsel from Calliff and Narper, PC spoke third saying that the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence for the conclusions drawn in the application.

In response to Mr. Lyphout, Commission members said that they could not consider economic or financial factors in their decision. However, since he had brought it up, they asked if there was anything further that could be shared in regards to future plans for the building site. Mr. Lyphout said that there were preliminary plans for a multistory office building with covered parking that would host multiple tenants including Modern Woodmen. He declined to elaborate any further. Responding to Mr. Groh, the Commission said that the building was a locally significant interpretation of a style that was designed by a locally significant architectural firm. It may not be a significant example of the International style nor is a representative work by the architect. Finally, Mr. Fox was asked what would constitute evidence in this case. He said that written statements or affidavits would be acceptable evidence. Commission members responded by saying that such materials are unlikely to exist and cannot be obtained because the individuals from whom they would be solicited are long deceased. Furthermore, the conclusions drawn are based on commonly understood and accepted information which is not in serious dispute. Evidence as described by Mr. Fox would be too much to ask for and is not required.

Chair DeLong closed the public hearing and the Commission entered into discussion. The Commission discussed the merits of the application and determined that the arguments made in it were sound. They further agreed that the building met if not all most of the criteria
identified. Anderson moved to approve the application for the First National Bank Building at 100 17th Street and designate the property as a local landmark. Morse seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken with Anderson, Daly, DeLong, Morse, Oestreich, Schwiebert in the affirmative, no one in the negative, and Braun and Fessler abstaining due to perceived conflicts of interest. With a vote of 6 to 0, the motion carried with the required two-thirds majority.

Other Business
Oestreich asked Brainard to comment on an email received by staff in late November from Todd Gritzuk, a member of a local historical society in Vermont. The email was letting staff know that the “Research and Helpful Links” page on the city website regarding historic preservation were being used by Mr. Gritzuk’s group and thanking the city of Rock Island for being so helpful having that available online. Brainard said that staff periodically get comments about the usefulness of the city’s online materials.

Adjournment
Chair DeLong asked for a motion to adjourn. Schwiebert moved to adjourn. Oestreich seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a vote of 8 to 0 at 6:25 PM.

Minutes submitted by Miles Brainard.
An application for a certificate of appropriateness was submitted by Bryan Pattschull and David Cordes, owners of the E. D. Sweeney House at 816 20th Street. Built in 1874, the house was designed by local architect Issac N. Holmes in the Italianate style. The application details three proposed actions.

The most significant proposed action is to remove the existing non-original front porch from the house and rebuild the original, smaller front porch. The existing non-original porch was built around 1900 and has neo-classical elements. It appears to have been added to the house as part of a trend that swept across the country after the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. That event helped to make popular neo-classical architecture and many homeowners undertook remodels and renovations to their houses in that style. Commonly, front porches were added to houses with neo-classical motifs. This appears to be the case with the porch on the E. D. Sweeney House.

The applicant is requesting to make this modification for three reasons: the design of the porch is incompatible with the house, the porch is poorly constructed, and the porch is significantly deteriorated. The applicant is aware that removal of porch is controversial. Some would argue that the addition of these porches is of historic value in and of itself. However, the applicant asserts that in this particular case the porch is not well enough constructed to warrant preservation and, in fact, detracts from the historic value of the house as a whole. Further, reconstruction of the original front porch would represent a significant enhancement of the Italianate design.

Planning staff have reviewed the application materials and were initially concerned about the proposed porch removal. These historic additions to properties should, in most cases, be retained. However, in this particular case the porch obscures the house instead of enhancing it. It also has flaws of construction that contribute to its deterioration. The gutter system built into it, for example, does not function not for lack of maintenance but as a result of poor design. As such, staff do not object to the proposed project so long as all work is done in accordance with the International Residential Code from the International Code Council when applicable. It is staff’s opinion that the proposed work will comply with the requirements in the Preservation Ordinance.

Additionally, staff have no objections to the restoration of the side bay window and the replacement of the temporary posts on the side porch. It is staff’s opinion that these proposed actions will also comply with the requirements in the Preservation Ordinance.

**Recommended Motion**

Move to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as outlined in the application for Case 2020-01 with the stipulation that the applicant consult with the Inspections Division regarding the need
for handrails and guards to be installed on both sides of the new front porch; and that if the Inspections Division requires installation of said handrails and guards that they be of a style as compatible as possible with the overall Italianate design.
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

City of Rock Island Planning Office  
City Hall, 1528 3rd Avenue  
Rock Island, Illinois 61201  
Phone: (309) 732-2900 Fax: (309) 732-2930  
Email: planning@rigov.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDMARK INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 20th Street (Edward D. and Harriett Sweeney Residence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Address of Property Owner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Pattschull and David Cordes, 816 20th Street, Rock Island, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of each existing condition and each proposed modification. Include information relating to dimension, profile, height, materials, landscaping, location, placement, etc. Attach additional page if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is for the following elements that would in part, restore the E. D. Sweeney house, built in 1874, to its original appearance. The Edward D. Sweeney house was constructed in the summer and fall of 1874 by contractor John Volk at a cost of $7,000. The architect was Isaac N. Holmes who designed a large number of the important buildings in Rock Island at this time, including the Hansgen house at 848 20th St., which is nearly identical to the Sweeney house, as well as the Star Block, the Harper House Hotel, and many others.

Specifically, this project would complete the following work elements:
1. Remove the existing front porch, which was constructed ca. 1900 and replace it with a reconstructed porch of the size and appearance of the original 1874 porch.
2. Restore the roof and soffits of the bay window.
3. Replace the temporary 4x4 posts on the side porch with 5 1/2 x 5 1/2" square columns with capital and base moldings. (continued on page 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Relevant site plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Detail sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Elevation drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Catalog pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Architect, contractor or builder:  
Mark Construction, Mark Kellenberger

Proposed Timeline of Work:  
Begin immediately, completion June 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (please print):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Pattschull and David Cordes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 676 4669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 20th Street, Rock Island, IL 61201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:davidcordes@gmail.com">davidcordes@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Signature] 1/09/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My signature indicates that I understand that any advice provided during an "Advice Session" or privately by a Rock Island Preservation Commission member is not binding pending submittal of the Certificate of Appropriateness Application.
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

EDWARD D. AND HARRIET SWEENEY HOUSE

NARRATIVE DISCUSSION

January 9, 2020

It is generally regarded in the world of historic preservation that rehabilitation is the preferred treatment in most cases. This treatment recognizes that some changes and modifications usually take place of time and in many cases these alterations may take on significance of their own and add to our understanding and appreciation of a historic resource. However, there are cases in which restoration is the better choice. In the case of the E. D. Sweeney house, the original house and porch were the work of a master, Isaac N. Holmes, who designed a number of important Rock Island buildings in the 1870s and 1880s. When the original porch was removed and replaced with one of the neoclassical wraparound type, a popular fad at the turn of the last century, it clearly was not the work of an architect, and served to diminish and conceal character defining elements of the original structure.

The following three items are what we considered when evaluating the E. D. Sweeney house and forming our plan of treatment. Any of these three factors when considered individually do not make the case for removal of the present porch and restoration to the 1874 appearance. However, when combined together, they lead us to conclude that restoration to the 1874 appearance is the best approach.

1. **Aesthetic Design Issues.** The design of the ca. 1901 porch conflicts with the overall Italianate style of the house. Common to Italianate architecture, there is a vertical emphasis with tall narrow windows featuring decorative hood molding and keystones, finials, roof cresting, and an overall massing that emphasizes the vertical. The ca. 1901 porch diminishes that vertical emphasis by partially concealing it. Through its own design, it adds a strong horizontal emphasis that is in conflict with the original building. Similarly, when considering the relative significance of the original Holmes design compared to the ca. 1901 porch, the Holmes design would be of greater historic significance.

2. **Structural and Construction Issues.** The actual construction and placement of the porch was poorly thought out. Even though there was plenty of space to leave the first story windows with their decorative arches and keystones fully exposed, this was not done. Rather, the ceiling of the new porch was placed even with brick opening, completely concealing decorative arches and keystones. These elements were character defining elements of the original I. N. Holmes design.

The structural design of the porch appears to be faulty. The length of the span of the box beam in the section where it curves, appears to be too great and therefore it has a pronounced sag. This sag appears to be slightly apparent in in the 1901 Picturesque Tri-Cities image, when the porch was brand new. Attempts have been made to repair it in the past, but those efforts have proven unsuccessful.
3. **Deterioration and Present Condition.** It is the current owners’ understanding that repairs were made by the prior owner, probably around 1980. However, the work was poorly carried out and has failed to stabilize the porch. In some cases, the work that was done has actually contributed to and accelerated the deterioration.

Specifically:

a. A new roof was put on at that time, but improper detailing at the drip edge has caused water to channel into the structure, which has caused damage and decay.

b. The concrete block piers, at the location in the center of the circular curve and at the point where the curve joins the straight portion, lean outward and cause instability.

c. A majority of the balustrade is damaged and deteriorated. Prior repairs have been poorly executed and have failed.

d. The floor is being supported by several temporary beams and posts which rest directly on the ground under the porch.

e. The skirting board directly under the porch floor was been mostly replaced with pieces of particleboard lap siding. This has greatly deteriorated and is falling off.

f. The foundation level lattice screening is mostly rotten beyond repair. This has been accelerated by the previous owner grading soil and gravel up against it, the purpose of which is unknown.

The Hansgen house, located at 848 Twentieth Street is nearly identical to the Sweeney house and the existing porch, as well as very clear historic photographs, provide a pattern for reconstruction of the Sweeney porch.

Primary projects associated with this COA are:

1. Removal of the existing front porch and replacement with a replica of the original porch, not including roof creting or built-in gutter. Materials to be painted wood. Roof to be EPDM membrane, PVC membrane, or flatlock copper. K style gutter would be used.

2. Reroofing the bay window and restoring the original roof form, wood soffits, facia, and decorative brackets, not including roof creting or built-in gutter. K style gutter would be used.

3. Replacing temporary 4x4 support posts on back side porch with square 5 1/2” x 5 1/2” paintable fiberglass posts.

Alternate #1 at the owner’s discretion: Add cast iron creting to both the porch and bay window roofs by using Hansgen creting to make identical patterns. Note: Hansgen creting is in storage in the Hansgen house attic.

Alternate #2 at the owner’s discretion: Install wooden crown molding and built-in gutters on the front porch and bay windows roofs.

Alternate #3 at the owner’s discretion: Remove aluminum cover material from eaves, soffits, and facia on the rest of the house. Repair and replace wood elements as needed, paint.
Sweeney House, 1901, *Picturesque Tri-Cities*.

Hansgen House, ca. 1901
CONTEMPLATED IMPROVEMENTS.

E. D. Sweeney, of the law firm of Sweeney & Jackson, is preparing to erect an elegant residence on Madison street, the ground for its foundation having already been broken. The building is to be of brick, and will cost some $7,000. John Volk has the contract, and I. N. Holmes is the architect of the structure.

E D Sweeney new house to be built. I N Holmes architect, John Volk contractor.
Sweeney House, current view

Sweeney House, current view.
Sweeney House, Current View.

Hansgen House, historic view.
1898 Sanborn Map showing original porch. Note identical size of Hansgen and Sweeney porches. (816 and 848 20th Street)

1892 Sanborn Map showing original porch.
Sweeney House, showing first and second story window details.
Sweeney bay window, ca. 1901. Cresting is not present at this time.

Also, note the original side porch with simple square posts. This porch was enlarged and modified ca 1915.
Square columns for side porch located to the back of the bay window.
NOTE 1: MEASUREMENTS TAKEN FROM PRODUCTION PARTS. DRAWINGS MAY VARY SLIGHTLY FROM ACTUAL PARTS.
NOTE 2: TUSCAN COLUMN CAP AND BASE ARE USED.

Cap Detail

Base Detail
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