



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 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: Ron Dehn, Paul Martzke, Justin Balsley, David Siegel, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ian Griffiths, Susan Ley, Excused: None

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the September 9, 2019, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the August 21, 2019, special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 19-11) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a roof redesign located at 1014 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Justin Balsley to approve COA 19-. Motion carried.

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

2. (COA 19-31) Consideration with possible action on a design review for siding, soffit, and window replacement at 1008 S. Webster Avenue.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to deny COA 19-31. Motion carried.

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

3. (COA 19-32) Consideration with possible action on a design review for roof and wall work located at 218 N. Adams Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve COA 19-32 with the following conditions:

1. No pressure washing is allowed.

2. The paint shall be permeable in nature. The proposed paint type is not allowed.

3. Any replacement brick shall be similar in texture and size to the existing brick.

Motion carried.

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

4. (COA 19-33) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a window replacement at 504 Porlier.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve COA 19-33. Motion carried.

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

5. (COA 19-34) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new awning sign located at 228 N. Adams Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to approve COA 19. Motion carried.

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

6. (COA 19-35) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a replacement window and deck replacement at 840 S. Quincy Street.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve COA 19-35. Motion carried.

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

E. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions

3. Staff Update

4. Date of next meeting: Monday, October 7, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Susan?

- Here.

- Veronica?

- Present.

- Justin?

- Here.

- Ron?

- Here.

- Ian?

- Here.

- David?

- Present.

- All members present and accounted for. First item on the agenda is Item B, approval of tonight's agenda. Anybody have any comments, questions, or requests of changes to the agenda? Hearing none, I'd ask for a motion to approve.

- Moved.

- Second.

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

- [All] Aye.

- The opposed? Motion carries. Next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from the August 21st 2019 meeting of the landmarks commission. Minutes are in your packet. Does anybody have any comments or corrections on the meeting minutes for August 21st? Hearing none, do we have a motion to approve those minutes?

- Motioned.

- Second.

- Any other discussion? Hearing none. All in favor of approval of the August 21st minutes, signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? Minutes are approved. Item D, regular business. D1, certificate of appropriateness 19-11, consideration of possible action on a design review for a roof redesign located at 1014 South Jackson Street. Jason, you want to?

- Sure.

- Give the staff information on this.

- Awesome map. I think it's highlighted in red there, 1014 South Jackson. I went and took a few pictures recently bearing in mind that I stand six foot four, six foot five. My eyes are a little bit shorter than that, but this is me standing on the sidewalk adjacent to that property and I want to call your attention to the fact that

you can't see the hipped roof. You can see the parapet. Standing in the middle of the street, not much traffic. I see the hint of a parapet roof, a hipped roof behind the parapet. Standing on the opposite sidewalk, a little more of the roof, still mostly hidden by parapet. We have some construction drawings. These show the as is condition. The parapet roof here looks kind of big, but these are projection views, craftsmen views. What it will look like with the parapet roof removed and a nice symmetric view of what's proposed. In short, it's to remove the parapet portion of the roof, to remove the hipped roof portion and to remove the parapet on the backside of the house and substitute the works with a one directional sloping roof and some gutter system. As I was explaining earlier, as a realistic person, I would give this a thumbs up but I want to warn you that the state may take a much more dim view of it. It's not in line with the letter of the Secretary of the Interior standards, but my opinion is such that the parapet by design was intended to create an appearance of not having the hipped roof. And that we're maintaining the parapet here, I'd like that. If however the home owner applies for tax credits, the state may send a nasty letter back saying you shouldn't be doing this, but it's up to you, that's my opinion. So I can't give you a recommendation for approval because it does not lie directly in line with the Secretary of the Interior standards. I think as a real thinking person that it's still a good idea because it addresses the issue of a leaking roof and it doesn't really negatively impact the historic character of the house unless you're looking for that hipped roof. I would not normally look for that hipped roof.

- Do you have anything that shows that that originally was a hipped roof?

- Oh, that's a fun question.

- Yeah. I mean, the garage itself has a flat roof on it. I mean, that hipped roof could have been for all I know, that hipped roof could have been added at some point in time. Somebody thought it was a better idea.

- I think it was original. And I don't know if that's because I saw a hint of that on a Sanborn Map, or a historical aerial photo, or what. I do note that it was there when it became a historic district in 1979, 1980, and was noted at that time. In that sense, even if it was an add on, it was considered a historic add on. But no, I've never pulled original architectural drawings of this.

- Is it too soon for me to make a motion? I mean, I would like to make a motion to approve this project. They've come a long way from their original design and basically they're trying to save the roof and the house from leaking. And after a rain if you walk by and look at their walls, their walls are actually saturated from the inside. So I mean, I think we should really approve this project and let them go forward with this.

- So I think I heard Ron make a motion. Is there a second to that motion?

- I'll second.

- Was the motion for the complete package? Were there other items besides the roof on this one?

- No other items. I mean, perhaps some coping on some of the parapet and the gutters on the back, but that's-

- No windows and no additions?

- The coping that's going over the top of the parapet is a metal coping. And what is, I can't say that I saw in the details specifically like how much of a coping that's gonna be because that's gonna look--

- Quite different. On top of the parapet wall is going to continue to be the limestone that it is.

- So there's a, it's not going over the top of the limestone? It's going underneath that top slate at the top?

- Yeah, it's gonna be inside, yeah.

- Okay. Then we're good. I was fearful it was gonna be sitting over the top of that wall and create a very dark band around the top.
- Nope.
- I don't think one, you want that, and two, it would look appropriate. So the rendering of an isometric 'cause you highlighted specifically the roof made it look a little bit more.
- Yeah, there's nothing on top there.
- Intensive, I guess.
- So that was my only question that I had.
- I've got a question. It's not really a historical issue as much as it's a constructability thing. It shows the existing parapet in on that back wall.
- Mm-hmm.
- But I think what you're gonna really want to do is you're gonna wanna when you rebuild it, you're gonna want the side wall parapets to go all the way to the end. Do you understand what I'm getting at? Because it leaves a funny condition if you stop that parapet short.
- Right.
- And I think you want those side wall parapets to go all the way to the back of the house and then have the mason wrap the masonry around that full parapet so when the roofer comes back in, he's got something to terminate to.
- Yup, I would agree.
- The way it's drawn right now, it shows a funny condition where you could have water get to the edge of that parapet and then shoot up the side before it gets to the, yeah, so. Just a suggestion to think about as you're constructing it.
- Yes, thank you.
- That's a good suggestion.
- So we had a motion. I didn't hear a second.
- Justin, Justin seconded it.
- Okay. So we're voting. Unless there's any more discussion?
- It was unanimously approved.
- Consideration of that.
- Thank you.
- Yeah.

- Thanks.

- Thank you very much.

- I think it's a much better solution.

- Thanks.

- Yeah, thanks.

- Item number D2 on the agenda is certificate of appropriateness 19-31, consideration of possible action on the design and review for siding, soffit, and window replacement at 1008 South Webster Avenue. Jason?

- Awesome map showing the location of 1008 South Webster. Just as an aside before I get too far into this, I believe the request was addressing both the house and a detached garage. Please bear in mind as I forget to bring it up again, but the detached garage is not historic per se. So I don't have strong advice on the garage, but to refresh your memory, we did speak about this at the special meeting in August. Here's a picture of the house. I've got a few slides that show some additional information that we've received. Top left, the proposed windows.

- It's a DH all welded windows. The siding from CertainTeed. The soffits also requested to be replaced. I'll draw your attention to the last bullet point on there. Reason to be aligned with the updated look of the home. That's . I didn't know if this was helpful to anybody, but I put in the window spec sheets. It's not particularly helpful to me, but here it is in case it comes up in conversation. We did receive a letter from the Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office Senior Architect. You've received a copy. This is an excerpt of that saying that SHPO State Historic Preservation Office never approves of vinyl windows or siding on a historic property. They go on to say that if you set a precedence of allowing vinyl windows in the district, there may slash will come a point in time where the district can be considered for delisting due to loss of integrity. I've said that to you. I just thought in case you don't believe me, there you go. That's an email dated August 27th 2019. You've got the complete email and hard copy in front of you. They say other interesting things in there. We have received from the applicant project description costs. Nearly \$35,000 in new siding, soffits. That's the house plus the garage. Plus almost \$14,000 and 30 new windows for a total of 48,000 some odd dollars. Here in our office, we do have paint quotes for comparable houses. 708 South Quincy, paint quote of \$10,000. That's a similar size house although it does have a large stone feature at the front which would not be painted. 806 South Quincy recently painting just on the front and part of a side for \$4,000. So I would suspect without having reached out for a quote that the house could be painted for \$20,000 and that portions of the wood could be replaced probably for \$10,000. And I would estimate repairing the windows at \$500 per window, although we haven't received any pictures of any of the windows with details, which would be a potential cost of \$45,000 dollars. And then that tax credit for all of this qualifying work would bring that down to less than \$34,000. Now, I note with that tax credit in play, if you do qualifying rehabilitation work, you could have upwards of a \$65,000 project, get that 25% tax credit and have a dollar for dollar cost with what's being proposed and replacing all the siding with vinyl and all the windows with new vinyl windows. So I note that the ordinance does not give consideration to economic factors, but as a realistic person, I think that's very important especially when somebody comes and says hey, my slate roof is no good. It'll cost me 100 grand for a slate roof or 20 grand for an asphalt shingle roof. Clearly, economic considerations are important so I just want to point out that it would appear that the work could be done compliant with the state's requirements and the Secretary of the Interior Standards for a comparable if not less amount of money. Revisiting the photographs here, we see the rear of the building. It's not an original addition to the rear of the house. And I think we have pointed out that the foundation of this addition is probably the culprit for rising moisture which is leading to the paint failure on this rear addition to the house. Top right is the garage that I'm not too worried about. Bottom left again is that foundation on the addition at the rear of the house. The condition of that suggests that moisture is rising up through that getting into the wall. And then as that moisture attempts

to escape, it's pushing the paint off with it. Top left shows where probably the cut ends up the siding are budding up too close to the roof and it's wicking in moisture off the roof. A lot of that, I would suggest probably needs to be replaced or trimmed and replaced. Bottom right shows dirt. I'm not particularly concerned with it. Here, we see soffits. Again, I think this is on the rear addition. I draw your attention to the gutters because they keep grabbing my attention. And I know that the gutters were added after the last time the roof was redone. It could have been quite a while ago, but my hunch looking at these on the next set of photos is that we're seeing damage caused by ice dams in the winter. The ice freezes, the moisture wicks into the roof and it's coming out the soffits. And here in particular if you look at the far right, you can see the top few boards look pretty good. Then you get to that gutter in the center of the frame and you can see the shadow on the paint where that ice dam forms. That moisture gets in the wall and kind of trickles down the inside of those boards and that's why we're missing a board and we see the accelerated paint failure below this. The photo in the center is showing a detail of that. The photo at left shows the missing board and fairly shiny gutters. This typically is a problem of those ice dams which may be related to insufficient insulation or just particularly harsh winter. I bring this to your attention because I don't know if replacing the siding with whatever material we're replacing it with is gonna solve the problem of moisture getting in behind the clapboard or the vinyl. I see other issues at play here. Staff still recommends denial of the COA noting that all the work is incompatible with the Secretary of the Interior standards. I also note that for Mark Buechel, the Senior Architect, says that the house may well be considered non-contributing after that point and that the house may not have access to tax credits at any point in the future and that it's a ding on the integrity of the district. So that's all I've got.

- Discussion?

- I would like to say that a lot of the damage is not from the roof itself. The addition on the back, they used the completely wrong wood. It does not fool the paint. Within two years, it has been repainted. The section that you're talking about on the corner, the wall inside the house has mushrooms growing on it and mold because there's actual holes. And the bottom half has been prepared just so I could get through another window with it. And the boards are all . There's not a single board on that wall that can be saved. And the boards on most of the walls on the other side have to be all replaced as well. There's a lot, a lot of boards that have to be replaced and that's where my budget cannot hold it. And one of the biggest concerns you guys had last time was that in the front, that I would keep the V shape of the corners of the entry way which Ken and I worked out. He said vinyl would not work there so what we were gonna do is enhance the entryway and keep that part wood because that part is good wood. There's no boards to be replaced there and we would do it a slight different shade or accent to bring out the front of the house where the door is. That's how we were going to deal with your concern with those corners. All the other corners on the house are squared. And the roof and gutters are very new, so they're not, they're in good shape.

- You know, I would add that rear addition where perhaps the wood was not well selected. Given that it's a non-historic addition, people take a much more lenient approach to what sort of siding goes on that addition. I'll leave it at that.

- But I don't want to have that siding be different than what's on the rest of the house. I do have pride in the house and I don't want it to be half patched together.

- Well, if the wood is as bad as, you say it would need to be replaced in order to put vinyl on.

- No, they'd go right over it. He said they can wrap it. They put a first layer on and then they wrap it and seal it. The only wall they'll have to completely redo is the one that has the interior damage done. That one. That one, we'd have to completely redo. The inside wall. And then once they open up the wall, they can see what other damage is done inside. That's a real. You know, he gave me an estimate of what that wall will cost but he said that's just the starting point. Once you open it up, he said we don't know what we'll find.

- That's also true of rot. I mean, the other rot that we're looking at all over the place. I mean, to just say I'm gonna wrap it, then you're living in a house full of rot and mold. I mean, that doesn't seem like a solution either. You know if you're inside that house, it's gonna be mighty moldy especially in the spring and fall.

- Well, he'll take off what needs to be taken off.

- Which is exactly what I'm saying. It's like, and I've done this.

- Right.

- It's like once you start, you don't know how deep that's gonna go. Usually what you see on the surface is a very small part of the rot that's actually there.

- That's what he said.

- You know and so it's a tricky proposition. I don't see how you can just oh rip through this and wrap it in vinyl. He'd almost have to clapboard it again before he could do vinyl. I mean, just from my own personal opinion, my own know how and what I've done. I just throw that out there.

- Any other discussion?

- You haven't presented any other costs other than the vinyl--

- I did the windows and then the soffits.

- So I was thinking about the Hardie board, that commercial made for a cement board, how that compares cost wise.

- That was addressed by the letter also.

- The state's architect finds himself in a position of having to walk the very narrow path of the Secretary of the Interior--

- Absolutely.

- Right.

- The comparable maintenance cost that you have there are your own numbers that you've generated, Jason.

- So the paint is based on the quotes that we've received through our revolving--

- It wasn't provided by the homeowner?

- No, no. I've got personal experience with purchasing and installing vertical grain clapboard cedar siding. So again, I haven't walked around the house. I don't go sneaking on people's properties, but I'm guessing \$10,000 to replace sections of wood. And again, throw another 20 grand on top of that, you're still not hitting the break even where vinyl is less expensive. That window repair. Again, that's an estimate. I haven't seen any details of the windows in their current state to say how far gone they are or not, but at \$500 per window, I think you'd have people lining up wanting to take on that work. That's just an estimate. I could be wrong, but we haven't received any cost data elsewhere.

- I guess that was my point.

- I think that the cost estimate scenarios that you've put up there are very valuable and definitely worth consideration, but at the end of the day, the cost isn't what we're talking about. It's we've got a contributing house to the district that's in original state that can be repaired. And if we go down the path now of approving vinyl siding for such a prominent residence within the district, I think that's a slippery slope that this commission can't entertain. We rejected aluminum soffit material previously this summer for a different residence, and so I don't know why we would reverse ourselves and approve it on this residence. So all that being said, I would just make a motion to deny the application.

- I'll second it.

- Any other discussion?

- Yes, that would be to deny.

- Yes, okay.

- Yes. change this one?

- Yeah.

- Stephanie, might as well.

- Okay. Sorry, that can be confusing. denied.

- Okay, next item on the agenda is Item D3, certificate of appropriateness 19-32. Consideration with possible action on the design review for the roof and wall work located 218 North Adam Street.

- On the left, you see the lovely map. On the right, we're zooming in a little bit on the rear portion of the roof. It's the republic chop house. Here's a photo that the owners provided. In particular, their request for certificate of appropriateness involves a new roof which I give a thumbs up to replacing some section of damaged brick at the top which I would also give thumbs up to although I don't have data on what brick is replacing it. The trouble is in the weeds here of the COA application. It calls for the pressure washing of the brick wall and painting it with an impermeable elastomeric paint. And that's where we run into trouble because the state has a statute, 101.1215, that expressly forbids high pressure washing of walls, brick masonry on historic buildings. And I've gone back and forth again with Mark Buechel quite a bit and best preservation practice states that a non-permeable paint on historic masonry will accelerate the deterioration and ultimate destruction of that masonry. It attracts the moisture inside and as moisture sits in the brick through the freeze thaw cycle, it will begin to kick off the face of the brick. It will . And we can see that already on the Confetti's theater building in the alleyway. If you look next to the parking garage, you look at a painted brick wall and you see a lot of the paint almost looks like it's peeling but it has a sandy backside to it. That's the brick. So that's moisture escaping the building and escaping it the only way it can is blasting through the paint. The best practice here to paint something is to apply a, what do they call it? The limewash paint. It's permeable. And as presented, the idea of pressure washing it and then painting it with an impermeable paint as winter approaches seems like a very bad idea. Mark Buechel's very clear that the moisture gets trapped in the brick for several months before it can have an adequate chance to dry out. The high pressure washing is illegal. Furthermore, the application of a paint, it ought to not be this elastomeric stuff. So that's the only hesitation that staff can provide. As far as the roof is concerned, that's fine. As far as the replacement of the brick is concerned, that's probably fine. I haven't seen what brick's coming in with. So be it, it's gonna be painted. It's the question of how to prepare the surface for paint and what sort of paint would be applied.

- Discussion? Patrick, do you want to open the floor?

- I mean, yeah, I read the recommendation that Jason wrote up. I don't have any problem with his recommendation. is the replacement of the mortar is to be traditional lined mortars which is fine. Not using pressure washing is simply fine. We'll do it a different way. I did read through the attachments that were there talking about how to do that. Basically, it's a little bit of hand scraping and using a basically a hose to clean off what needs to be cleaned off. Again, I didn't have any problem with what was recommended in that regard. As far as the brick, it's a bit unknown at how much brick actually has to be replaced. The concern that we had was once they start to dig in along the trim, if any of that brick crumbles out, that, I mean, it clearly has to be replaced with something. So there isn't a lot of direction on what that brick actually should be, but because of the age of the building, I would think that we would focus more on its size and shape, right, to be the same. And then since the intent is to paint over it with a vapor permeable paint which is also fine, we would do that. And then I guess what the brick is itself is a little bit less of a concern at that point. The vapor permeable paint will allow it to weave out, I guess, for lack of a better term. So honestly, looking at everything that was recommended and suggested, I really don't see any issue with it at all.

- The only other thing I would add, Patrick, is in addition to the size of the brick would be any texture on the brick. So if it's a flat brick, let's put a flat brick back, not a velour face brick, or a stippled brick, or sand rubbed. So the brick should be of a similar texture as well 'cause they come in multiple textures.

- The brick is, the pictures that I took today, it's a little bit difficult to see exactly what it is, but I would agree with you. I know what you're saying. It just doesn't need to be something completely foreign to what the building is.

- If you challenge your masonry contractor and if they know what they're doing with historical stuff, a good mason should be able to look at the brick, he can tell what it is, and there are stock piles of old brick that quite frankly would if they know where to find those, they're replacing it with a similar material as opposed to buying something that's new and it might not be able to expand and contract at the same rate as that historic stuff that's there.

- Right. Like I said, it's a little bit tough to tell how much is actually gonna be having to be replaced until you get right up to it close.

- I think the other thing is that when you do the roof and the flashing that goes along that top edge, that trim, just make sure that it has a kick off so that any water that's sitting on the top gets diverted away from the face of the building.

- Correct.

- That half inch lip will make a tremendous difference so it doesn't want to wick back in and then capillary down the--

- Yup, .

- Yup.

- I'd make a motion on this one. Make a motion to approve.

- I'll second it.

- Are you asking them to change?

- I'm sorry, discussion.

- Yeah, go ahead.

- And no power washing?
- Right, yeah.
- With the contingency.
- Yes, with all contingencies.
- No pressure washing, paint with a permeable type paint, and brick a similar texture and size.
- Yup.
- Yup.
- So it's really just following the recommendations stated on the agenda.
- Correct.
- The only question I did have is that the, am I correct in the assumption that there is not a guideline on the color of the paint that goes over?
- Whatever you'd like.
- Pink and purple's fine.
- Within reason, Patrick, 'cause I can see it from my office.
- The color can be whatever you would like, but .
- Fair enough, okay.
- So we had a motion, we had a second. Is there any other discussion? I would say to voting.
- That was unanimously approved.
- So the, when the general contractor will submit for the, I mean, do we have to pull a permit?
- For roofing, I would imagine.
- Yeah, we will have to pull a permit of some type even if it's just general in nature. Part of that process will then request that the work has been approved via here. Correct.
- Correct?
- Yup.
- The pulling of the permit, can that commence tomorrow?
- Mm-hmm.
- Okay, all right. Perfect, okay, thank you.

- Thank you.

- Next item on the agenda is Item D4, certificate of appropriateness 19-33, a consideration of possible action on a design review for a window replacement at 504, okay, here we go, let's fight about this, Porlier, Porlier? Any other? 504 Porlier. Jason?

- Here it is on the map. The owner's submitted what they called a photograph from 1927. This is a copy of that and the windows in question are up in the forward facing dormer, if you will, those three pairs of windows with the survey says markers all up and down. Here's the photo from the national register district nomination. You can see in the center pair, the bottom bits have changed. So before, after. And here, the owner has supplied some photos. The photo on the right is the center grouping. You'll see it's not a big X in the window, but it's just one slash. And you'll see the router marks around the window frame suggest much more recent construction. We also have one photo of the interior of those flanking pairs. I guess if you're on the inside, this would be the left one. If you're on the outside, it's the right one. These may be original. I don't know. They're older. The request for COA involves replacing all six of the lot with some Pella Architect Series windows that will very closely match the originals. In the case of the center pair of windows which are not historic anyway, this is certainly a good idea. When looking at the flanking pairs of windows by the letter of the Secretary of the Interior Standards, perhaps it's not such a good idea, but this is where I kinda whisper if I was doing it, I'd want to replace them too, and take that for what you will.

- Yeah, I'd just also add that to remove the windows on either side, they're in very bad condition. So being able even to maintain some of the integrity even of the lattice work in 'em may be a challenge. So there's concern that in getting those two windows out, that we could lose glass, some of the work. The windows are in pretty rough shape.

- Could you elaborate on what you mean by rough shape? What exactly is wrong?

- Well, I think that if you look, some of the wood looks like it's a little compromised and then trying to blank on what holds the glass in.

- The glazing.

- The glazing is peeling very bad. So there's some flex to get that window free because there's many layers of paint on it that the windows and the lattice could just kind of let go.

- You know, to interject, if in the process of taking them out they accidentally became broken beyond repair, they would clearly need to be replaced. In order to maintain the windows properly, they do need to be removed. My recommendation is that if you do grant approval of the COA in its entirety that if the windows come out in one piece, I'd recommend they be put in the basement for somebody else some day to look and say hey, that's the original windows. How cool is that? But yes, it would be a real pity if they became broken. That by the Secretary of the Interior Standards, you're forced to replace, so. Wink, wink, nod, nod. Sorry, sorry.

- I would make a motion to approve it in its entirety.

- Second that motion.

- Any other discussion? Call for a vote.

- Unanimously approved.

- Thank you.

- Next item is Item D5, certificate of appropriateness 19-34, consideration with possible action on a design review for new awning sign located at 228 North Adam Street.

- Here's a picture. It's the former Liberty Cafe just across the street from Hotel Martha. The top two photos are cartoons showing what's proposed. The bottom right is a Google Street View. The recommendation is to approve. I note that sign installer says that they'll attach it to the mortar joints. I also note that there's no mortar joints in way of where they're attaching it, so. Somebody may be assuming that this is a straight forward matter when maybe it's gonna throw them a curve ball. Regardless, recommendation is to approve. They'll figure out a way to attach it.

- Question for you.

- Yes?

- So this property came up was it the last month or the month before?

- Month before.

- Oh, for the doors, yes?

- So that's just my question is is it just the property owner that we're dealing with this on multiple months that they didn't have their design for their awning done? Just curious.

- Yes. From what I understand is they didn't have the design of the awning selected yet when they were doing the door replacement. I'm not even sure they had a contract signed at that point. I know they were working through some of the window signage as well with other people in my department.

- Okay.

- Door replacement was by owner. Awning is by tenant.

- Tenant, okay.

- Oh, now I see. It's Ian's fault.

- That's right.

- You might be able to help guide them where to anchor the awning, so.

- Yeah, .

- I would make a motion to approve this request.

- Second that.

- Any other discussion?

- Call to a vote.

- It was approved with one abstention.

- Okay. Next item is Item D6, certificate of appropriateness 19-35, consideration of possible action on a design review for a replacement window and a deck replacement at 840 South Quincy Street.

- Here's the map. It's not the corner property, but the one further to the northeast. So the front, sorry, yup, right there. The front view is at the top left. The property owner supplied the rear view which I ordinarily wouldn't notice because I can't see it from the public right of way. That's in the photo at bottom left. Note the deck. In the center bottom is the proposed new deck which is larger in that it goes past the, you want to call it bay, but past the oriel window in the center. And bottom right shows the footprint of the proposed deck. LC staff recommends approval. None of this is visible from the public right of way.

- Yeah.

- Motions are made.

- Second.

- Any discussion? We have voting again.

- Unanimously approved.

- All right.

- Thank you.

- We are on to item E on the agenda. EI staff level certificate of appropriateness applications.

- We had one. This was a stop work order. We see you doing something. A new roof at 918, was it Emily? Cool, they're getting a new roof. The real heartbreaker there is that it's a \$20,000 roof. It would have been eligible for tax credits but the work had started before anybody thought to check into it. That's it.

- I think there were more than that.

- Were there? Damn, I dropped the ball.

- Pretty sure. I probably should have put them in the before I gave it to you. Let me look.

- Yeah, there was a list.

- Was there? Oh, then I screwed up.

- Does anyone know where that started?

- It's the last page of the packet.

- 26?

- 25.

- That was a driveway on 1120 South Quincy Street. Did the mural, the dream mural on . We did.

- Oh yeah, we talked about that last time.

- It must be the next ones. 838 South Jackson got a porch. Yeah, we did that.

- And the fence we did last time, too.

- Oh, I'm just bad at my job.
- Well, these were in the special meeting, I think, or one or more was so that kind of...
- That was kind of confusing.
- E2, raise and repair orders.
- We have none this month.
- Great. Staff update.
- I think last time we met that I told you we were meeting with another person to do another revolving loan that was signed and it's gonna be recorded next week. So we've secured our two revolving loans this month and I just got another application for another one though I'm not sure that they'll follow through on it. It's a much larger project than \$10,000, so I don't know if they'll actually do it. But I think that's all that I have.
- I need to write a letter to the State Preservation Office. It's a letter of intent saying that the city of Green Bay would like to apply for the grant money, that CLG grant money to begin work on a new intensive survey through the city. I don't know if at the end of that rainbow, it means an update to the old one plus new areas or it'll focus on new areas, but it's a big project and we'll get the ball rolling at this month.
- I certainly think it should be updated, not just added to.
- No, it's an important tool.
- It's significantly out of date.
- And that tool can help drive investment and redevelopment.
- '87, '88? Yeah, it's old.
- It is old.
- There's a number of buildings in there that no longer exist.
- No longer exist and I think there's some residential neighborhoods that are probably now eligible. And to bring tax credits to home owners is a good thing even if home owners maybe don't like it. I think that's all I've got unless we were talking about anything else.
- I don't think so.
- Okay, last thing is date of next meeting which I don't think is correct on here anymore.
- What's on there, no.
- I was just looking at my calendar. The 14th which would be our usual meeting is Columbus Day so is City Hall closed that day?
- That's so funny. Of course, we're not. We're very open. I'm gonna be in Montana on the 14th, so I'd sent you guys an email asking if the 7th would work to have a meeting. I heard back from David that he would not be

able to attend and Susan and Ron said they would be able to. So if I can just secure that there will be a quorum on the 7th, that's when we'll have it. If we have no obligations, we won't have a meeting at all.

- I can attend.

- Yup. I was gonna ask you to move it anyways 'cause the 14th is the Monday night Packer game.

- And I care so deeply about that. No, I won't be in town. So we're planning the 7th. We have the room secured and everything, but I haven't got any applications for next meeting yet. That doesn't mean we won't get any, so.

- Sure. All right.

- Very good.

- Do we need a motion to adjourn?

- Yes.

- Okay, so made.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [All] Aye.

- Meeting adjourned. Thank you everybody.

- Just for informational purposes, what is--