



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2020, 4:30 PM

Telephonic Meeting

Public may also view at

www.youtube.com/CityOfGreenBay

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION

I. Please find information to join this meeting via "zoom meeting" along with instructions.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Present: Ian Griffiths, Veronica Corpus-Dax, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Paul Martzke, David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Excused: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the April 13, 2020, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

1. Approval of the minutes from the March 2, 2020, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 20-05) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a sign located at 645 S. Irwin Avenue

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ald. Veronica Corpus-Dax to approve COA 20-05. Motion carried.

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

2. (COA 20-06) Consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement garage doors, roof replacement, and window replacement at 728 S. Jefferson Street

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve COA 20-06 subject to the following conditions:

1. The new windows shall be specified as I/I types similar to those currently present.

2. The new roof shingles shall be specified as asphalt type, but not "high definition" or equivalent.

Motion carried.

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

3. (COA 20-07) Consideration with possible action on a design review for new windows and doors at 235 N. Broadway

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by David Siegel to hold COA 20-07 until further information is provided from the applicant. Motion carried.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

No report.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

No action taken.

3. Staff Update.

S. Hummel provided the staff update.

4. Date of next meeting: Monday, May 11, 2020

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ian Griffiths to adjourn. Motion carried.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- I'll return this over to Paul, Shelby if you want to unmute Paul Martzke. And then you run in civic clerk from home. So I'm gonna try to keep up as much as I can, but there might be a little bit of lag between running the meeting and getting this updated 'cause I'm doing this all from home. So, Paul if you wanna take over on the agenda with the roll call, we can start there.

- Yeah, that's fine. I'll call the Landmarks Commission meeting of Monday, April 13th, 2020 to order. From is the roll call, Susan Ley. Veronica.

- Present.

- Justin.

- Ron.

- Ian.

- Yeah.

- David.

- Present. Okay, so we've got a full slate tonight. Next item on the agenda is item C, that's the approval of tonight's agenda. Does anybody have any changes, edits, alterations to the agenda? Hearing none, I would ask for a motion to approve the agenda.

- So moved, Veronica.

- Second, Justin.

- All in favor of approving tonight's agenda, signify by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay, the agenda has been approved. Next item is item D, approval of the minutes from the march 2nd 2020 meeting of the landmarks commission. Now, does anybody have any edits or revisions needed to those meeting minutes? Hearing none, I'd ask for a motion to approve the march 2nd meeting minutes.

- Veronica, so moved.

- Ron Dehn, second.

- All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Members] Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. On to item E, regular business. Item E1 is Certificate of appropriateness 20-5 consideration with possible action on a design review for a site located at 645 South Irwin Avenue. You wanna take us through a staff report on this?

- No, but I can. In your packets, I believe it's the 12th page of 45 as PDFs go, there's a brief write up on that. More specifically, then on the 14th page of 45. There's a rendering of the sign that's going to go somewhat near this Soul Church. It has no impact on the historic integrity of the property and I recommend approval.

- Any discussion from the members of the Commission?

- I guess I have one question. Is it a permanent sign or temporary?

- It's a permanent sign.

- It's just all that it has the leasing office and townhomes located that it's very specific.

- I think they have it labeled like that because the townhomes are actually around the corner and so is the leasing office, so instead of putting the sign right in front of them, they have it on the Irwin's. I'm not sure why they decided that in the applicant it is not on the line. But I think it's because it's not located at the same address or on the same street.

- Okay.
- Is there anyone may wanna present a motion for this side?
- Ron here, I will make a motion to approve.
- Veronica, I'll second.
- Any other further discussion? Okay, then I think we're voting on that motion and we're using city clerk for that, Stephanie.
- I know voice vote would be preferred.
- Okay, Susan. Susan, your mic was off, I couldn't hear. I think that was aye.
- Yeah. Okay.
- Veronica?
- Yes.
- Justin.
- Yay.
- Ron.
- Yay.
- Ian.
- Yay. And David.
- Yes.
- And I also vote yay. Motion carries unanimously. Next item on the agenda is item E2, Certificate of appropriateness 20-6, consideration with possible action on design review for replacement of garage doors, roof Replacement and window replacement at 728 South Jefferson Street. Jason.
- So there's a small house in the Astor neighborhood. It is a contributing property but it's got all replacement siding, all replacement windows, for the proposed project, I'm recommending approval on the condition of course that the new windows more or less look like the current ones, like a one pane over one pane not, like the thing behind me. And the roof shingles be, asphalt roof shingles is fine, as long as they're not calling out high definition or enhanced shadow lines or something like that, Shippo really doesn't like those.
- Does members of the commission have any questions or discussion on this item?

- Yeah, and they have agreed to those conditions?
- Kevin King is on the line with us. He is the one who's our applicant, he also works with us in our department. So he can speak to that, Kevin.
- Yes, the homeowner is looking to make some several improvements on the home mostly on the interior but the exterior improvements she's agreed to.
- Did everybody hear that?
- Yes.
- Yes.
- So if there's no other discussion, I would make a motion to approve this item.
- Ron here, I will second that.
- Any further discussion? Okay, then voice vote. Start with Susan.
- Aye.
- Veronica.
- Aye.
- Justin.
- Yay.
- Ron.
- Aye.
- Ian.
- Aye.
- David?
- Aye.
- I also vote aye, motion carries. Item E3, Certificate of Appropriateness 20-7, consideration with possible action on a design review for new windows and doors at 235 North Broadway. Jason.
- This building is the Platinum place building, it is contributing, the only concerns I had are those that come from Shippo, and I'm understanding that these are not really concerns because the owner

wants to do it the right way, I guess. First of all, they're proposing window frames, new window frames and door frames, all of that to be aluminum. That's fine, but this aluminum work can't be anodized it would need to be painted or something else. The glass to be used on the storefront windows needs to have a light transmissivity value of 72 or higher. The owner is provided cut sheets that specify a LTV of 73, so that's good. The only thing that I am not entirely certain on is if this property has or has not received tax credits within the last five years. I don't think that it has, but if it has, then everything we're talking about needs to have explicit Shippo approval.

- So the question on that, that's still the responsibility of the property owner, correct?

- Yes. They're aware of that as well, he's the property owner. He was supposed to be looking into that. So we can just condition it in case that does come up, he's been researching that.

- Okay. The other question I had is just looking at what was submitted. We really don't have any knowledge that the aluminum is painted as opposed to anodized, the glass specs are not included up. Again, are we approving it conditionally on these items?

- We have had some correspondence that's not included here. And the email correspondence said specifically that the aluminum was to be painted. And we got some very detailed cut sheets on the glass noting an LTV value of 73 which fickle requirements. So I'm satisfied that they've said the right things. I think maybe it wouldn't hurt just to have them commit to that as a condition though.

- And just out of curiosity sake, did we see this project previously?

- Right, I was thinking the same.

- I think that it was for something different if I remember correctly, Jason would have to, he's probably got about memory than I do. Either they change the sign

- What's the one they change the sign, they took off the aquarium advanced aquarium sign, then put up a platinum sign?

- I thought we saw the window replacement project before.

- Yeah, I thought so too.

- Yeah, now that you mentioned that's right, I think they did come before us about the windows.

- I guess I also have some questions about what was actually existing. None of the documentation here shows what the existing elevations are. So if you look at like sheet a 9.5, the vertical mullions in the main vision windows don't align with the mullions in the upper clear story windows. I don't know if they presently do, but it looks very odd in this elevation.

- We do have the applicant on the line, Cheryl, if you wanted to interject with any of that information.

- Sure. So the mullions do not currently line up. We do Have an existing you can all hear me, right?

- Yep.

- So we do have an existing elevation. The reason it's been resubmitted is because our scope of work is different than it was originally. So we're proposing to take off the T1-T1 siding that is above the awnings and replace that with Windows.

- So the windows that currently on or not?

- There are windows behind that siding, yes. So we're proposing to bring it back to more of its original state. And the reason the mullions don't line up is because that that transformer, that clear storey is divided into three equal parts, and because of the angle for the entrances, it just doesn't line up. So our intention would be to try to line at least one of them up, but then the bottom windows would be asymmetrical if you will.

- But it wouldn't be better to have two of the three all, three align but not aligning with the ones above. No unit is separated from the punched open and distinctly by wall of brick was the window within the window doesn't align, looks very odd. Do you have record of what the tear story windows were before?

- Some of the existing ones are like leaded glass. If they're buried behind the siding on the outside, they have some sort of drywall or interior finish on the inside so we can't tell what they are, in some cases.

- Has it been reviewed by Shippo or not?

- I do not know that information, I'm actually the general contractor that's working on the project. Skip would know that information more than I would.

- Jason, are you aware if it's been reviewed by Shippo or do they not need to review it now?

- They won't need to review it if it's outside of that five year period. So because they got the credit before in within five years, they would have to have it re approved. But I don't know what the last time that they received those credits, that's what Skip was supposed to provide to us. So we don't have that information yet. What if Shippo needs to do a review that would supersede our recommendation as well.

- I think their feedback might also pertain to those player storey windows and how they align.

- Right now we're matching the existing vertical mullions which the lowest piece to clear storey, yes. So how it's drawn is a match to what's there currently. It would be our intention that if it makes sense, we would love to line up the mullions vertically. It is more architecturally statically pleasing.

- The base of these windows fluctuates as well. So you have one that's maybe three or four stack brick and then one that metal panel or some sort of aluminium another one that's maybe we high or low. That's how it is existing. So our intention is to pull back the windows to the existing masonry opening and use the existing masonry openings without having to manipulate any of the masonry. We do not know what is behind the existing aluminum panels. So in those circumstances, that's what we're proposing, either a new ACM panel or spandrel glass panel.

- Well, I would echo Ian's comments. I don't understand why the mullions on the transoms would not line up with the mullions for the globe, the storefront below I think it's gonna look weird if those two vertical pieces aren't aligned up.
- And then over on 9.6 on the far right on the Broadway elevation, there's four Windows and then three above and a doorway below.
- Yeah, same thing there. Why wouldn't that transom be divided into four lights?
- And we were just matching what's existing. It is divided.
- So a 9.6 one on the corner, to the far right where there's the forest lights, you're not replacing that storefront down below?
- 9.6 four lights. Oh, that's the corner. Yes, that will be replaced. So that's the corner unit and that door is clipped at a 45 degree inside the building.
- Right I understand the doors that have 45 but the four windows in the storefront are not correct.
- Correct, so you'd rather see that clear story window or that transom window to the corner line up with that corner mullion and then divide that into four or three.
- I think that's what we're saying is it Ian?
- I guess it's hard to know what it used to look like. And if and we know that all the transoms are three.
- You know that, okay.
- Yeah, we know that for certain.
- I guess some of that documentation in this packet would have been useful.
- All of the volume that are there currently, that will put on just a couple of years ago with a big heavy aluminum brackets that hold them on, are all coming off and staying off.
- The intention is to put them back on.
- So we wouldn't see these windows anyway.
- The awning goes between the mullion, the horizontal mullion of the clear story window and the bottom which is where it is currently.
- So, the story window was set up above.
- Yes, sir.

- I guess you know, it's when the drawing doesn't represent what the final product is gonna be or we don't have the info of what's currently there, it's hard to make a final determination on...

- On the 9.6.

- Yep.

- All the units the mullions will line up except for the corner one.

- Yep.

- And we thought it was more appropriate to have the clear story match the other four, instead of making that corner different and then 9.5. They will all line up. It's just a bad picture but they all line up. They're offset a couple inches on this picture but that's just a bad drawing. The shop drawings for the windows showing them lining up perfectly, which I thought was submitted along with the glass submittal.

- What is the timeline for the proposed work?

- Like to get started as soon as it's approved.

- I guess I would agree with his comment it does appear the shop drawings do show the mullions still line up. Have you seen it Ian?

- Yeah. I'm not sure which one is accurate I mean not awful mullion. I've been looking at sheet I don't know what she did is that all one have to but the grading area I guess why are those graded is that spandrel glass.

- That's currently where the metal panels are. So when the existing building and the existing windows that's a metal panel right now. So the interior finish, there's a window ledge right there in the insight.

- So is that clear glass?

- No, it's gonna be painted the same color as the frame.

- I have a small concern that I'm noticing here. Just throw something else in the works on the Dawson elevation, Flying point five. In the fourth Bay from the left, it's calling for a new aluminum storefront transoms. And when I look at the Street View Google Maps I see that the existing transom there has already been exposed and what's there is historic glass block transoms which kind of makes me question what you're going to find when you remove the siding from the other transoms because I would not recommend removing historic glass block transom windows.

- If I'm not mistaken, some of those transoms are leaded glass on the downspouts side, those would be replaced or they're like two levels of glass. There's an exterior and then there are some interior historic windows, if my memory serves from just from walking that route I would hate to see those disposed off.

- Yeah, I guess I can't see clearly enough it looks like maybe leaded glass squares. Yeah not glass blocks but yeah, those are the things that I wouldn't recommend replacing with new.

- Yeah, that is what's being proposed right now. And it's hard saying whether that's occurring underneath the TI-II that's there right now, too. There's the signage, that's in some of the existing windows are gonna remain as it's?

- That's the responsibility of the tenants and or the landlord. But it would have to be replaced.

- Yeah.

- Oh yeah. So Jason, you think that after some of this is removed that more bad type of lock transom might be exposed?

- If you look at the tenant space all the way at the end, that's the leaded glass. The one in between the glass block and the leaded glass just looks like regular single pane window with some frost.

- You know right now, on Broadway the fourth, the middle bay of the five is divided into four and what's showing on your drawing is dividing into three.

- So how do we remedy this through public process? Do we first want the removal of that citing to see what transoms exist currently so that we have a better idea or are we less concerned with that because those awnings will be going back up. Like what process do we want to take here?

- I think the applicant needs to submit a full set of drawings that are affecting the conditions that are gonna be indicative of what's happening at the end. These drawings don't align with what the intent is.

- Well, I would say that my biggest concern is simply what's behind the plywood soffit or fascia that's coming down. If that's a glass block behind it, I have a really hard time tearing that out and replacing it with modern transoms. The awnings, even if they're put back up or below that, so you're still going to see the transoms.

- Yeah, first, let's blow that thing out.

- The commission would prefer that we left the siding then, we can't replace the bottom window and leave the top because the bottom windows supports the top.

- First take the siding off and see what's there and take it from there determine a course of action FTC what's underneath that.

- That'd be agreeable Chad's but first, remove that citing to see what's underneath and then go from there with a course of action for window replacement.

- From a cost perspective, I don't think that is gonna make sense to the building owner.

- I would have guess if those transforms are not known and it's a go or no go at this point I would recommend denial.

- Sleeve the transoms covered.

- With original proposal when it was brought before you guys the first time was to leave the TI-II siding there. I believe that got approved actually. I don't know for sure we were not involved at that point, but I thought it did.

- That sounds right, I can't check, I don't have my files here.

- So again, we could see the majority of the units the only one we couldn't see was the corner. So the one two, not those on the other corner match the Lucky Dog Rescue. So they're not leaded, they're just single pane windows. The only two or that look like to be anything historical and I don't think it's class, like I think like individual mold squares of glass or leaded glass and then that corner unit on Delson is two leaded glass. And so it was brought to the owners attention that we would save those pieces, but then it would be his responsibility or the tenants responsibility to rehang them, so we can get the insulated glass properties we're looking for, but then reuse the historic elements. I think if we could approve it with some sort of condition that we reuse those historic elements after we get the insulated glass installed, that would be the best of both worlds.

- I guess I don't know what you mean by reuse the historic elements, you'd be hanging them back behind the replacement glass is that what you mean?

- Whatever your recommendation would be, it would be more it would make more sense to put them on the inside as far as like preserving it.

- Well plainly, yeah.

- But from a exterior look, you're gonna wanna see from the outside so...

- Right right.

- The base of some of these windows I can't tell from the street view like the one to the left of Lucky Dog which appears to be brick on the drawing doesn't to me look like brick.

- They're metal panel right now.

- So it's a vertical powder coated metal panel.

- To my recollection all the windows on the Broadway side or the ones that have a notable historic value to me just as a pedestrian are the ones on the talisman side. The ones particularly that are in that corner where the re-salvage places now and the Broadway ones I don't ever really. Remember it's standing out too much. In fact, I remember seeing a lot of rot at the bottom of the ones at the advanced aquarium like when they first moved out or the photography place was going in, I remember looking in and you could see the dry rot in there. The Dowson ones looked like they're in pretty good condition from my recollection.

- My two senses there's insufficient documentation here for us to make a judgment.

- I wouldn't be on board with sacrificing the ones that are historic and aesthetically pleasing in order to solve the problem of the ones that absolutely have to be replaced, for installation reasons or whatever. But yeah, I'm with you know, insufficient now maybe.
- More information and perhaps we could do a special meeting. Now they want to get going with us.
- Yeah, I don't know about you guys, but I've got plenty of time at my home office so I'd be happy to set up a special meeting, if we all just wanna go walk around the building, take a look at it in person and get some more information from the applicant concerning or what their plan is anything else that we need, we can just set up a group email too, so that way we can all, just kind of have from the applicant, and then have some time to go in person because I know each storefront does look a little different. So I'd be nice to go out there with the plans and go from there so, I would be okay with that. We should be able to set up a special meeting pretty easily.
- I think if we do have no idea how to go back to the shippo, I think that would make a determination right there, send down the Gen Davonne to get their recommendation.
- Yeah, I know that we still have to review anything that needs shippo review, but comply with what they're doing because they're standards are higher than ours. So we could always do a table on this item until we have that information from the property owner on if a shippo review would be required. And then from there we can reconvene at a special meet, and then also the knowledge of shippo review as well if we wanna go that route.
- Make sense to me.
- Yeah, that sounds good.
- Nice job of reutilizing the building, I would just hate to spoil it at this point.
- Well, I think it's critical that we get that T1-I1 plywood off of that facade and never was supposed to be there in the first place, it's a poor way of treating that. And I do think that the new transoms are an improvement on that but I don't wanna sacrifice the existing leaded glass transoms if they're still there. To me, that's where the Glazers got to come back and figure out how to make that work.
- Is there any discussion about removing T1-I1, that's at the top of the building?
- As part of this contract for us, okay.
- Okay.
- Thank you, I think I know what I need to do.
- What was the action we need to take them especially we wanna give them good direction if we are tabling this, so that we can accomplish what needs to be done so that the owner isn't unnecessarily delayed here.
- Right.

- We would like to have a motion to hold the item then until further in this report from there, I will send out an email to both Chad and the property owner and I will include Jason and Paul as the chair so that we can have a rolling conversation about what other information we may need. And then also talking to shippo about those requirements. So from you, I would just need a motion to hold.

- I'll make that motion.

- This is David, I'll second that.

- We're all in favor with voice vote him.

- Yes.

- Veronica.

- Aye.

- Susan.

- Aye.

- David.

- Aye.

- Justin.

- Aye.

- Ron.

- Aye.

- And I also vote aye. Okay, thank you everybody for that. On to item F, Informational Agenda Items. First thing is staff level Certificate of appropriateness applications.

- We have had no application since our last meeting.

- Okay. Item F2 is review city raising repair orders and demolitions.

- We had to hook up then, I'm sorry.

- There's two of them. One is a garage behind a post war minimal traditional and the other one's a remodeled 19th century cottage with nothing noted on that from the state.

- So it was an 18th century.

- I don't know that we have one but a lot has happened in the past month, so I couldn't be missing something. We did get that award from the Brown County Historical Society but we were unable to accept it because they had to cancel their awards dinner but once they re appoint that I'll be sure to let everyone know. I'm not sure what the award is for, we didn't get really a lot of information on it but I'm excited that we are getting noticed in our community so that's great. I don't know if Jason has anything else to update, he is obviously alive and well so that's very exciting news.

- Yeah, not dead Yet. I think there's a little bit of chatter starting up again about the CLG grants money that we're getting, but that everything's kind of taking a backseat to the COVID stuff lately so, I don't know a whole lot news.

- Well, it's good to see your face again, Jason.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- Yeah thanks, good to be seen.

- Does anybody have any other issues for tonight?

- No.

- No.

- Nope.

- Okay, I think this format works pretty good. I don't know how we're gonna ever get done a meeting in less than 30 minutes but, David you can you can be proud of the fact this is the shortest online meeting this commission has ever had.

- It is true. and the longest.

- And when you over explain the joke, it kind of loses its punch.

- The day or next meeting would be the official meeting would be Monday, May 11. But obviously if we get a recent mail for the building we just looked at we'll try and schedule something special that works with everybody. So nothing else going on, I would go ask for a motion to adjourn.

- All moved, Susan.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- Aye. Any opposed. Okay, we'll talk to everybody soon, stay home.