



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**MONDAY, MAY 13, 2019, 4:30 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 310**

A. ROLL CALL.

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

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the May 13, 2019, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 25, 2019, special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 19-09) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new garage and driveway at 926. S Quincy Street.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve (COA 19-09). Motion carried.

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

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Informational review for window replacement, roof restructuring, and an addition at 1014. S Jackson Street (COA 19-11)

2. Staff-Level COA Applications

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

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

3. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions

Moved by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, seconded by David Siegel to receive and place on file. Motion carried.

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

4. Staff Update

5. Date of next meeting: Monday, June 10, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by David Siegel to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Well she can forget about that raise we were talking about.
- Yeah, exactly.
- That's funny.
- Are you good?
- Yup.
- Cool. Okay we'll call to order the May 13th meeting of the landmarks commission. We'll start with the roll.
Susan? Veronica?
- Here.
- Justin?
- Yes.
- Ron? Ian?
- Yes.
- And David.
- Present.
- Okay we have a quorum. First item on the agenda is item B: approval of the agenda for the May 13th 2019 meeting of the landmark's commission. Just as a note this agenda was amended from what we originally posted. Any comments, questions, changes to the night's agenda? Hearing none, the motion to approve? So moved.
- Second.
- All in favor signify by saying aye.
- [All] Aye.
- Motion carries. Next item is item C: approval of the minutes from the April 25th 2019 meeting of the landmark's commission, minutes are in your packet. Anybody have any comments, changes, revisions to the meeting minutes? Hearing none, now we have a motion for approval? So moved.

- Second.
- Any other discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries.
- Item D: regular business of certificate of appropriate, certificate of appropriateness 19-09, consideration with possible action on the design review for a new garage in driveway 926 South Quincy Street. Jason?
- There it is, South Quincy Street. Here's the proposed new garage. Some sketches showing where the proposed new garage will go, it's in way of the older, possibly historic but certainly not original garage. Slightly larger but not much larger. And recommend approval of the proposed demolition of the current garage. Recommend approval of the construction of the new garage. Recommend approval of the proposed changes to the driveway, sidewalk arrangements. And just as an aside, the windows are kind of fancy, it'd be a shame to see them in a dumpster. See all that, I have more.
- Any discussion?
- Can you walk through the placement of the garage on the side?
- So on the left you have a site map, and top right, which I guess would be, what, the northwest? That's where the current garage is. As constructed the house had a larger, taller carriage house at that site, but the Sanborn maps from 1936 showed a much smaller, shorter garage, which is presumably the one that is there currently. So the current garage is not original, but maybe somewhat historic in its own right? I say that with a contentional question mark in my voice. There's an addition, a shed addition to the garage, at the north end of the garage, so the request is to demolish the current garage and attached shed, construct a new garage of similar overall form and dimensions on the site of the current garage and to rework the driveway approach so that the entrance to the garage is not from the east but rather is from the south. So the portion of the driveway that you would see from the street remains as it was, but instead of branching off and cutting through the backyard which is kind of the dash line swoop, you would have a straighter approach to a garage driveway pad, and then into the garage from the south instead of from the east. The current garage is vinyl sided. The National Register Nomination paperwork generally does not make any reference to detached garages, so it's difficult to make an argument that this garage, which is not really visible from the right of way, is an important part in defining the historic character or integrity of the property. The new garage is respectful to the size and style of the house, and also to the garage that they're proposing to raze. Based on that there's no objections that I can find, even Secretary of Interior Standards to this and on that alone I would recommend approval of these plans.
- There's no photographs in that packet of them, right? Of the existing garage, right?
- Yeah.
- There are.
- Got some cracks and water.
- Thought it was in the slideshow but they're...
- One, you couldn't tell where the garage started and the pond ended or whatever.

- So at the bottom of this view is the east perspective, which basically compare favorably with the front of the garage as it is now. Those two windows on the left side with that gable in, that's where the current garage door is.

- Okay.

- Think it's compelling what you said about how this is respectful to the house itself, particularly given that this is not original to, was it 1901?

- Correct. In 1901 there was a, presumably a side gabled one and a half story carriage shed, some sort of accessory structure. At some point that was given its own street address as a, nine-oh whatever it is and a half, or a nine, I forget what it is I'm sorry, but it had a half number on it so I don't know if that was implying that it'd been converted to a place of business or a mother-in-law type structure or just rental. The current building is not one and a half stories, it's shorter, which leads me to speculate that the current garage is not the original building, it may be old and somewhat historic, but it's not make or break for the integrity of the property or district, or even really visible from the public right away unless you're really looking for it.

- Any other discussion? Questions?

- I'll make the motion to approve.

- I have a second.

- Further discussion? Susan did you get logged in?

- Yeah.

- Okay motion carries unanimously, thank you. Next item on the agenda is item E: informational. E one is an informational review for window replacement, roof restructuring, and an addition at 1014 South Jackson Street. Certificate of appropriateness 19-11.

- I sense this is for you all?

- Yes.

- If you want to just come sit at the table we're just gonna have a discussion about it, if I can just get all of your names for the public record.

- Sure.

- Go ahead and start.

- Sue Laluzerne.

- Bill Laluzerne.

- Ryan Kraft.

- Rod Golonka.

- So I don't know if you want to just go through some of the things that we've put together, give everyone a brief discussion about what the project is, this was an action item originally, we moved it to informational because we were going to recommend denial of the application, so they wanted to come in and have a

discussion with you all to see what parts of their concepts you like, which parts you would not be supportive of, and just go back and forth between what we think is best for the house and what they're willing to do with it, basically. Go.

- All right. Here we are on the map, South Jackson near Eliza Street. Built in 1936, it's a contributing property within the district, I suppose technically it's a colonial revival stone building with stone parapet, also notice the stone dentils and keystones above the windows, hidden in the stone arrangement there. The dentils, keystones, and the parapet would be considered key characteristics for this particular house. Within your packet you've got some dealers proposed drawings. Here I've tried to put them side by side, just for convenience sake. So on the left we have a drawing of what the house currently is, give or take. I've drawn some sight lines just to show that I'm trying to line everything up, the ground with the ground, the top of the chimney with the top of the chimney. And the proposed arrangement, the roof itself, I suppose maintains its shape but grows, it gets bigger so its overall height is larger, and in the proposed arrangement, the roof then extends out beyond where the parapet is... to what you have here. Pictures work more than what I can tell you. From the north elevation here again, it is versus what's proposed, you see the removal of the parapet, the reuse of that stone to construct an addition on the rear of the house, and the larger hipped roof form, of the taller and hipping out over the back of the house. Another view, the back of the house, this is the view hidden from the street, is on the left side you see stone that will be reused to build the addition. Also, on the two story bay, it's proposed to reside that to remove the current wood siding and put on new wood siding. And based on what I understand from the drawings what appears to be a gable end roof over the garage isn't really a roof over the garage, but rather up against the wall of the house, perhaps in anticipation of a future, larger, garage. So that's what's going on here. Without the isometric view, it was kind of a oh wait a minute I understand. The forth view is as on the left you see the stone parapet here at the top, the garage, and the proposed arrangement, the much larger hipped roof replacing the stone parapet, the rear addition on the second story, and the gable end that will perhaps someday project over a different garage. Beyond the main visible changes, it's also been proposed to swap out the windows, I don't know if the windows that are currently there are original or not. It's also been proposed to replace rotting lintels. There are metal lintels above the windows some of them show signs of rust. I don't know that they require replacement, or just some cleaning and repainting, but these are just general questions that I had. I don't know what the next slide holds so let me check. Oh, Secretary of the Interior standards, right. So if we want to get into that, I note that the Secretary of the Interior standards say that you shouldn't be removing distinctive materials or altering features that characterize a property. I note that... when you make an addition these changes shouldn't create a false sense of historical development, distinctive features will be preserved, deteriorated stuff should be repaired rather than replaced, and the numbering isn't me being unable to count from one to four, these are number two, number three, number five, number six, within the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation. To continue, they have guidelines for masonry, recommending that you identify, retain and preserve features that are important and defining to the overall historic character of the building, such as walls, brackets, railings, corners as well. Not recommended, altering features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Also, guidelines for roofs, recommended identifying, retaining and preserving the roof that defines the overall historic character of the building. The form of the roof is significant as are its decorative and functional features such as parapets and size. Not recommended, altering the roof and roofing materials, which are important to the overall historic character of the building so that the character is diminished.

- Can you go back one? Yeah, so it says the same thing in that one, it says as a result the character is diminished, so I think that's stretching it a little bit but I don't think we're diminishing the character of the home.

- Changing it, I mean. Diminishing is a certain..

- Right, well, I like to think preserving it is a better word, so not preserving the character but preserving the home, so just because of the problems that we've had since we've been there.

- That would be the first question I would have. What are the problems with the parapet in particular?

- Well my wife and I have been there for 20 years now, so we've had that roof replaced, so the way that parapet sits is, the parapet obviously the hip roof sits inside the parapet wall, right, so the parapet wall has basically been rubber roofed over the top and then comes down and then comes up underneath the shingles. So, we had problems with leaking when we replaced it eight years ago or so, we're having problems with leaking again, so those rubber roofs are just not fun to deal with, particularly the corners, the scuppers, they're traditional scuppers running out the sides when you try to seal all that, so you go into our master bedroom and that ceiling's been patched, you go into the other bedroom and that ceiling's been patched, we had a leak starting in the closet of the other bedroom this year and in the hallway.

- Holds a lot of water up there.

- Yeah, so the parapet walls, the top caps are tipped in, which leads us to question whether or not structurally we're going to have some issues and we won't know that until we get into it, but we had leaking in the kitchen... Well, whenever we did the kitchen, prior to doing the kitchen, which was 2015 or something like that, but if you look if you can go to a view here, go ahead to, or back a few. Can't remember which way you were going. Go forward, the drawings, excuse me. Okay so if you look at the existing on the left, you see the garage and then you see another flat roof up on top of there? Okay, that's above the kitchen. So we had issues with water coming in that kitchen, through the kitchen ceiling, and we had the roofer over trying to figure out, you know, exactly what was happening during that time period. What we think finally got it, because he did some work caulking on the edge of that rubber roof, okay, 'cause now you're taking a rubber roof and you're trying to match it up against the stone, right, and you have kind of this ledge there. So he did some caulking there, but on that parapet wall with those blocks tipping forward, that exposed a big gap underneath the block as well, and he went in and put a large, you know, some really good caulk in there underneath that top cap. Between those two things, that... took care of it but again how long is that going to last?

- Is that unusual for a hipped roof to be inside a parapet?

- I can answer that, yes. In this particular case, I looked through the Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory database, and I think I only saw the two other houses that are colonial revival with a parapet and a largely hidden hipped roof. So in that sense it's somewhat unique within the state. Or more unique than not I suppose.

- Certainly there are plenty of flat parapet roofs that don't have the leakage problems you're talking about. So is this an issue of having a hipped roof inside the parapet, is that what you think it is?

- Yeah, at one point in time in the front, there was actually... a drain... that also caught the roof runoff, so in the very front right up above that middle window is the bathroom. And that was actually going to the storm sewer which of course is, you know, you can't do anymore, right? But that was actually a vent, a combination, a vent and a drain, and it was down kind of recessed inside, you know, you have, you have the hip roof that goes inside the parapet, and then there's probably about a, I don't know what is it, 18 inches flat that's all the way around there, and that drain was in that flat part, and it was sunken down in there, and so the water could run in there, and then it had like a screen there to keep the big stuff out, okay, but when that would back up, then it would rush up underneath the rubber roofing. When we redid the bathroom upstairs, 'cause we redid the master bath, when we redid that they actually had to repair part of that wall because of the water damage that had been done in there.

- Do you describe this as a fundamental design flaw?

- Well I would. I mean we've, you know, we've replaced all the rubber roofing and the shingles once already, you know--

- How long ago?

- We did that about eight years ago. You know, again the dentil work would stay, we actually took ideas from the neighborhood, because there are other homes, maybe not exact with the stone design, but there are other stone homes around that have, you know, the traditional overhang.

- Our part with the hip roof and side of this parapet is it's a large unheated heading space and there is really no ventilation coming in from the eve. So our overall design only talked about taking the, introducing the overhangs is we're gonna leave the dentil work which is a large character of the house, and the top of that dentil is where we were carrying off with our soffit line, and the new roof system. So, what pictures don't show is the inside of that attic, the roof boards, the rafters are whack. They haven't been breathing correctly for years. You can see in this photo the dentil mold detail around there and all the way down to the window tops where that masonry is a little bit discolored? That has been leaking for years, we haven't been able to open up a wall to see what kind of condition the wood is in, but those steel lintels on there, where you can see the rust in these pictures, there's some on the back of the house that are just about gone, it is not scaling rust they are just about... completely worn through the full quarter inch--

- ...a fundamentally flawed design?

- Yes. Like you'd said, there's parapet roofs with fine roof structures, with internal drains that work, they're all right, but this, the combination of the hip roof and that parapet, the drainage design inside of the roof around that parapet is pretty poor.

- So why not just get rid of the hip roof altogether? Why are you replacing it--

- Ultimately I think because there's a large concern of that stone taking on water, I mean the stone was porous, so the stone should absorb the water, we think that water is getting in through that storm on top of that whole big thing, it sticks up probably about five inches, water is actually seeping in and around that and attacking the flint.

- So on the inside of the parapet there's the rubber roof, the backside of the stone?

- It runs up the backside of the stone, yes, and it actually covers over the top of it, but the dentil mold itself, on the top of that stone, there's no flashings there, there's no rubber protecting that, there's just stone.

- So here is a photo of a close up of one of the lintels. It isn't a, I actually, when my wife and I first bought the house and I was a little bit more energetic, I actually took and scraped all of those and primed them with, you know, with appropriate primer for the metal, and caulked them and things like that, and I've since had them touched up again, but they're, like Rod said, they're deteriorating. It isn't surface rust, and if you look at that you can see down the window, the rust is running, right, the rust is running down the window. So the combinations that I put on when I did this at the time, you know, this was when we'd first moved in, I replaced the wood screens and storms because they were in very rough shape. With the aluminum combinations and those combination that I have put on are... on many of them, you know, there's just rust. It doesn't wipe off or anything like that, it's there, I mean even rust on some of the windows.

- So the hip roof design ultimately needs to give us a soffit on the house, and allow us to get true attic ventilation, or we're going to get that attic full, coming from the eve up through the mid-shaft.

- But if you got rid of the hip roof altogether you don't have a ventilation problem.

- Right there's nothing to vent.

- There's nothing to vent.

- Yeah if you have a flat roof, kind of like a bit of a shed roof, just like a slope, maybe towards the back and drain from there?
- Are those relief scuppers vulnerable? In the parapet?
- Yes. Yeah, to the north and the south.
- And they don't function?
- They function, so actually I have the north one I've got hooked up to, I had a mini-storm put in, and I have that one hooked up to the mini-storm.
- It goes out of the side of the, to the outside of the stone.
- Correct.
- And then down.
- Yeah it's like a, you know, it's a hole in the stone which they rubber roofed around, right, and then there's a metal box that sticks out of the stone, right, and then the six inch, you know, drain goes down, or six inch--
- I'm just wondering, no, where the water's backing up under the rubber roof, if you have a relief scupper in addition to the soffit roof drain--
- We have a lot of, you have a lot of seams in those corners not to mention the cap, and like I mentioned you can kind of see it, you can kind of see it on this picture, the gap at that cap. Right? That's a big gap from those stones--
- Is that a stone cap on the top of the parapet?
- Yes, that a stone, those are, you know, you can see those are all uniform size caps, but those caps are all tipped in like that and we went in and had the roofing company Compin's Roofing, go in and caulk all those.
- Tipping back towards the house?
- They're tipping to the inside, correct.
- You say you had the roof done once since you've been there in 20 years.
- Correct.
- Just one complete re-roofing.
- Yep.
- And who did that same, Compin's?
- Compin's.
- Were there, prior to having that done, or it was after having that done that you noticed water in the bedroom, water in the--

- There had been issues before we moved in, you know, that we probably didn't recognize, but then there were issues after and we had it replaced, so part of the big issues we had was with that bathroom drain that was in there, and when we redid that bathroom we, you know, we took that--
- Was the water in the same place before, with the old roof and the new roof, were you having water issues in the same spots?
- Yes, in the front room on the right, still having some water issues there, and part of it is what Rod said is when you don't have the proper ventilation and we put the peak vent on there, you can see the peak vent, that's actually new to the roof, right, but you've got nothing feeding it? And I actually had in, I'm trying to think if it was spring of last year, it was bad and we had caught some spots from the sweating and I actually carried a dehumidifier up there--
- An outlet without an inlet probably isn't doing a thing.
- Yeah, yeah. And like you said, you've got the black on the bottom of the, the black on the bottom of the boards, I mean you go up there in the winter time and you can certainly see that in the frost, you know the frost build up on the underside as well.
- How are you addressing the lintels, what are you going to do with those?
- Replace them.
- So you have to take that stone off.
- Yes. Or take the parapet down for the new hip roof, we were to take each window down to the window-head, replace the lintel, re-flash the window, and put all the stone back in place.
- Right, I can see just on the second story.
- Just on the second story, yes.
- All the way around those things?
- All the way around. First floor windows it's painted steel, and with the condensation there's some, painted or not, deteriorated.
- Not getting as much moisture--
- Right yeah.
- What would be the obstacle to simply removing the hip and leaving a flat roof?
- I would still say that there's a lot of moisture going in to the house from that dentil detail and that projection of that five inches and that stonework is going in there, you can see the collar of the stone with the parapet, it's not really distorted the other section from the downward down to the window you can almost see the discoloration in old mortar joints, and all the stone a little bit of the efflorescence from the moisture being inside of there wanting to move forward.
- So what's the obstacle to just removing the hip, converting it to flat? Do you feel that parapet is just so compromised?

- Still with the stone detail around and the stool, the stool is going to allow that water into that stone. We've had houses, similar to this where we've tried sealers on the stone to get that water not to penetrate, but to just rinse off the surface, and it lasts for awhile, it'll work for awhile but it tends to want to wear off.

- Yeah and the problem is, when do you see it? You don't see it until all the sudden you start having stains on your drywall and, you know, it's stuff like that, so then you don't even know the extent of what you have on the inside and the structure, you know, that's what worries me most, about the parapet wall too, is that we don't know, you can't see it from inside, right, but what we're going to end up getting into there, structurally, I think knowing what I had in the front, I think there are going to be issues, structurally there. That stone is, you know, what is it a three inch facing, is what it is, it's not a solid, it's not a solid stone, so it's just a veneer, I don't know what you'd call it, I don't know what the proper term is, but it's just a three inch facing on the, you know, there's two by fours and then there's siding and then there's the stone facing on there.

- You could flash the dentil.

- With what?

- Piece of copper flashing, or stainless flashing, I don't know what the flashing is on the rest of the house, but if you used a piece of metal flashing above the dentil, and then the parapet caps, there probably should have been a piece of flashing put on, are they stone? The caps of the parapet?

- Yeah.

- So those should have been removed and flashed underneath before they were reinstalled.

- Right.

- We never took them off, so, you know, that was the design when we bought the house, with the rubber roofing over the cap, they peeled off the old and put on a new one, you know, is what they did. Is there any thought to bringing, leaving some of the parapet, but not all of it? But not, I mean not as a parapet. You know what I mean? It would just be more facing so the roof wouldn't sit out right on top of the dentil, it would sit up on top of maybe two rows of stone. I might be speaking out of line here from a construction stand-point.

- I mean is there a way to keep it at the front and the sides, and then pitch it back so you're building up that, basically internal gutter, so it's pitching down and around the back to collect it. Is the, the image that I saw of the.. scupper, the relief scupper, it's very high up on there on the parapet.

- It sits right... I'm trying to think if it sits right above the dentil--

- No.

- This right--

- Yeah, okay, you got it, oh yeah it does sit higher, yup, so that's where the, and that's obviously where the roof sits, right?

- Right, I would have imagined that that roof was sitting lower behind that parapet, because I mean you really don't see a lot of that hipped roof right now, I mean you have, you can barely see it.

- Yeah and I'm on, I took that from the other side of the street, that's the only way you can see it, that's the only way, yeah, so that's the only way that you see that. I remember when I had that done, because I came before the commission for that roof eight years ago and, you know, it was a shingle color thing at that point in time and, you know, it was like oh yeah you're fine, nobody can see the roof.

- The parapet is perhaps the key character, the defining feature of the whole roof structure, especially those three sides, the front, the north, and the south sides, if the hipped roof disappeared altogether and you did something else that's still hidden by that parapet, the Secretary of Interior standards would look more favorably on a pass than removing the parapets.

- At the same time, if it's a choice between, I mean if the house is really in jeopardy from the current design, I mean I know obviously it's been there a long time--

- Its been there over 30 years.

- Yeah but--

- You saying it's an inherent design flaw, it's not ideal for the northeast Wisconsin window--

- No, right obviously, neither is a flat roof.

- However, in the last 70 plus years without an issue suggests--

- Well without an issue that was plain, anyway. Exactly.

- So like I said, I don't know what's gonna be, it's not like I can go up there and shake the parapet wall and it's loose, right, it's not anything like that, but I don't know given that that top cap fell in, we had to caulk all that, I don't know how much, you know, it's not like we caught that right away. I don't know how much damage has been done and knowing the damage that I saw in the bathroom from that other drain, those scuppers are not ideal either, those are not easy to seal, right? You know, and then if you're scupper backs up, you know I mean I've managed to keep them clean, for the most part, but if that scupper backs up, right, now all the sudden it's pushing up underneath that roof again and again you don't know it until later. On the back side of the house, if you look on the back side, with the drawing, yeah, so this particular structure here currently is just flat, okay, again that's been rubber roofed up to the dentil, and then sealed on the sides, but we have water marks in this ceiling now and in, of course this was replaced when they did all this, but we have water marks in this ceiling and this interior trim. On this particular window is, the paint is starting to bubble on there, so I've got to getting moisture in there. I don't feel good about repeating the same thing and then waiting for more problems to happen ten years down the road or eight years down the road.

- Well there's always the potential for problems with the new roof too.

- No doubt, yeah--

- I mean you're gonna do a few, or a complete renovation of a structure, you don't know what, you can't foresee what the potential future will hold, you know what I'm saying? And also like you're saying once you start tearing this stuff apart you don't know what you're going to be getting into with rot in there or whatever-

-

- But I think a traditional roof you can get in and see, I mean you can't even get in, I mean I can crawl in my attic but I can't even, I can't even, you know that leak that happened in the front took me awhile to figure out what the heck was going on there, 'cause I can't physically even get in there because of that walkway, so to speak, around, that's all flat you can't get in there and see or do anything.

- And without a precedent really, with it being a strange design, you don't really have a precedent for how long is it supposed to last. There is no, I mean--

- Uncommon design--

- Right, yeah.
- I mean you see this design often on commercial buildings, it's unusual on a residential.
- Yeah, with the combination of hip and--
- I mean you do see parapet-- This building has one, that one has one--
- It's not an impossible...
- Excuse me.
- If it's detailed correctly and you allow the moisture to get out, I'm just not sure how the parapet is constructed. Do you have a sense as to how it's constructed or no?
- You would know. More than me.
- If you look at it in-plan, how wide is the parapet? I mean is it a foot thick--
- I think it's less than a foot but very close, say 11 inches something like that.
- So, solid masonry? Or is there--
- I don't believe so, my guess here would be wood framing coming up vertically with the stone on the exterior and a stone capping.
- Just kind of below the frame from the floor below up through the top of the parapet?
- Yes, or a small need wall possibly on top?
- Yeah I don't know that structurally it could have handled the stone, but I don't remember when they redid it the first time what that was, but certainly the walls are of normal size so it isn't like it was blown out there to absorb, to be able to absorb that extra weight if you put that stone laminate on the inside as well.
- It's 13 and a half inches thick and it projects about ten and a half inches above the flat roof we're seeing on the inside, if one goes up into the--
- Do you have a detail of it then?
- Just a sketch.
- Take pictures we need to, I need to play? Can you go and climb up there?
- Yeah we have pictures in our file, we'll do anything with this but--
- Yeah, we do have pictures of it in our file.
- I mean ultimately the design that we put forward with the hipped roof and the soffit and fascia is, we felt was the best answer for a build forever, if you want to own this home forever, all the water's going to shed to the outside we have proper ventilation to the attic and the stone is covered, if the stone's got moisture we'd be in it, it's protected by an overhang on the roof so we kind of like recapped and covered everything that, if we do this, this is gonna secure this house for the rest of its life. We won't be running into issues--

- I absolutely see that but, going back to one of the original serious japes I had I do think it does change the distinctive nature of it, I think it does fit that. I mean I'm very sympathetic to your plight with all the water, you've got a bad design.

- Yeah. Prior to going through this my wife and I had quite a decision because this isn't cheap.

- No.

- My wife and I had quite a decision to say are we gonna commit and stay in this neighborhood because this is a lot of money we won't get back out of the house. This isn't a let's put it in and we're gonna get it back out, that isn't gonna happen.

- Well I think that's part of what we're charged with here, is to kind of assist in the historic integrity of the entire district, as well we're charged with, and that's part of, and presuming you enjoy the neighbor because all the houses are different, they're all unique, they're all pretty well intact. This is a character-changing operation--

- I just didn't think, I just didn't think it is to this particular property I just didn't think it was for the neighborhood.

- Because as the nicer houses in the neighborhood are a problem, you know, you've got a great residence.

- Because you go around and there's similar ones out there with the similar overhang design.

- Right, but it's individually contributing right.

- That's the problem, there's tons of colonial revivals with a large overhanging hipped roof, there's not with the parapet--

- The uniqueness of what you have is what makes it especially challenging.

- How do the existing rafters, what do they bear on?

- I'm not sure, they might just be, my guess is that the roof structure is framed very similar to the floor structure between first and second floor, so wall structure, floor joints, the cap, wall structure and a floor system, the cap again, then somehow they tied in those rafters coming down on the, probably on the side of those floor joints where that flat roof--

- What were you gonna bear the new trusses on?

- Over the wall.

- Outside wall, that's the, part of the reason for it coming up a little bit, and ultimately what we wanted to do is for the dentil mold detail to still stay there and having the soffit start at that line. But yes the new rafters bearing on the wood frame.

- So the first floor in this as well also offers some support for the main walls that go up because the first floor in the house is concrete. So this is built like a bomb shelter. So there's no wood structure in the basement whatsoever.

- The pitch to me is like preserving the house for posterity as a long term thing, destroying some of the character but preserving the house itself, that's the pitch that you guys are kind of making here.

- Right.

- Now with the cost of this renovation spread out over just doing here and there roofing repairs that need to be done as needed rather than the big thing, I mean just looking at that how long does that stretch the life, you know, I'm just talking out loud here.

- Yup, and the problem is, and the problem that we have is you don't know when you have a problem.

- Sure, sure, right, right.

- And I realize that's partially on, I realize that any structure it's kind of like that a little bit, but--

- If those nickles and dimes come along every ten years, and they're not nickles and dimes, still, they're expensive, but not this kind of expensive. But then you're still preserving the character which is I guess out main objective in a sense. It'd be nice to find a way that we could preserve the character and still have, have you have a dry and well preserved home, I mean that's the goal, right?

- What is, what are the mortar joints like on the stone?

- We've had them redone.

- They've been re-tuck binded? The parapet?

- Yup.

- The whole house or just the parapet?

- The whole house. So we had that done... four? I don't know, all the years run together. Four years ago or so, you know when we had the mortar joints were deteriorating in areas so we had a couple of guys come in and hit all the, hit all the weak spots but that was also a \$9000 project.

- Oh yeah.

- I mean in every one of these photographs you hardly see the roof. That's what's most bothersome to me is that you're going to go from not seeing it to only seeing it. Is there a way to do a single pitch to the back and collect it there without having to lose the integrity of that parapet? I'm not sure that we'd be doing our job if we--

- That's what I was suggesting, sort of shed-type roof with a pitch to the back for the drainage.

- So removal of the parapet on the back wall.

- Right.

- You remove the back wall parapet you can salvage that stone to do the north elevation and the addition? And then the west, which would be the backside of the house, and the south side of the addition I think it wouldn't be inappropriate there to do the incline and addition in the wood siding. Because it's not to the street.

- So Secretary of the Interior standards point out that additions should be differentiable from the original. In that sense, using some of the stone to patch up what you're tearing apart is fine, but the lion's share of the addition itself should probably clad in something--

- Shouldn't look like for its original--

- No and I'm not sure about the window that's on the north elevation of the addition that matches the other one is, I don't know if that's where they'd want that. That window on the right.

- I agree I don't know that you'd want to, as proposed it would appear that the house had been built with the addition and with a large hipped roof. I don't think that that would be conforming to the Secretary of the Interior standards. Some sympathetic sort of shaped window in a different siding wood, but it's above my pay grade to say what's better and what's not. I'm afraid that using the stone from the parapet for the purposes of creating a seamless addition is clearly not what the Secretary of the Interior standards would call for.

- It's kind of counter intuitive, it makes it seamless sort of but at the same time you want it to be seamed in order to know what's old and a what's new, but anyway--

- These things have changed over time, there was a time when seamless was where it was at, now it's about hyphens and similar-but-different. Yeah it might be more fifty years, but yes fifty years from now I don't know what it'll be.

- What are you saying on that proposed addition?

- Yeah, so you do siding.

- Or some other material.

- I guess I'm fifty years ago maybe, personally.

- Personally I am too, but I've got to report to you what I'm trained--

- Yeah, sure, right right right, I just, I like it better with the stone. And if you were, no, we're talking about shed roof, pitching that back, that there's a hip roof on the addition, I mean that was proposed, so what would that, obviously it would have to be done differently if the construction were to change.

- Well the idea behind that was to eventually extend over the garage and put a three stall garage back there. The garage is, it's nice having an attached garage on an older house, certainly unique, somewhat unique, but it's a very, you fit two cars in it--

- Barely.

- Yup.

- You walk around the back door to walk around the cars.

- Twice as big as I can fit in mine.

- Right it wasn't part of the original ceiling application but there's mention of tearing it all down and replacing it with a three car garage which, I would have an opinion on that as well.

- Yeah that is the eventual plan.

- Well as an attached original garage that does have historic value, so Secretary of Interior Standards would recommend against removing the garage and replacing it. It would be okay with adding a stall that's differentiable in some way, but not the wholesale replacement of what's currently there.

- Well and then you have the flat roof, that one is actually held up okay, that one has a drain on top of it as well but--

- Is that single pitched one way?

- Yeah it kind of comes back into the drain just to the left of the window. It's in this back left corner of the garage. So here's where that drain is, that roof drain.

- Is it a built-in-the-roof type drain?

- Yeah. Yeah fortunately we haven't, we had that replaced 'cause it was leaking so that was replaced. But again, I'm not, I'm not real comfortable with that either, the garage wasn't finished at the time either and the garage is finished now. To my wife and I this was a design we thought, these were things we thought we could certainly live with for another, that we could live with for another 20 years. But if that's not the case I don't know that we want to live there.

- That's how I feel. And the addition I wouldn't want to be anything other than stone.

- Well, no, it could be stone, but I think the fact that you'll be using that same stone, even if it was a different stone or a different cut or a different, the fact that differentiates it is really what the guidelines are trying to push.

- Which means a trimming off of the--

- Right or there's a vertical seam or something to say this is where the corner of the house came to and then maybe have a recessed, a stone that's recessed maybe an inch or two back and then it comes back out again, but so you can clearly see when you're looking at it in the future that, okay, that's where it did, and that's what they did to address what the addition is, as opposed to painting--

- As opposed to using siding on it.

- Right, you know what I'm saying?

- I know what you're saying, but to me that's the whole point is to make it look like it exists, like it always existed, like it's original. I know what you're saying, but I don't like the look of an addition, it looks added on.

- So we're saying as to the house we can't change the look element going to a hipped roof over the parapet, but if we add on the back we want to change the element of the house.

- If you change it, right.

- That's very tough to stomach and understand.

- Yeah, right.

- I feel like a seamless addition helps to preserve the character of the neighborhood, maybe not the property itself but more, the neighborhood looks more, stays more historic looking, but I guess that doesn't really add up 'cause the neighborhood is made up of the individual things, so yeah. It does seem counter-intuitive to me, just as a layman, I'm just a layman.

- Going back to your comment about that roof, an addition to the roof, you're changing the original feature, if you're doing an addition you're not changing something that was originally there. And again, as Jason mentioned, we have to fall by the federal guidelines.

- Well, let me speak to that point, you don't have to, and that is weird for me to say. Your ordinance says that you shall approve it unless the designated structure, historic site, blah, blah, blah, will be detrimentally changed, I'm advising that, yes, it would be detrimentally changed. This is more of your ordinance, and it says that in arriving at your determination you shall, what was it, consider the following factors, including letter I the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation. In considering it, the legal part of me says well you've considered it you can throw it out the window and burn it it doesn't matter, you've acknowledged that it exists you said yes, no, it does or doesn't approve it, and we're dealing with it however we see fit. You consider it, you're not bound to it. Personally, I'd rather you were bound to it.

- So if we do this, do we get a black mark on our building that says they did not comply with--

- You're seeking start--

- I put in that application, but something tells me it ain't happening.

- I can tell you that for nothing.

- The state will literally put a black mark in their file.

- But from our side, the COA is required before I do any permitting, so if you don't get the COA and you do the work anyway you'd be doing without a permit which is a finable offense, same as doing the work without a COA is also a finable offense, so we need to come to court some sort of a resolution so that way you can get your building permit to do the work basically.

- What is the time limit for this or what was the time limit for this?

- July, we were gonna start in July.

- I mean, certainly you've put in a significant investment into the property, I can't sit here and question that at all in you--

- It's a commitment.

- It's a commitment to the neighborhood that needs that type of, right, I live the next block over, I wish I could put that into my place. I mean I can't fault you for that but by the same token we're, we need to insure that we're not approving something that is going to be detrimental to the overall neighborhood and to your, to your building, to your home.

- So what would you approve? Some type of different, like we talked about--

- Something that preserves the parapet.

- Can we get rid of that roof up top and see what we can do about just having a flat roof up top?

- Yeah like a shed-roof, little slope to the west, to the back of the house.

- I mean even if it came off the back of the cap of the parapet, so you could literally run that roofing membrane under the cap and through and down the back pitch of that, I mean it rains it's going to the west it's going towards the river. It's got nothing to stop it from moving.

- Going into Lake La Verne in the back.

- I was just going to say--

- Waterfront property.

- Waterfront is fine, not water-in.

- Without sitting down and figuring out the specifics, to me looking if I'm looking at that and saying, if we did that to that roof in lieu of what you're proposing, it would keep the historic integrity of the building, that applies in my mind.

- I concur with that, I say exactly that. I'm sympathetic to all the problems you've got and you want to take care of this in one fell swoop and who knows what's under that parapet, get rid of it, I see where you're coming from. But that parapet, to me that does make it distinct, and I'd like to see more of an examination of preserving that with what we're talking about, shed roof going right off the back.

- So preserving parapet three sides, shed roof off the the back, can we still consider it a possibility of putting the stone on the addition versus changing materials? If you've seen the home there's actually kind of an accident that we'd carry vertically with that stone addition, so from that elevation it looks like it's built into that house, where it's supposed to be, which is the outside of the kitchen, the side offset before it starts to ground, that's what we'd carry over--

- Right I see that on the aerials, yeah.

- So it has occurred to me the reason why the standards says it needs to be distinct is probably to dissuade it, to dissuade changing what the structure looks like. Because I agree with everyone saying it should be seamless, but by making it, no one wants to see a seam, no one would, perhaps the reason why the standard is that way is to dissuade these type of additions, whether it's small like this or much larger which does change the structure substantially.

- And to expand on that I think that they're really trying to get people to do very subtle changes too, it's not like, there are some additions where you're like oh that's clearly an addition, but there are some where he was saying that you just do the stonework a little bit differently for a few inches so that way it just shows that there's just a subtle change in what was there versus what you're proposing to add. The idea is that you want it to look nice you want it to look cohesive, but you want to make sure there's at least a subtle difference between what's original and what's being added on.

- It's got that coin-like thickness back there which, you use that as a delineation or, you know too it maybe the consensus of the committee that a seamless addition on the rear--

- If you want to know--

- In that material is okay, even though the Secretary of the Interior's standards says--

- Take a picture before and a picture in during, you can, if you want to put it back the way it was you can.

- At the corners of your building, it steps out.

- Yes.

- You know, again, that's all I'm suggesting is maybe on the back corner, that you have something similar to that kind of defines that corner and then you go from there with the next piece of stone, as opposed to trying to blend the joint of the stone into one which is how it's shown here. Again it can be stone, but it's subtly different. Like if you went back fifty years from now and you said okay where did they blend this together--

- You could look at a photo--
- You could look at a photo and say, oh this is that line, that distinction between it, and that's what the Department of the Interior's standards is trying to get at. It's not that it can't be stone, but it shouldn't look like it was always--
- So you'd have to have a delineation line then you could go with the original stone?
- Yeah.
- Okay.
- You know it's not a perfect example but I'm looking at the Green Bay Press Gazette building, where they added a third story I believe, and you see it's in matching brick, but you can see where each addition came along at some point.
- But as we look to that next step though and I think that's important to talk about now because that's one of the other things that is going to keep us there for another 20 years is that garage.
- So the Secretary standards would recommend an additional one-car stall that kind of telescopes out of the...
- West?
- Thank you, the west side. So you'd have a two-car garage where you have a two-car garage--
- So it would be an addition, here, in keeping the integrity of this.
- Then you'd have a one-car stall next to it. In place of that shed.
- Oh yeah you've got a good aerial view there.
- And then you could just clear out the portion of the wall between the two or something.
- Why wouldn't you do that?
- It doesn't look good. Because it looks like it was added. Because it's only functional, it isn't--
- It looks cut apart, everything's chopped up--
- Well it doesn't help the issue that the garage is a two stall garage but--
- We can't get two--
- You can't get two cars in there and not ding your doors and rip off your side-view mirrors it's pretty small.
- Are you saying the existing garage is not wide enough to fit two cars in?
- Correct. Well we can but you've got to have two small cars in there.
- What about doing that garage addition and making a stall and a half wide, I mean even two stalls, you've got enough yard there I think you'd be okay with the setbacks and then converting that existing garage to basically a one-car garage instead of two, a small two stall?

- So you're saying, the one we have existing making that a one and a half?
- Making that a really generous one stall, and then adding on--
- But it wouldn't connect.
- Yeah, they would connect.
- Like inside they would connect?
- Sure.
- Yeah you could make them connect.
- Could they be all the same--
- No this would have to stay stone. This one would have to stay stone the next one would have to be siding.
- Again, that why I don't want to do it that way--
- Or it could be stone, but not--
- Not the same--
- Same thing as the other thing, it's just gotta be--
- Show the delineation.
- All right.
- I think properly to do anything with your roof you'd have to, I mean we can talk about this outside the room but you'd have to, we'd have to rip all the way down to the parapet and see what's actually underneath all of that to make sure your walls are structurally okay.
- Yeah, 'cause that is one of the bigger concerns is I don't think that parapet wall is, I mean I don't feel good about that.
- You'd need to take it down anyways to repair the lintels and the windows.
- Well you wouldn't have to, you can go from the lintels up.
- Parapet's coming all the way down--
- No, go from the lintel, take out that stone above the lintel, put the new lintel back in and patch the stone.
- To flash, to counter-flash that dentil detail, you'd need to terminate that somewhere, so that would actually have to go in to the wall structure and up so then you're taking that stone off.
- But you wouldn't have to take the whole parapet down, you can piece it back in.
- You would have to take that off. It can be put back up the way it is, you know it can look the same you can use the same stone, but you would need to take that down to that layer, we'd just need just the width of the

window to get that far over. So I guess I'm saying we have to take the parapet all the way down to the top of the dentil detail and then we would stage each section by the window, we'd have to take down to the window to replace the lintel.

- I disagree. I don't think you have to take the parapet down to replace those lintels. A good stone mason can cut that stone out above the lintels, replace the steel and then piece that stone back in.

- Yes he can, but the flashing dentil details--

- Well yeah above the dentil, but would same principal as the lintels, that's why I asked how you were replacing the lintels earlier. I think you could take a couple of courses out above the dentil and put that flashing in.

- And let the rest float?

- You've gotta support it temporarily while you're flashing. It's not easy.

- But nothing is on a historic house.

- So it seems.

- Okay. All right thank you for your time and your input.

- Yeah thank you for coming, if you guys want to discuss amongst yourselves and then get back to us and let us know what you'd like to move forward with, I mean you can still submit the application as you would like, but I think this was beneficial to see how we might react to it, so keep me posted.

- All right.

- Thanks.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Nice to meet you sir, thanks for your time.

- Okay, we're on to item two, we've got essentially 20 minutes to wrap up the rest of the items on the agenda. So staff-level certificate of appropriateness applications.

- I'm confused which--

- I forget what we did, sorry.

- I actually have four, so these were the ones that were proposed in your packet, and then Whitney School has some additional staff-level things that were done at the same time that we did the window application at landmarks commission. So these were all done in the last month.

- That was chimney tuck-pointing, then the one in the middle, what looks like a wooden fence currently there is photoshopped in, they want to put that wooden fence there. 1716 Dousman, new roof, no change, asphalt shingles. Whitney School I forget what they--

- Yeah I think it was tuck-pointing and some sidewalk work? Really minor stuff.

- And in the case of Whitney School the Department of the Interior has oversight on all of that anyway because it's a tax credit project.
- So if they go in after federal tax credits or state tax credits, then we don't need to review?
- That's not true--
- I want some at our post to say that but right now we still do.
- This is me saying that people who spend a lot more time looking at this stuff are looking at that particular property. It would be a little awkward for me to argue with the Department of the Interior about the preservation treatments for that building.
- Yeah I'm just wondering how that sets it up for precedent, like in this scenario if he was going after tax credits, we would defer then to the state of Wisconsin for their input?
- I'm confident that the state of Wisconsin would deny their application.
- I don't disagree, I'm just--
- We use it for proverbial material, so they submit that back to us for our staff review. We have a much easier job pre-interviewed by somebody else basically.
- Frankly, if the state thought it was okay, I'm on thin ice to disagree with the state. I disagree with them on a lot of things, mostly personal, but they think very highly of themselves, so it would be a challenge. But yes, this committee does still retain all oversight of everything, even if it's a tax credit project.
- That's what I thought I just wanted to check.
- Yeah.
- Okay.
- If we could receive and place on file please.
- I make a motion to place staff-level certificate of appropriateness of application on file.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carries. Next item would be review city raze and repair orders and demolitions.
- For these, all of them except for the North Webster were part of the flood that happened with East River last month. So those are, they have raze/repair orders on them only to keep people out of the home until they are safe to occupy again. I believe most of them will be rehabbed and brought back to the living. I don't know the background on the North Webster project. I don't know, Jason, if you have anything to add--
- I do. With the flood properties I think we're gonna see more raze/repair orders in the month or two ahead following that general, which part is it there by the East River, I forget.

- East River .
- East River Park?
- Is it really?
- No, I'm sorry, I thought you were talking about neighborhood association.
- No, where Mason crosses the East River, that whole general area.
- Yeah.
- That park.
- Different neighborhood association.
- So lot of flooding there, and as I walked around taking pictures of these houses I saw others with condemned placards in the windows so, that's that. 1113 North Webster, center top, according to the letter I think it was basically a sewer backed up into the basement. It's a landlord rental property, I don't know how often the tenants were in the basement but it's a raze/repair order based on a basement swimming pool. North Webster is interesting though because that house is on the west side and that's in the area where everything on the east side of the North Webster has been bulldozed here in the last several months. So as a neighborhood goes, I think they just punched out a large corridor, this is punching out something on the other side of that. Unfortunately, I mean hopefully it'll be fixed I don't have any reason to think it will be or won't be but that's what that's about.
- And none of these were listed as historic properties.
- Correct.
- Nice character on those pilots though.
- They're cute aren't they.
- I think we're looking for a motion then?
- So moved, receive and place on file.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries. Staff update.
- I emailed all of you but we are now a certified local government.
- Yay!
- So two years of hard work at least, three, four? I don't know, forever? So with that, when the new cycle of funding becomes available we'll have to do some brainstorming about what we'd like to apply for. So the

biggest money-getter is always to redo or do a new survey. I don't know how interested we are in doing that straight off the bat, I know we have some other things we'd probably like to accomplish prior to getting more properties to take care of, but I would like to do some more educational outreach, you know pamphlet, that sort of thing to make sure that we have a really strong presence in the community before we start initiating some more survey work, but I think we should have a staff discussion about that.

- My thought on that is that that's not gonna happen overnight. That survey is gonna take a long time--

- Oh yeah, and a lot of money, and not enough that they cover with that grant--

- It'd be a multi-phase project over several years.

- Definitely.

- So, in my mind, the sooner we can get going on that the better, so that we can start to build that database of information. I think the key thing is where do you want to start? Where's the biggest risk? Where are our biggest challenges?

- I also think we need to think about if we want to resurvey places that have already been surveyed because they're due for them? They're about 30 years old. But some of them may have lost quite a bit of integrity.

- Well I think it would be good this time through to have some graphics associated with the text. Everything before was purely text as far as I've seen so photographs, site plans, identification of the buildings should be part of the RFP process.

- Yeah we'll need help triggering an RFP. I don't know exactly who you'd call if it's Pete and Hunt and, whatever, talks about being better than Pete and Hunt-- But the whole city should be done and the state now recommends at least once every 30 years, I think we're at the 30 year plus point right now.

- We're at 30 right now.

- So for writing the RFP though there has to be examples of that are being issued--

- Yes.

- On the municipalities--

- And as a CLG we are entitled to technical assistance from the State Historic Preservation office. I'm sure they have on file, in a cabinet, copies of RFPs, and probably some ideas about how it could have been better or worse.

- I mean it didn't appear just through theirs?

- I think so.

- When I worked Beloit I got a grant through CLG for new survey, so-- I know what to look for. They're not fun, but they're easy.

- It's bigger than me going around in my car taking pictures. It's, you know, 50 of me going around in their cars taking pictures.

- Right absolutely. My two cents is that that's something we should get. 'Cause it's gonna take awhile.

- Okay, well I'll get a better idea of when the funding window opens and then we can have a discussion here about that. That's it for my update.
- I'll just add that I think the CLG sub-grants are usually the upper end of 25,000 a year or something. Intensive survey of the city of Green Bay will be more than that--
- Oh, a lot more.
- A lot more, which is why I said it'll be a multi-year, multi-phase thing. Spreading it over three years would covers the costs or not, but I mean we'll figure it out as part of the RFP process.
- I wouldn't be surprised if that was a 150,000 dollar investment, to 200,000.
- That sounds about right.
- But the neat thing of that is we'd have an updated survey, which would identify eligible properties and districts and then there's the financial aspect to the, coming in saying well if we nominate this district well the tax credits become available to all these property owners. So there's money on the line, that's a good thing to chase after.
- Well when it was done last time the city JS system didn't exist and I think there are ways we could potentially tie some of those things together too.
- Can keep Stephanie busy for a long time.
- That's for sure.
- And keep me busy too.
- I believe so.
- Unless I get Mary Poppin-sed out of here or something.
- Please don't leave us.
- Next item on the agenda is the day of the next meeting, Monday June 10th, everybody think they're going to attend? Okay, any other further business of the commission?
- David what am I doing on June 10th?
- In the morning you're mowing my lawn.
- Okay.
- Afternoon is windows. I used to to windows--
- That's tomorrow.
- Unless there's any other new business, motion to adjourn?
- So moved.
- Second.

- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.
- Any opposed? Meeting is adjourned, thank you everybody.
- Now we can log out--