



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 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, Susan Ley, Ron Dehn, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, Ian Griffiths,
Excused: Justin Balsley

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the November 11, 2019, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Susan Ley to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

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

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the October 7, 2019, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Susan Ley to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

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

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 19-47) Consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement doors and windows located at 1033 S. Quincy Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve COA 19-47, subject to the following conditions:

1. The window replacement is approved as proposed.
2. The replacement of both the front and rear door is denied. Motion carried.

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

2. (COA 19-50) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a roof dormer located at 912 S. Madison Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve COA 19-50 as proposed. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax, 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, December 9, 2019

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ron Dehn to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Call to order the Monday November 11th meeting of the Landmark's Commission. We'll start with the role call. Susan?

- Here.

- Veronica?

- Present.

- Justin?

- [Susan] Excused.

- Ron?

- Here.

- Ian?

- Here, but not connected.

- And David, here. Okay, everybody present except for Justin. Item B on the agenda is the approval of tonight's meeting agenda. It was in the packet, does anybody have any corrections or modifications to tonight's agenda? Hearing none, all in favor of approval of the agenda signify by saying aye.

- [Attendees] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. Item C is the approval of the minutes from the October 7, 2019 meeting of the Landmark's Commission. Those meeting minutes were in your packet. Are there any discussions, corrections, or comments on those meetings minutes? Hearing none, I call for approval of those minutes. Signify by saying aye.

- [Attendees] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. Item D, regular business. First item on the agenda, is certificate of appropriateness 19-47, consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement doors and windows located at 1033 South Quincy Street. Jason?

- [Jason] Here you see it on the map, it's across the street from, what school is that? Thank you, I thought it might be. Picture of the house that I took this morning. It's a contributing property within Astor. I forget, did I write down there, built 1922ish. It is not a priority property. But it has a good degree of integrity. A lot of original siding, with the exception I think, in that little dormer up high. A lot of original windows, but I couldn't tell you if they're all original. Here, I just wanna call your attention to the front door. You see the door with sidelights. And, you know, this is one of those recommendations I don't necessarily feel good about, but I

wanna talk more about the door. You see it's got three sidelight windows, on either side. You see that they're kind of sort of the same height as the partition in the windows to either side.

- Mm-hmm .

- Mm-hmm .

- [Jason] Excellent. So the application calls for the replacement of the front door. You see the current front door, top left. It's got that nine light window, with the sidelights to either side. Each sidelight having three panes of glass. The blue door, as best I can tell, is an example of what the closest replacement is. The five light sidelights, as I understand it, are also what the proposed replacement is. Moving on to the top right, you see the back door and the proposed replacement for the back door. I know that the back door kind of matches the front door, in general handling design. And then, bottom center you see a picture of the paired windows, that they're proposing to replace. Based on the Secretary of Interior Standards, it's very clear repair rather than replace. Based on this, I would recommend denial. But, again, I said as a person, I don't feel great about that. I know that the back door, had they not sent me a photo, I wouldn't have known you had a back door. So, it's typical that the back doors had been replaced. In this case, it appears to be original. Windows are a bigger deal. That is very much a repair rather than replace issue, so long as it can be repaired. Based on the photo, it would appear that this could be repaired, if need be. The front door, I kind of had to kick to you. Again, I'm recommending denial on all of these, just because they could all be repaired, rather than replaced. But, as a realist, I'd say, you know, I don't so much care about the back door. The windows, where you draw the line, if you trade out some good windows, you're kind of giving a green light to trade out all the windows. But on the front door, you know, I would say the front door, as does the Secretary of the Interior, that it's a character defining element. And while I could see replacing a front door, perhaps, here you've got an original one that doesn't really quite look like the one that they're calling for to replace it. So, that one I'd have the most turned down I suppose. In the end, it's up to you folks, so. You may want to address these individually though, the back door, the windows and the front door.

- Do we know the windows, I thought that it was proposed that they were a Pella architect series window?

- [Jason] They're proposing to replace the original paired windows shown here, with Pella architect series. They're a very good match, with the muntins that actually have you know, OG profiles on the interior and the exterior, with the spacer in between the panes.

- And explain to us, I mean, because of the match, because of the Pella architect series have been approved by this commission in the past, as being a very historically accurate window, the only thing we're really losing then, is just the original windows to the building.

- That's correct.

- And this does not front the public right of way.

- [Jason] I guess my issue there is, I just came from a conference where they kept screaming about keeping the original windows.

- Oh.

- Is the property owner here? No? Guess we're on our own tonight.

- Again, I mean as far as the back door goes, that's not visible from the right of away, correct?

- Correct.

- Any way shape or form, so.

- And realistically, most properties have already replaced the back door.

- Yeah.

- In which case, replacing a replacement is fine. Here, my minor hesitation is that the back door clearly matches the front door. Okay, so you've got an original element. If you remove and replace it, it is a ding to the integrity of this house. Is it such that it's gonna bump the house from contributing to non-contributing, no. Is this a high priority priority, no. So, as a realistic person, which, you do not pay me to represent. I don't so much care about the back door. The Secretary of the Interior Standards says, repair rather than replace.

- Do we have any knowledge of why they're doing this? They appear to be in good condition.

- [Jason] I have no information on the reason why.

- I mean, like said, like looking in the case of my home, I know that I have a door that looks like it's from the original property, but it's actually from another old home. So it's not door. So whether it's original to the property or not, is another question.

- Yeah, in this case, it would seem that if they're not original to this property, they found two matching doors.

- Sure. Sure. More dubious that they'd be some other property.

- Right, right.

- You know, just a thought.

- And the adjacent sidelights, are matching.

- Matching.

- Yeah.

- [Jason] And if you're speaking of the front door, you know, I call your attention to the proposed replacement. The height of that window, would no longer, there seems to have been some intent of design, that there was a line maintained across the facade.

- Yep.

- Is it the upper most window?

- [Jason] No the window to be replaced is around, looking at this, it would be over on the left side, facing the neighboring property.

- Oh, okay.

- Just the one?

- [Jason] Just the pair, yes. And on the front I think the first story windows are original. I think the dormer windows are original. The center second story appear to be original, I'm not sure about the left, right sides. replacements or . I didn't get out of the car, it was cold, you know? So I don't know what I can say to make your decision easier on this, but.

- And the lights, adjacent to the front door, run top to bottom?
- [Jason] Opposed to the proposed pillar replacement as a five light, sidelight. So they--
- Look, yeah fallen.
- [Jason] They look like the blue door there on the top left, I suppose, I don't know what color of course, but.
- The blue one.
- [Jason] I don't know what color they would
- Yeah.
- Purchase, but.
- I don't feel like we have enough information. My instincts are telling me that those sidelights are being custom built, to fit the existing old one. And if that's the case, then why would they be you know, custom built to replicate what's there. Without a submission and without a property owner here, we really don't have, any reasoning or rationale as to why they've chosen to do what they are doing. I would be inclined to approve the window replacement and reject the replacement of the front and rear door at this time.
- [Jason] I'd second that motion.
- So we've got a motion on the floor. Is there any further discussion?
- Nope.
- We'll be voting. Is it noted in the, what he just seconded?
- [Stephanie] Mm-hmm .
- Okay, gotcha.
- [Stephanie] Is yours up, Susan?
- I don't see anything yet, I'm voting.
- Oh. Would you like to vote, as well?
- What the heck? Just waiting for it to pop up.
- [Stephanie] So yes?
- I don't have anything yet.
- [Stephanie] Yeah, can you voice vote for us, instead?
- Oh, yes.
- [Stephanie] Okay. Then that passes unanimously.

- Okay. Next item on the agenda is Item D2, certificate of appropriateness, 19-50, consideration with possible action on design review for a move to owner located at 912 South Madison Street. Jason?

- [Jason] Here we are on the map. I think the most recognizable landmark is the house just to the north on the corner. The huge, red brick one. Not to say this house isn't recognizable in its own right. Built in the 1880s, by the owner of a lumber mill. When I look at this photo I instantly think that I see additions. And maybe that's not the case. The 1907 Sanborn map shows it more or less in its current configuration. So this addition looking thing on the left, was present by the time of 1907. So you might have a very brambly house, that perhaps the owner of the lumber mill may have designed and built himself, because he has the materials and you know, arrives at an aesthetic conclusion that looks like an addition. I don't know. Where we'll be looking. If you look at that map, we're gonna be looking around say on the top left corner here, in a second. Pardon me while I nerd out for a second. He's got a one story playhouse in the back in 1907. That's kind of unique. It's not there anymore. So around back in the corner, the proposal is to build a dormer to the left of the stick figure who's standing in the second story addition. It would be a dormer above what was an enclosed back porch at some point. This is a contributing property. It has relatively low integrity, because of replacement siding, replacement windows and of course, you can see all the changes here on this back corner. In the end, I'm recommending approval of the application, because the new work would be differentiable from the old and respectful to size, massing and style of this historic building. The addition is not visible, as best I can tell, from a public right of way. And frankly, it kind of keeps to the rambling vernacular style of what's been built, so. I'll have a heart attack over a window, but this dormer addition, hey, that's good. Any questions? So there's a stick figure standing--

- Yeah, I see him. Yeah, hanging there whatever.

- [Jason] So this would be a shed roof dormer above that enclosed porch corner.

- Gotcha.

- [Jason] Which would allow a person to walk in to what's unusable space currently and not have to crawl. I think it's for a closet.

- Well .

- [Jason] And there's new roof shingles too. But we can approve that at the staff level, or if you throw it into the motion, that would be great too.

- It's on the back side of the house. It's not visible from the street. Quite frankly, I think it matches the existing character of the house, so I would recommend approval.

- Second that.

- We've got a seconded motion. Any other discussion by anybody? David, you wanna again? We're voting.

- [Stephanie] That was approved.

- All right. Great, fantastic. We're on to item E, informational agenda items. The first would be a staff level certificate of appropriateness applications.

- [Jason] So first up, number 45. So this is at 816 Shawno. You may remember them as folks with wooden soffits. Their garage has this person access door. I approved it. Any questions on that? I think it was probably in worse shape, than what the showed. 1043 South Van Buren a garage roof and gutters. You know, a little bit of personal hesitation there, because we have nice half round gutters and the fancy metal cresting, but, we had

nothing to say to that shouldn't be replaced, so. Approved and noted too that the half round gutters are appropriate and the cresting is pretty cool, if they should try and do that again.

- Do you know what their intention is?

- [Jason] I guess shingle.

- Okay.

- With gutters, they didn't specify, I'm guessing, anytime specifies gutters, it's gonna be a case style gutter. But half rounds are pretty cool. You can still get them.

- Yeah.

- [Jason] 739 South Jackson, number 48. They, oh wait, I think somebody else. But they want a fence in the backyard. So, fence in the backyard. 722 South Monroe, had a big list of things, but only two that warranted any consideration by this group. Replacing a non-historic back door. With something that will look more historic. It'll be a paneled door. Sorry, I didn't anticipate it would be so much of an eye chart there, but it's a multi-panel solid back door. Then they went and put in wood storm window, which is awesome. So, gave them a thumbs up for having done that. And they're also putting fire extinguishers and doing some furnace work and . I don't know, I was on the .

- Is that a multi-unit?

- I think so, yeah.

- Yeah. I think that's a three or four plex.

- Okay.

- [Jason] Really cool big house.

- Yeah.

- [Jason] The door will be an improvement. Wooden storm windows, always a good thing. 109 North Broadway. It's a new sign. It's replacing an existing sign, so the half circle sign will become why is it so much easier to read on my screen?

- Something ?

- Broadway Exchange Company Antiques.

- Oh antiques.

- Vintage.

- Vintage.

- [Jason] So that was approved. They want a new roof. That's fine, we approved that, with the condition that it doesn't wrap over the cornice, or is in any way visible under the coping, or over the coping there in the front of the facade. Then drain pipes and some insulation decking, and stuff you won't see any of that from the road. That was it for staff level COAs.

- Okay. Raise and repair orders.

- [Jason] One property, 1115 Wertz. It's on the west side. According to the raise repair order, it has a lot of issues, foundation, roof. Multiple ceilings, windows, doors, plumbing, heating. Anything you can think to criticize, it was criticized, I suppose. I see no reason to think that this house is individually eligible for National Registry listing. If it's eligible, it's part of a district, we don't. That's it for.

- Okay. Staff update?

- [Jason] I sent in our application to the State Historic Preservation Office for a grant to do the update to the Intensive Resource Survey Report. We got three responses from potential bidders. Two of which were serious enough to have more than you know, one sentence, they sent in a packet. Looks like, from those two, they're estimating nine-ish years, at \$25,000 a year. So, indeed I sent in our application for the grant. Cautiously optimistic that we will receive that. Cautious because the grant is pretty easy to fill out. Just a couple of sentences in ink. Hope that's good enough. Anecdotally, I've heard in the past, that the state has had trouble giving away the money. So, hopefully this goes to the front of the line. It's been 32 years or so, since our Intensive Survey Report was published. The state looks at 25 years or more, we have not been a recipient of this grant money in our past. You know, we've ticked off boxes, so. That's the extent of my staff update.

- [Stephanie] That's all effective, so.

- Okay. Date of our next meeting is Monday, December 9, 2019. Be the last meeting of the year, I think. Anybody else have any other items?

- [Jason] If that's our last meeting, would it be all right to, visit a lot of the things that we approved? Revisit many of the things that we approved, during the course of the year, just as a

- Summary.

- [Jason] Yeah, like, let me authorize this, COA, here's the final product.

- Mm-hmm .

- Yeah, we usually are, recording upstairs, so we can just do that as a presentation.

- Yeah, I think that would be good to do that. Like, twice a year, about every six months or so.

- It'll add time, but.

- Who's bringing treats?

- [Stephanie] Veronica, obviously.

- Anyone can do it.

- Okay. If there's not any other business, I look for a motion to adjourn.

- So moved.

- Second.

- Second.

- All in favor?
- [Attendees] Aye.
- Any opposed? Meeting adjourned. Take care, everybody.