



Our Vision

Red Wing thrives as a vibrant, creative river town that values its natural environment, welcomes all people, and unlocks opportunity for everyone.

Our Mission

We strive to create a sustainable, healthy, accessible, resilient, and equitable community where every person feels at home.

Statement of Intent: We gather today in this room as one people to discuss and attend to the matters of Red Wing. Together, as a government body and as community members, we agree to treat everyone with courtesy, dignity, and respect. We will listen to all sides of an issue, encourage participation, support each other, act with honor and accountability, and inspire pride in our community. This we commit as we open this meeting.

Meeting Announcement and Agenda Heritage Preservation Commission Regular Meeting City Council Chambers, 315 West 4th Street, Red Wing, MN & Virtually Wednesday, July 1, 2026, at 5:30 PM

This meeting will be held in the City Hall Council Chambers and virtually via Webex at the same time. Members of the public can join this meeting either in person at City Hall or virtually. [Join the meeting via Webex](#). To join via telephone, please dial (415) 655-0001. Enter access code 2555 854 0854 and password 2026 when prompted.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes

4.A. Draft Minutes from the May 6, 2026, Regular Meeting

5. Public Comment

We now invite anyone to share their thoughts on a topic that is not on the agenda. We welcome all opinions and ideas. We appreciate you stating your name at the lectern, and please remember that personal attacks may be ruled out of order. You will have up to three minutes to comment, and we appreciate your time in coming tonight.

6. Motions & General Business

6.A. Design Review - Building Sign for the St. James Hotel at 406 Main Street

6.B. Design Review - Amendment Request to the Major Facelift at 325 Bush Street (Upper Facade) (Attachments to be Provided at Meeting)

6.C. Design Review - Amendment Request to the Major Facelift at 325 Plum Street (Rear Facade)

6.D. Recap of Preservation Month Activities (No attachments)

6.E. NAPC Conference and Conference Tour Items (No attachments)

7. Communication Items

7.A. Staff Status Report (Verbal)

7.B. Commissioner Comments

8. Adjournment

Accommodations for signing interpreter, Braille, large print, etc. can be made. Call City Hall at 385.3600 seven days prior to the need. Hearing assistance devices are available during meetings.

**The 553rd Meeting of the Red Wing Heritage Preservation Commission
Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers
May 6, 2026**

Members Present: Chair Brooke Reinke; Commissioners Kent Tsui, Ruth Nerhaugen, Jenifer Majerus, and Lottie Aslakson

Members Absent: Commissioners Paul Pflueger and Megan Goodwin (excused absence)

Others Present: Steve Kohn, Planning Manager

1. Call to Order

Chair Reinke called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Roll call was conducted. Chair Reinke and Commissioners Tsui, Nerhaugen, Majerus, and Aslakson were in attendance.

Commissioners Pflueger and Goodwin previously indicated they would be absent.

3. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Commissioner Majerus, seconded by Commissioner Nerhaugen to approve the agenda as drafted. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Draft Minutes from the April 1, 2026, Regular Meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nerhaugen, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to approve the minutes as drafted. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 4:0:1, with Commissioner Tsui abstaining from the vote.

B. Draft Minutes from the April 14, 2026, Workshop.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nerhaugen, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to approve the minutes as drafted. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

5. Public Comment

No one wished to address the Commission.

6. Motions and General Business

A. Design Review – Window Sign and Projecting Sign at 320 W. Third Street.

Staff Liaison Kohn presented on the design review as found in the Agenda Packet; a projecting sign and large window sign were reviewed.

Staff Liaison Kohn discussed projecting signs and indicated that some larger vertical building signs in the downtown area are allowed because the signs do not project more than 18 inches; signs that extend more than 18 inches from a façade are considered projecting signs and have size and placement restrictions. The Commission agreed that the proposed projecting sign was a good solution, since the building façade does not offer a traditional building sign location.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tsui, seconded by Commissioner Aslakson to approve the signs for Man on the Water. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

B. Design Review – A-Frame Sign at 420 W. Third Street.

Staff Liaison Kohn shared background on the application and presented the information as found in the Agenda Packet; an A-Frame sign was reviewed.

Chair Reinke asked the Commission for input on the color selection. Commissioner Tsui noted that the Commission had not required past applicants to submit such specific details on colors.

Staff Liaison Kohn stated that the signs need to be compatible with the building façade and existing signage.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tsui, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to approve the A-Frame sign. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

C. Design Review – Applicant Request to Address HPC, Storefront Approval at 325 Bush Street (No Attachments).

Chair Reinke noted that the applicant wished to address the Commission. The applicant showed pictures of the building in question and pointed out what was being requested: 42-inch bulkhead panels and matching black/bronze window framing. The HPC previously approved lower panels and brushed aluminum window framing. The applicant indicated that a mistake was made and that the whole storefront would have to be replaced in order to correct the situation.

Chair Reinke asked whether there were any current pictures of the storefront. The Applicant stated that he did not bring any photos.

Commissioner Tsui noted that the original panels appear to be at least 42 inches. The Applicant explained that the originals may have been closer to 45 inches.

Chair Reinke stated that the Applicant is respecting the building's original style. She pointed out that the Commission desires for projects to be completed as approved, but things outside of their control may happen.

The Applicant invited the Commission to see the building. The grand opening is on May 28.

A motion was made by Commissioner Majerus, seconded by Commissioner Tsui to approve as installed. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

D. 2026 Preservation Month Discussion and Approvals (No Attachments).

Chair Reinke explained that the Commission would discuss Preservation Month and make approvals. Staff Liaison Kohn pointed out that the approvals are for the awards and any money that will be spent on food and prizes. Chair Reinke stated that the list of nominees would be referred to by a number only.

Staff Liaison Kohn shared that May 28 at St. James was secured for the event, but the time needed to be decided.

Commissioner Nerhaugen asked whether someone had been secured to do the trivia. Staff Liaison Kohn stated no one had been secured.

Chair Reinke stated that she would be the emcee for the program. Commissioner Majerus offered to emcee the trivia. The Commission discussed the need for a sound system, a slideshow for the trivia, and potential prizes.

Staff Liaison Kohn explained he would obtain prizes for the scavenger hunt, and the information had been dropped off at the schools. He suggested the awards be presented at 6:30 p.m., and the program be held at 7:00 p.m. The Commission agreed.

The Commission discussed food options and what motions needed to be made. They also spoke about the cost of the scavenger hunt prizes.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nerhaugen, seconded by Commissioner Reinke to authorize up to \$200 for prizes for the scavenger hunt. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

The Commission discussed the trivia prizes.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tsui, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to authorize up to \$50 for trivia prizes. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

The Commission discussed the food for the event.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nerhaugen, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to authorize up to \$500 for food for the event. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

The Commission discussed the money for the bricks with affixed tabs.

A motion was made by Commissioner Tsui, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to authorize up to \$200 for the awards plaques. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

The Commission discussed the nominees for the awards.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nerhaugen, seconded by Commissioner Majerus to approve all five nominees to receive awards. A vote was conducted, and the motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5:0.

Chair Reinke stated that she would reach out to the nominees. Commissioner Tsui shared that he would reach out to the number five nominee.

Staff Liaison Kohn stated that he would communicate with the number one and number three nominees. He asked that the nominees provide before-and-after pictures for the presentation. The Commission decided that a presentation would not be necessary.

Commissioner Majerus asked about advertising. Staff Liaison Kohn shared how the event would be promoted.

E. 2026 NAPC Forum Conference Discussion (No Attachments).

Staff Liaison Kohn gave an update on the Conference and stated they are considering a workshop in early June once more information is received. The Commission discussed the meeting time and tentatively decided to hold it after the regular meeting.

7. Communication Items

A. Staff Status Report (Verbal).

Staff Liaison Kohn shared that the Applicant had mentioned gathering the Malting Committee to review the concept and layout. Chair Reinke and Commissioner Tsui had previously volunteered to serve on the committee. Commissioner Majerus stated she would step in on the committee if needed.

B. Commissioner Comments.

Chair Reinke shared that she is excited for the event and thanked everyone for their work.

8. Adjournment

Chair Reinke adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Agenda Item

6.A. – Heritage Preservation Design Review for St. James Hotel – Building Sign at 406 Main Street

Action Requested

Motion to Adopt Staff Recommendation

Attachments

- Photos

Prepared By

Steve Kohn, Planning Manager, June 26, 2026

Background

The St. James Hotel has submitted an application for a Design Review for a building sign on the front façade of the historic hotel building. The proposal involves the repainting of an existing building sign that is located between the second and third floors in the center of the main façade, facing Main Street. The wood sign appears to date to the 1970s restoration of the hotel and includes raised letters on a framed background panel. A similar sign (size and content) has historically been displayed in the same location at various points of the hotel's existence.

The panel has been painted for decades a dark maroon (background) with a flat gold color for the lettering and trim. The sign simply reads "St. JAMES." The applicant is proposing to repaint the sign to a black background with white lettering and trim. Due to the availability of aerial lift equipment onsite for the recent front façade project, the applicant moved ahead with the repainting prior to HPC review. Please see the attached "before" and "after" photos.

Analysis and Staff Recommendation

The historic hotel building consists of a red brick façade with white windows, white window hoods, white storefront elements, and other decorative architectural elements that are painted white. A painted sign on the rear of the building, facing the Mississippi River is painted white and black. Staff is not aware of any special significance of the maroon and gold colors used on the existing sign in the past. The proposed colors selected for sign are compatible with the storefront, other facades on the building, and existing signage on the rear of the building and the new Main Street canopy. The proposal does not change the size or location of the existing sign; the request is strictly new paint colors.

Staff finds that the proposed sign will not alter or destroy the distinguishing original qualities and character of the building and district. The sign appears to meet all sign regulations in the Sign Ordinance and the Heritage Preservation Ordinance.

Staff recommends a motion to approve the proposed signage as proposed.





ST. JAMES.

HOTEL BARNEY

OPEN

P BAR BOUTIQUE

2022



ST. JAMES HOTEL

Agenda Item

06.C. – Amendment - Heritage Preservation Design Review for Eagle House Major Facelift For Rear Façade at 325 Plum Street

Action Requested

Motion to Adopt Staff Recommendation

Attachments

- Drawing
- Current Photo

Prepared By

Steve Kohn, Planning Manager, June 26, 2026

Background

RW3 Capital Investments, LLC, Minnetonka, MN, submitted an application for a Design Review in 2025 for a Major Facelift related to the rear façade of the building and for the replacement of non-storefront windows on the building, mainly on the upper levels. On August 6, 2025, the HPC approved the window replacement, but tabled the review of the proposed work on the rear façade in order for the applicant to provide additional information and proposed materials. On November 5, 2025, the HPC approved the removal of the wall caps and a design for the rear façade. The applicant has now completed all structural reinforcement of the rear façade and is requesting some minor adjustments.

The eastern lower corner of the building recently had a collapse of the brick façade. The applicant was able to work with a structural engineer to shore up the corner of the building, to save the two-story portion of the building. Due to the collapse and the shoring, about ¼ of the rear façade is now open. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the exterior wall with a brick knee wall and a Hardie Board finish; the space would also include three new windows and three new doors. An existing fire escape stairway would be reused, but flipped to land at the northern corner of the two story portion of the building.

The applicant previously indicated that it appeared the entire brick façade on the rear of the building would need to be removed due to the structural failures found at the time. Due to the added expense related to the structural failure and corrections, the applicant is proposing a lower cost solution to enclose the structure.

The Italianate style building was built in 1874 and is historically known as the Hotel de Batlo. The building originally had an elaborate arcaded corbel table cornice; however, due to masonry deterioration, the height of the cornice was reduced in the 1940s.

Analysis

Rear Wall – The applicant has spent a considerable amount of time and money on the rear wall collapse issue. It is understandable that the applicant would like to recoup some of the cost by covering the impacted portion of the building with a lower cost solution.

As mentioned above, roughly ¼ of the back façade would be covered in a Hardie Board finish, painted black. The area would also include three new windows and a new door. The

previous design only had two new windows. The proposed new windows are a fixed single pane, commercial design. The proposed material is aluminum. Existing windows on the rear façade will be replaced as previously approved, matching their historic shapes and divisions. The proposed doors are an aluminum commercial design with a large glass window and will be consistent with the new window design on the lower level.

Although on the rear façade of the building, the area is very visible from W. Fourth Street and surrounding properties. The area to the east of the building is not located within the Downtown Historic District and has a different building aesthetic.

The proposal is very similar to what the HPC approved on November 5, 2025, and has no impact on the findings adopted by the HPC at that meeting. (See below).

When reviewing design applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission shall make its findings based upon the following guidelines and criteria (staff comments are listed below each guideline).

Adherence to the Secretary of Interior's General Standards for Historic Preservation Projects as amended:

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose. The Commission may require written economic, architectural, and/or building use justifications for proposed uses which would alter the compatibility of the building or use with surrounding buildings. The proposed use of the structure (residential upper, commercial lower) will not change, with the exception of additional residential units in the rear portion of the main floor. The building has been in a dilapidated state for many years and the applicant is fully remodeling and updating mechanical components of the residential units. The proposed exterior changes will have minimal exterior aesthetic impacts to the historic building and the use is supported by the City's Comprehensive Plan. The wall cap replacement will have minimal impact to the character of the building and district. The rear exterior wall replacement is in an area not generally visible to the general public and will not impact the character of the building or district from most vantage points.

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided whenever possible. The proposal will not result in the removal or alteration of any original historic material, with the exception of the rear brick wall, which collapsed due to structural failure. The applicant is proposing a contemporary finish to approximately ¼ of the rear façade; the proposed material is consistent with materials used on storefronts in the district. The existing stone and clay wall caps can be considered distinctive stylistic features of the building and appear to date from the 1940s. The replacement of brick, stone, and clay wall caps with metal caps has been a trend in the district due to new roofing products and the need to make buildings watertight. The applicant has demonstrated interior and exterior water damage due to water intrusion through the existing caps. The proposal appears to be comparable in character.

3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Proposed alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an appearance from an earlier era shall be avoided whenever possible. The proposal does not seek to create an appearance from an earlier time.

4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. If significant, these changes shall be left intact whenever possible. The caps were added in the 1940s. Although significant, this type of cap has been shown to allow water intrusion if damaged or not properly maintained. The removal and resetting of the existing caps with a modern roof system is not feasible.

5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be retained if at all possible. Does not apply.

6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features shall be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures. The existing stone and clay roof caps are in poor condition and need to be removed to install a new membrane roof system. The applicant is proposing a simple metal cap to replace the stone/clay caps due to cost and ease of replacement in the future if the membrane roof system needs to be replaced.

7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken. Does not apply.

8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction project. Does not apply.

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall be discouraged when such alterations and additions destroy significant historic, architectural, or cultural material and such design is not compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, or environment. The proposal will not destroy significant historic, architectural, or cultural material. Although new materials are being introduced, the proposal is compatible with the existing building and district in size, division, scale, color, and character.

10. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired. The majority of the proposal involves the installation of new windows in existing openings, new roof caps, and a small wall infill and will not impair the essential form and integrity of the structure.

11. The original exterior walls or surfaces of buildings and structures shall be retained to the maximum extent possible. In no case shall more than 25% of the original exterior walls or surfaces be destroyed, removed, or covered. Does not apply.

From Chapter 16

A. Minor Face-Lift.

1. A minor face-lift is defined as work that does not significantly alter, but rather, enhances the historic or original exterior appearance of the Building or Structure. This may include refinishing, repair, painting, and general maintenance.

2. The Commission encourages the use of materials similar to those used in the original construction, wherever possible. Synthetic and non-similar materials may be allowed only when replacement of similar materials is not feasible.
3. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to Buildings or Structures shall be done in such a manner that if they were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original Building or Structure would not be destroyed. The Commission will not approve sandblasting or chemical treatment that would damage the Building or Structure. The Commission will not approve the removal of cornices, painting of unpainted masonry, alterations to existing historic or original openings for windows and doorways and changes to other significant architectural detail.

“In the case of a proposed alteration or addition to an existing Building or Structure, that such alteration or addition will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the Building or Structure; the Commission shall make written findings considering the existing Buildings or Structures and existing exterior appearance, Building height, Building width, depth, or other dimensions, roof style, type of Building materials, ornamentation, paving, setback and color”.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the analysis above, staff recommends a motion to approve the amendment proposal as submitted.

E D.5 D C B A



