



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2018, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Chair Paul Martzke, Vice-Chair Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Justin Balsley, Ron Dehn, Ian Griffiths, and David Siegel

Present: Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Justin Balsley, David Siegel, Ron Dehn and Susan Ley.

Excused: None

Also present: Ald. Brian Johnson

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the December 10, 2018, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and seconded by David Siegel to approve. Motion carried. Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the November 12, 2018, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Susan Ley and seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve. Motion carried. Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 18-14) Consideration with possible action on the alteration of fenestration, window installation, and new siding at 838 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke and seconded by Ron Dehn to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and seconded by Susan Ley to close the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

Moved by Ian Griffiths and seconded by Justin Balsley to approve the proposal with the following condition: Frame out the void with window casing under the new window and fill the inside with new fancy end cut shake siding that matches the existing shakes on the house. The window casing would be painted white and the siding would be painted white as well to give the appearance at a glance of a full window. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

2. (COA 18-15) Consideration with possible action on a new commercial sign at 220-222 N. Adams Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke and seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by Ron Dehn to close floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve the sign as proposed. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- Ian Griffiths.

3. (COA 18-16) Consideration with possible action on new windows and doors at 112-114 S.

Broadway.

Moved by Ian Griffiths and seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and seconded by David Siegel to close floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None

Moved by Ian Griffiths and seconded by Justin Balsley to approve the proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. All glass should be clear, not low-e.
2. Metal window frames should be powder coated or have a baked-on finish. No exterior metal finishes shall be anodized (window frames, doors, etc.).
3. Exterior doors cannot be stained wood (painted wood is ok).
4. Exterior doors cannot have a fake stamped wood grain or the appearance of a wood stain finish (smooth is ok).
5. No painting of unpainted exterior brick. Previously painted brick can be painted again.

Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

E. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Staff-Level COA Applications

Moved by Paul Martzke and seconded by Susan Ley to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions

No report

3. Staff Update

No report

4. Date of next meeting: Monday, January 14, 2019.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and seconded by Susan Ley to adjourn. Motion carried.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax and Justin Balsley. No- None. Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Now, we'll call the meeting to order. This is the Landmarks Commission meeting for Monday, December 10th, 2018. We'll begin with a role call. Paul Martzke is here, Susan Ley.

- Ley.

- Ley. Veronica Corpus-Dax.

- Here.

- Justing Balsley.

- Here.

- Ron Dehn.

- Yeah, here.

- Ian Griffiths.

- Yep.

- And David Siegel.

- Present.

- Okay, the entire committee is here. Next item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. We've got an agenda for us for tonight's meeting. Do I have a motion to approve the agenda?

- Move to approve.

- Second.

- We have a second. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of tonight's agenda signify by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Any nays? Motion carried unanimously. Next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the November 12th, 2018 meeting of the Landmarks Commission. Again, I'd ask for a motion of approval of those minutes.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Any discussion on the November 12th, 2018 meeting minutes? Hearing none, I'd ask for a vote on approval of the minutes. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Any nays? Again, motion carries unanimously. Item D, regular business, item number one: consideration with possible action on alteration of fenestration, window installation, and new siding at eight 38 South Jackson street. I'd ask for a presentation by staff.

- Oh, I can do that. Eight 38 South Jackson street is the house that you see here. At some point in the recent past, windows have been altered on the side that faces the driveway, which is on the right side here, and so there's two first story windows that are smaller, pardon my ship terminology, aft of the rounded portion of the wall. And on the second story, window's been replaced with a much smaller window. The staff report he recommends that no action be taken regarding the windows on the first story and that we consider only the work going forward for the window on the second story, specifically what sort of siding will fill in the metal sheathing that's below the small window that's now been installed. With that in mind, staff recommends that it be framed out as though there was a full window frame there with some sort of shingled siding within that window frame, but you can do as you please. Staff recommends this. It's for you to discuss and come to your own conclusion.

- Okay. I'd like to open up the floor for discussion.

- Can you just open the floor or is it just open?

- You have to vote to open it.

- Yeah, okay.

- But Ron can ask questions prior to that.
- Yeah, motion to One quick question, so originally it was the large window that had been cut out below the small one.
- From the lower right photograph to the two photos, the window where you see that metal sheathing was identical to the window that's left of it.
- To the left of it, okay.
- So, I'll call it a full height window.
- Gotcha. Just want to be clear. Okay, thank you.
- Also, the windows in the front were replaced at some point too?
- At some point.
- Yeah.
- But those presumably were more recent and it's those two there--
- Those two.
- Those two, yeah.
- Were replaced more recently, but the issue that I've run into in thinking about this is that we revised our preservation ordinance on August 21st. I am going in blind, but presuming that all of these windows were installed prior to August 21st, so frankly, if you don't like the windows, you would be attempting to enforce a code that is no longer on the books. But presuming these windows were installed prior to August 21st, we're still left with a situation on the second story where someone needs to make a design call, if you will, as to how best to--
- What's done is done and let's move on.
- That's my opinion.
- Sounds like a good opinion to me.
- You could attempt to pursue enforcing either the current ordinance or the superseded ordinance, get a little more information and, worst case scenario from the homeowner perspective, you could attempt to persuade the homeowner to put the old windows back in. I don't think you'll make many friends doing that.
- Yeah.
- And counterproductive.

- The homeowner's right here if you have any questions.

- Is it safe to presume those windows were pretty well rotted?

- Yes, the window in question upstairs is a bathroom. It was a full-size window, very inappropriate for a bathroom. A shower was installed up there, the bathroom was remodeled, so we raised the window, had no knowledge of any of this at the time that that was done, when I put the window in that this commission even existed. That was in May we did that.

- I didn't know either.

- I didn't get at the siding because I needed a band saw to make the fancy cut shingles, which I have. I didn't have it there yet 'cause we were moving. I have it now. My proposal is to make the fancy cut shingles and just replace what's there.

- Blending into the rest of the shingles on the left and right and below?

- To match everything that's there.

- Shape, color.

- Yeah.

- I think the proposal we received is to extend the window casing down to the full, earlier opening and then fill in that space with shingles. Now, I know we've discussed at one point just trying to match the shingles for shingles in a seamless fashion. I don't know how seamlessly that can be done. If you like that option, by all means, run with it. My feeling on that is that the second stories are characterized by some sort of symmetry fenestration and that by putting in window casing where the window had been, you'd be at least acknowledging that the symmetry existed, but architecturally, I defer to the architects in the group.

- Sir, what do you think about creating a seamless transition from old shingle to what you're filling in? Sounds like you've got a plan.

- I think I could do it. I already researched buying the shingles. I can't buy the fancy cut ends, but I can buy that original shingle in that size, cut the ends myself, paint 'em ahead of time, and then put 'em up and match. Obviously, some shingles are cut when that window was installed originally. I would just take part of that shingle out that was half a shingle and just make it a full shingle there to match it, like it was never there, like the window was never there. I made three proposals, like that gentleman was talking about, one with the frame, and I think one is to paint the shingles blue inside, like the color of the original paint job there inside the frame or I can paint them white. Whatever people think is best, I guess. Or put the frame in and then paint the shingles white inside.

- I think the recommendation to put the framing around it speaks to the fact that that has been the change and it's more the ability to document the change in the future as more clear, so from my perspective, I think framing that out and then infilling the center of that with a adjacent matching shingle would architecturally be the most appropriate way to do it.

- Sounds reasonable to me.
- If I could interject too, I don't think you'll ever get a recommendation from me for paint colors. I don't care about the paint. If it's polka dots, at least it's protected.
- Let's not do polka dots.
- No.
- But if it's white or blue I'll never voice an opinion on it.
- Yeah. I think it's at the home owners discretion, but I think the blue actually would probably work better. If you look at the elevation now, as you look at the windows in the front, you see that the glass actually does reflect a kind of dark color. If you did it white, I think it would stand out more, so I think in order to keep it more like a window, infilling it with a blue painted shingle probably would make more sense.
- So, you're saying a white frame with a blue--
- Yep.
- Okay.
- To mimic a full sized window. It's not truly glass, all white on the bottom.
- Yep.
- Are there any other discussion from the members of the public? Okay. At this point, does anybody wanna make a motion on how to proceed with this item?
- Motion from the floor.
- Motion from the floor. Do we have a second?
- Second.
- Okay.
- I think you're looking for a motion to issue a certificate of appropriateness for interruption as to put window casing and plus fill in the space with fancy cut shingles.
- And I think that was listed as option number three?
- Two or three. The difference between the two is the paint color.
- Yeah, three is the one where the shakes match the existing house. Two is where they'd be painted white.

- I'd make that recommendation of option three.

- So, a second?

- Okay, any other discussion? I just would add as part of the discussion that it looks like you have a very well maintained and lovely house in the neighborhood, so I do appreciate that. So, no hearing any other discussion, we would wanna call a vote then to vote for the current item, which would be option three: frame out the window with window casing under the new window and fill in the inside with new fancy end cut shaked siding that matches the existing shakes on the house. So at this time, we can vote.

- Susan, what will your vote be?

- Yay.

- It has been approved.

- Okay. Motion carried unanimously. Next item on the agenda, item D two, consideration with possible action on a new commercial sign at two 20 to two 22 North Adams street. Again, I ask for a staff report.

- This particular building, the three story building on the left was identified as a contributing building within the downtown historic district, which to the state register and they started replacing it in February of this year. Since that time, under the previous ordinance, the facade was removed in its entirety and replaced with a new facade. From a preservation perspective, I see no reason to oppose this signage, so staff recommends approval of the COA as requested.

- Motion to open the floor for comment?

- Second.

- Start with members of the public. Is anybody here from the public chapeaus that would like to discuss this issue?

- I'm here for Pat. His wife had surgery today in Milwaukee.

- Anything you wanna add, Craig? Or no?

- Just that it's a signage and visibility. It's going to be much more well-maintained exterior facade bringing business to the downtown district.

- Any other discussion? Okay, I think we need a motion to close the floor.

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- And at this point then, we are looking at vote on this item.

- Make a motion to accept this as recommended.
- Second.
- Oh, sorry Susan. Passes with one abstain.
- Okay. Motion carried. Next item on the agenda is item D three, consideration with possible action on new windows and doors at one 12 one 14 South Broadway. Again, asking for a staff report on this issue.
- One 12 one 14 South Broadway is a contributing property in the Broadway of Walnut National registered historic district, built 1883-ish. This building benefited from a very thorough rehabilitation around 2001. At that time, an entirely new storefront window group was installed on the first floor. A big improvement over what had been there, which was plywood paneling type closed off appearance. The current windows that you seen in the top left are very similar to the ones you see proposed in the bottom right, so much so that you probably wouldn't know a difference, except that the new ones are new and metal frames, as opposed to not-so-new, circa 2001 and wood framed. I did contact the state Historical Society's Preservation Architect for northeast Wisconsin, received a little bit of feedback, specifically that to maintain the historic integrity, all the glass should be clear, not low-E, metal window frames should be powder coated or have a baked on finish, specifically not an anodized finish, exterior doors can't be stained wood, but painted wood is fine, exterior doors can't have a fake stamp wood grain on them, but smooth doors is fine, don't paint any brick that hasn't already been painted. I don't see any conflict with what's been proposed in this application for a certificate of appropriateness, so staff has recommended approval of the COA.
- Could you elaborate on the explanation about metal window frames, coated, baked on, and not aligned, but anodized? Elaborate on exactly what that means.
- A little bit. The baked on finish will have the appearance of a painted thing, be it wood or otherwise. The anodized finish will have the appearance of metal window frames. The goal here is that you want to maintain the appearance of a historically appropriate option, and more to the point, the anodized window frames would cause this project to no longer be eligible for tax credits should the property owner choose to pursue that. So, we consider the state's architect's input as being of a higher value here because his or her opinion is such that what they're recommending would qualify for tax credits, should the property owner chose to pursue those, and anodized finish would not. To the average passerby, nobody's really gonna notice a difference, but to the architectural connoisseurs that constitute tax credit approval people, it makes a difference.
- Are those doors... Those were also replaced in '01?
- That's my belief, yes.
- Okay. I've gone in Jake's and I wasn't in Metro PCS, but before that... The doors seem big and heavy and old and I don't know if they were or not. If they were old doors, I would think that preserving those would be more appropriate than replacing 'em.

- Yes, the state usually is pretty lenient with the first floor storefront and I would say even more so, given that most of what we see here, if not nearly all of it was replaced in 2001, there is some original material, historic fabric, some cast iron columns that break up the windows, but those would be maintained under the current proposal. The property owner's also here, too. So, if you wanna--

- Jason, can you clarify? So, is the new proposal... What type of windows are they proposing to put in?

- That's not clear. My suggestion here is that you stipulate baked on finish versus anodized.

- Okay. Anybody else on the Commission have anything they wanna talk about at the moment? Do we wanna open it up to the floor for public comment?

- Sure. Make a motion to open the floor.

- I'll second that.

- I understand the property owner is here?

- That's me. Hi, Ricci Bosley.

- So, can you elaborate on your intentions for replacing the windows?

- Sure, my concern is to make them more energy efficient, so to have the same look, also following the guidelines given by Jason and I care about making sure that the historical integrity is withheld for the building, so if there are any stipulations, such as the low-E, I'll make sure that those windows have everything that's recommended. I want it to be more appealing to the eye and then more efficient for my tenants, as well.

- Is it your intention to pursue historic tax credits?

- I'm considering it.

- So, that would weigh into your decision as to what type of window system you utilize?

- Yes.

- The state has a minimum expense of \$50,000. So, I think the proposed project is just shy of that. There's an option to bundle other projects and stretch it out over two years or so. Things for the property owner to consider.

- I'm gonna ask a general question. Can the windows still be low-E and still meet the state's requirements under historic preservation?

- I don't think so.

- Okay.

- I don't think so.

- The issue becomes a reflective coating that constitutes the low-E and you really don't get a clear line of sight into the property if you have that low-E coating on it. The difference between the low-E and the non-low-E in form of thermal perspective is gonna be minimal in terms of... As long as you have an insulated unit, you're gonna be significantly improved over what's there. So, it will allow people to actually see in to the business instead of seeing a reflection of themselves or their vehicle as they drive by.

- Okay.

- If additional privacy is desired, you can put up an interior vinyl sticky thing or something and not compromise the historic integrity.

- Any other comments from the public? Any other discussion on the Commission? So, do we have a motion to close the floor?

- Motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- And then, we would be looking for a motion to take action on this.

- I make a motion to approve, as outlined by the Wisconsin Historical Society, with the baked finish and non-low-E coated glass.

- Second.

- Second.

- Any further discussion? Hearing none, I guess we're up for a vote.

- Unanimously approved.

- Okay. That would include the regular business for tonight's meeting. Now, we're onto item E, informational. Staff have a certificate of appropriateness applications.

- We only have the one COA coming in between our last meeting and now, which was a porch repair. Just for the rope on the porch, so that's pictured here. I was up early, sent a lot of applications, so we are getting approval on that.

- The porch should have been a relatively new reconstruction, so there's no historic fabric here to deal with, but I believe the homeowner was running into an issue with this cedar shake roofing that was leaking and he wanted to replace it with something, I think asphalt shingle, that looked a lot like this. Got nothing historic involved to be lost.

- Okay.

- We received a placement file for this.

- Do we need a motion for that?
- Was it a contributing property?
- Yes.
- Did they utilize a shingle that was approved for use by the state Historical Society?
- I believe so, but I really doubt that they've pursued the tax credit for this.
- Yeah, no doubt.
- It's unfortunate, but yeah, I think there's an architectural asphalt shingle that actually matches what...
- Is on the rest of the house.
- It matches or is an improvement on what's on the rest of the house, yes.
- I will make a motion to accept this report and place on file.
- Second.
- Any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.
- [Members] Aye.
- Any opposed? Next item is review of city raise in repair orders and demolitions.
- We've got none to report this month.
- Okay. And next item on the agenda would be a staff update.
- I have not staff update. Do you have anything?
- No. Is there any progress on revising the ordinates to include the first class mandate?
- We are planning to bring that forward to our planning commission in the first meeting of January. We have to do a couple of revisions in order to get our served by local government status updated, so the next available meeting is January 14th or something like that. So, it'll be early January that we can sort out all of our tax amendments that need to get done and then from there, it gets approved by Council and then we can finish our application for that.
- Okay, next item on the agenda is date of the next meeting is Monday, January 14th, 2019. Any other discussion of the Commission tonight?
- Nope.

- Hearing none, I look for a motion to adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [Members] Aye.
- Any opposed? We're all done. Thank you, everybody.