



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2021, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Members: Chair Paul Martzke, Vice Chair Ron Dehn, Ald. Mark Steuer, Justin Balsley, Ian Griffiths, Susan Ley, and David Siegel

Present: David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Ian Griffiths (arrived during Item E.I),

Excused: Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the April 21, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the February 17, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by David Siegel to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Susan Ley to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by David Siegel to close the floor for discussion and return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Susan Ley to approve. Motion withdrawn.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ron Dehn to hold the application into data on all transom windows is received. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- Ian Griffiths

2. (COA 20-15) Consideration with possible action on an updated design review for a new shed dormer located at 626 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Ron Dehn to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to close the floor for discussion and return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to approve COA 20-15, updated design review for a new shed dormer located at 626 S. Jackson Street. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

3. (COA 21-05) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new sign located at 139 N. Broadway for Gather on Broadway.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by David Siegel to approve COA 21-05, a design review for a new sign located at 139 N. Broadway for Gather on Broadway. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

4. (COA 21-06) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new garage located at 704 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Paul Martzke to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Ron Dehn to close the floor for discussion and return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

Moved by Ron Dehn to approve COA 21-06 as presented. Motion failed due to lack of second.

Moved by David Sigel, seconded by Susan Ley to hold the application until a report from a qualified engineering or inspection official is submitted concerning the condition of the existing garage. Applicant shall also submit a rendering for the proposed new garage that is more height-appropriate to the scale of the district. Motion carried.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, No- Ron Dehn, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

Stephanie Hummel provided the report on staff-level COAs.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

No report.

3. Staff Update.

Stephanie Hummel gave the staff update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, May 19, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- I'll make a present. I would call to order the Wednesday April 21st, 2021 meeting of the Landmarks Commission to order. The first thing we will do is the roll call. Ron.
- Ron if you're trying to talk, we can't hear you.
- [Ron] Hi, I'm here. I lost my screen there for a second.
- All right, Alderman .
- He's excused.
- Okay, Justin.
- Also excused.
- Ian. Looks like a not yet. Susan.
- Here.
- And David.
- Present.
- Okay, next item would be the approval of the agenda for tonight's meeting. Does anybody have any requested changes or comments on the agenda.
- No.
- Hearing none, I would ask for a motion to approve.
- I'll move.
- I'll second it.
- All in favor, signify by saying aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously. Next from the February 17th, 2021 meeting in the Landmarks Commission. The meeting minutes are in the packet. Does anybody have any corrections or comments on those minutes? Hearing none, I would look for a motion to approve.

- So moved.

- I'll second that.

- Any other discussion. Hearing none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously. Onto item E regular business. First item is Certificate of Appropriateness 20-07, consideration with review for new windows and doors at 235 North Broadway Platon place. Jason, would you like to take us through this?

- Sure, I think you're all familiar with the building, as a reminder back in April of 2020, addressed this COA application and you see a copy of the response. They're saying that the Landmarks Commission needs more details about the project. It's now come back. We're talking about it again. Next slide. So I'll be walking you through two views of the building. This is the North Broadway view and shortly we'll also have the Dousman Street view. And I think the important bit here is number four in the is that a purple box, the existing vertical wood siding to be removed to expose the original transom window opening. And we'd be replacing all the transom windows with new material. Then number seven is also new windows in the storefronts. I think those are the main bits here. So if we go to the next slide you see the architectural drawings. This is again, the Broadway facade up at the top is the way the building currently appears down below is the new view. So again, just to draw your attention to the number four items, the transom windows they would all be exposed and replaced and all the storefront glass in the number sevens would be replaced. Can we go to the next view? This is the Dousman Street's view Again, just to point out the number four items. We have a number of transom windows that are currently covered in some that are currently exposed, invisible those being the number sevens here. And again the plan is to expose and replace all the transom windows and to replace all the storefront windows. So if we go to the next slide you'll see the architectural detail again. At the top, we have the existing elevation and at the bottom, the new proposed work covered under the COA. Looking at the top, you see the number four items. That's where transom windows are currently covered. When you come down below, they become exposed and whatever material is there, it gets replaced. And on the right half of the facade the existing transom window glass gets replaced with some new material. So going forward I have some photographs that are representative of those that have been shared with us to indicate the material that's present in these locations. Again, with the Broadway facade going from left to right, left being at the bottom, that storefront the 235 North Broadway I think, the photographs presented are somewhat inconclusive as to what the material is in the existing transom windows. I just don't know for sure if I had to bet I would bet that it's not glass block but I could lose that money too, going over to the the lucky dog or what's now had cetera. It seems fairly conclusive that all the transom windows there are glass, not glass blocks. And then going over to a pair of store fronts, the vacant tenant space. The photograph suggests that there are at least some areas of existing historic glass block in the transoms. I don't know the extent of that. It wasn't immensely clear to me. And I know I'm focusing a lot on the glass block transoms. If I recall correctly from 2020 this was one of the primary areas of concern for the Landmarks Commission. So that's why I'm drawing it to your attention in particular, if we go to the next slide for the Dousman facade, it start at the top right. I've got a green arrow. I think it's green anyway to the one storefront that has exposed an existing glass block transom glass. There, you see it. If we go to the bottom right, in the former Drury restore area, they're not glass block. They're glass windows with a stain glass border on each of the windows. I couldn't tell you the age, my hunch is that they're not original, but they're not just plain glass. And then going to the bottom left, that other storefront of I think it was also part of Drury's shop. I really couldn't tell you what that is. It's not clear

glass. It has a fuzzy appearance when you look through it. By fuzzy, I mean, not lenticular, not other things, but I'm just gonna call it fuzzy as though you're looking through old acrylic, but maybe it's not acrylic. I don't know what it is. It's not glass block. Going one more slide you'll see, well, in this current slide, and now there were a number of storefronts that were identified with no pictures. Pictures have now been provided. I've mixed it up a little at the top is the Dousman facade and at the bottom is the Broadway facade but really we're talking about the corner storefronts, the cremation shop, I guess I would call it. And based on the photographs submitted, I don't think it's conclusive what is in the transoms. On the inside of the shops some drywall work has been done to effectively seal up those transom windows and on the outside, I didn't get a sense of what is behind that vertical wood paneling. So I don't know if it's glass blocks, if it's glass at all, if it's styrofoam if it's a Banksy artwork, it could be whatever it is. Moving on to the next slide. This information came in today. It seems that there's a revision to what they're proposing to do in the transoms. And to be perfectly honest, I can't speak to this because I don't really know what they're proposing except to say, I think it's the lenticular glass as shown on the right or the ribbed glass whatever you like to call it. And then maybe some grid work that accompanies that, it wasn't entirely clear to me. I'm sure the building owner or representative can speak to that. And then moving on to the final slide, the COA requests deals with a lot of stuff of particular interest, I think are the transom windows. All I can say is that some of the transoms appear to be historic glass block, some are replacements, and some are still unknown. My recommendation there would be to maintain the historic glass block, wherever it exists and to come up with perhaps what they're proposing is fine in other areas, that's a recommendation you may choose to accept that or do as you please, I suppose, that's best of what I know in this case. So thank you.

- All right, I propose that we open the floor to public comment on this. I believe that the owner or the owner's representatives may be on the call and I think we're gonna have some questions. So I look for a motion to open the floor.

- I'll make.

- Second.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, who has questions? Or maybe I should back up. Is there somebody representing the owner that would like to comment on Jason's preparation or presentation and answer any of the unknowns that we might have?

- Jason I was going to ask.

- I can speak to that. I believe Jason did a great job explaining what we're trying to do. A couple of things that I guess were vague in his presentation are what we're trying--

- Could I just interrupt for a second. Could you identify yourself, please.

- Chad Reichelt with CR Structures.

- Okay. Thank you.

- I believe Skip is also on the call. So if he has anything to add, he can add. But so the proposal that we have that we're trying to do with the transoms, is that prism ribbed glass would be the first pane and within the air

gap, we would put the mutton bars and then another glass pane that would be tempered. So it would be an energy efficient glass piece. I don't know if you can share your screen again and go back to that slide.

- [Stephanie] Which slide are you looking for?

- [Chad] The slide with the glass detail. Yep. So at the bottom of the graph paper from Green Bay glass is kind of a section cut through the glass. So the back is the ribbed glass. The two vertical lines in the middle would be the mutton bars with the air gap. And then the tempered glass on the exterior, in the end the goal is to mimic the prism glass that we can see currently. And we're proposing to do that on all street side transoms. Inside the entry areas, where you can see from the pictures is just regular plate glass that would remain regular standard plate glass. Other than that clarification, I believe his presentation was accurate and complete.

- Isn't your intention to replace the existing glass block? Or are you gonna leave that?

- [Chad] The way our proposal is written to the building owner is to replace it. It's not cost-effective to replace the, to repair the existed glass, because we would have to remove all the lead and completely redo the window with non-lead material, the cost to do that makes the job not move forward essentially.

- The view in front of us right now on the slide. Would that be like from the inside looking out or would that be a side view of the piece of glass?

- [Chad] The glass itself is from the outside of the glass. And again, it's just a piece of glass that the manufacturer had that they took a picture of to send to us. It's not a true, mock-up like the mutton bars are not shown in the glass example.

- Correct.

- Chad, when you say that the replacement or repair of the existing glass is prohibitively expensive can you share with us some of the numbers?

- [Chad] So back in 2020, we did get a quote per transom or per storefront. So each storefront approximately has three individual transoms in it. And they were anywhere from 3000 to \$4,500 per pair. And how does that compare to replacing with this glass that we're looking at now?

- [Chad] I mean, in total it would probably add 70 to \$80,000 to a project that the owner is already spending upwards of almost \$300,000 on.

- Actually to directly compare options, to replace with what you're proposing here the image that we've got versus repairing the existing. Can you compare those directly price-wise?

- [Chad] The true repair would be 70 to \$80,000 more.

- How many windows?

- I'm not sure we'd have to pull that slide up and count them but 30, 30 transoms that are exposed to the street.

- So, Jason, I guess that would throw a question back to you, if they went forward with this window that they're proposing, is that gonna significantly alter the historical value of the property?

- Yes, significant being, hard to quantify word, will it result in the building being, losing its national register designation? Probably not. Significant, yes. I mean, it's difficult when I don't really know the extent of the remaining glass block windows. And of course we don't have very good photographs of the building in its, as

built condition either but to totally pivot to a different topic I suspect that tax credits are not an option here because for a commercial property, you have to spend an amount equal to the depreciated value of the building. And I believe that there is a large tax credit investment in this building within the last certainly within the last 15 years anyway. So I don't know that there's a good way to defray the costs associated with a proper rehabilitation of any existing glass windows that having been said. It wasn't entirely clear to me what needs to be done to the existing glass windows to keep them in place. We're talking about re-letting. I don't understand if that's required or what's driving that maintenance expense. So.

- Okay.

- The question floor is open.

- Go ahead Brian.

- Thank you, for those who may not know me Brian Johnson, I'm the alderman for this area but also the executive director of On Broadway and the core of our mission is as an organization is to promote historic preservation of properties. And so we recognize the importance of taking prudent action to protect historic integrity of a number of these properties. When I'm looking at this project and I spoke with the owner earlier as well, recognizing the substantial investment that it's going to take to preserve the historic integrity of what's happening here. It almost makes it cost prohibitive without some level of assistance. And to me, when you're taking a look at something, I mean, materials evolve, emerge, and they become more energy efficient. They, I mean, obviously as materials erode, you can, I mean the structural integrity of some of these things can certainly be knocked away at. And so I just wonder, I mean, the design is intended to preserve the historic visualization of what was there while also still bringing in, I mean, newer materials that are gonna help button that property up. And I think protect it for the longterm. And it's, part of it is just recognizing that not have historic material while it seems from what I understand from Jason there some of them may be undetermined but I think for sure we know that they're not all they don't all still possess that historic material. And I think that there's some merit in recognizing that having some consistency with how those things are buttoned up matters too. So, I mean, personally, I think I would advocate for and I appreciate Jason's role in providing the recommendation but we also have to play, walk a fine line here with recognizing the difference between preserving something that is significantly important versus something that maybe modification might be an order to protect the long-term interest of the property. It's not like we're painting over an entire brick structure here. This is something that I think when you look at it in the project as if it were original and again have material in there that as really important. So those are my two senses. I understand some of the concerns, financial concerns presented by the property owner and obviously the delicate balancing act that you have to play as a commission. But I at least just wanted to offer that perspective from an organization again, who typically fights to have these types of things, but also it's recognizing how you'd get these investments to be made in the first place as well. And my fear right now is with that cost addition, it might put this project out of reach. All said.

- So, we still don't have confirmation as to how many of those transoms have the original material in it. Is that correct?

- Correct.

- Correct, they've been covered up for multiple years. And obviously they were covered up for a purpose. They were covered up because they're in disrepair. The material that they're covered with is not a historic material. To improve the historic representation of the building with using an energy efficient material. We're gonna remove a non historic element that was added to the building to cover up something that was in disrepair.

- Okay, I guess from my perspective, we don't know the status of the maintenance of any of those that are covered.

- Of the windows that are there, the transom windows can we get a breakdown of what is known to have historic? What is known to be a non-historic and what is unknown?

- Yeah, those are in the slides. We can quickly go through those again. Stephanie, could you cue us up to the Broadway view of the building with all the numbers? So that's maybe less helpful than I was hoping, down four slides to number nine. So this is the Broadway facade on starting at the far left there that's the South side of the building, I think, I've got photographs that are inconclusive in that first of five bays counting from left to right. And the second bay, I was fairly well satisfied that there's no evidence of glass block remaining, in the third and fourth bays there was some evidence of glass block in some location. It wasn't clear to me the full extent of that. The photograph there I believe is above the door or one of the doors. So when we're talking about transoms, there's the large transoms facing the street. And then there are these little inset transoms above the doors that are inset in the storefronts as well. So in bays three and four there is some evidence of glass block. I don't know the extent of that glass block. In Bay five, we have totally inconclusive bits the bit on the right there, the North East corner of the building. So moving on to the next slide, here let's go from right to left. That'd be from West to East. At the far right, I'll call it Bay one of six. We don't have glass block. We have windows with stained glass borders. I don't know the age of these. It's uncommon to have a glass window with a stained glass border. And I think there's some like dream catcher design and the central bit, my hunches that these are not original or even necessarily historic. So that's Bay one here, moving to the left to Bay two. There's no evidence of glass block. I'm looking at the bottom left. This is where we've got that fuzzy glass or some covering over regular glass. I don't know what it is. Bay three, the photograph at the top right. You see, we have a full and intact glass block transom likely original to the building or certainly within the buildings period of significance. That is a discreet feature that contributes to the historic integrity of the building. In bays four, five and six. Again this is an instance where we have no conclusive evidence. The exterior photographs have the paneling in place. The interior photographs show recent dry wall work that covers that area in its entirety. So on this side of the building, I can tell you that one sixth of it has glass block, two sixth of it definitely don't, and the other half is a total question mark. I think that addresses your question Commissioner Siegel.

- Yes, it does, thank you.

- Skip, if you're looking to speak and you're on a cell phone you can hit star six to unmute yourself. Skip is the property owner here.

- You didn't just trick him with the whole hangup accidentally combination did you?

- No.

- Can you hear me now?

- There, hello.

- Oh, thank heavens.

- Okay, I'm in a rented car in North Carolina and I'm talking on my cell phone and that's enough audio obstacles to, for a lifetime here. Is this my time?

- Yep, go ahead.

- Okay, thank you. Thank you to everybody for your time and attention to this project. I wanted to, let me just go through what I've some things that I prepared to speak about. I'm the owner of Platen place. I bought this building in 2012 when it was condemned and foreclosed. I renovated the building to it's current state with city funds, state and federal tax credits which totaled 40% of the project costs. The building is now valued at \$1.3

million. And it's taxed at a rate of \$1.7 million. It generates over 10,000 per year in parking fees alone for the city. The tenancy is 100% capacity for both the residential units on the second and third floor and the commercial spaces as we sit here today. It's won the mayor's beautification award it won main street award for historic preservation. Our proposal would add, like Chad said nearly \$300,000 of improvement to a historic building in a high visibility corner in Downtown Green Bay. There will be zero city state or federal dollars that are available to be used for this project. I will be paying for it entirely myself. Well, as Chad noted it is not a historic preservation would markedly improve plant in places, environmental footprint, its structural integrity and the overall aesthetics of the building. The recommendation to reveal and preserve the transom windows would be cost prohibitive. The project would be out of reach and it would not move forward. The first floor fascia would remain as is aesthetically shabby, environmentally antiquated. And with a perpetual look of disrepair. I respectfully submit to the Landmark Commission to reconsider our proposal and accept as is. I'm asking to consider this request in light of the original renovation was a vastly expensive undertaking that was only financially feasible with the support of contributions from the city. And most importantly, 40% tax credits from combined state and federal historic societies. I researched extensively with, have been planning for years now. And there I have not found any funds available either with the city, the state, or the federal offices to help with this. This project is submitted, will add nearly \$300,000 of improvements to Downtown Green Bay with no additional cost to the city. Again, I respectfully request the commission to accept the proposal as submitted. That's all. Thank you.

- I've got just a couple of thoughts to share on this this project, just the transom windows is very unique for this commission in that parts of it are original, parts of it the historic original materials are gone. So we're examining something that it sounds it needs to be an all or none deep. Usually it's a straightforward matter of an entire structure or part of a structure. So I think I've got a much better understanding of what this project entails and the difficulty we're facing, I load the idea of materials, of historic materials because we're all about preserving, but I'm also recognizing, and you guys have explained very well the difficulty with preserving original as well as matching up. So at this point, I'm definitely leaning towards approving this because it needs to be consistent, and what you're proposing would not match but I guess a better word is mimic the historic nature of the glass. But I do say that loading the idea of removing the original but I think a mimicry with all new material is better than inconsistent or as Skip you said, the current shabby appearance.

- And it's also better than the building's slipping into ruin completely because they can't complete the project. So I concur with you David.

- It's like all or nothing. It's not just do part of them. You have to do the whole thing for that unified look.

- And if I might add one more point commissioners Commissioner Dehn, you had mentioned this specifically. I think it was a very pointed question and a good one, and that is, would the property lose its historic designation if this project were to proceed in recognizing that the answer is no. I think when you think about the intent of the law and when it was originally written, they recognized, right. People recognize that it is near impossible to 100% preserve the historic integrity of these properties that eventually things change. And it becomes very difficult to preserve something. So there is some wiggle room there that at the end of the day preserving that designation to me is what's most critical. And if this project is allowed to proceed and it doesn't damage that, I think that's a great thing. And if it were to put the property position, were to lose its designation I think it would be a very different dialogue right now. So the fact that we're able to keep that is really significant.

- I'm not disagreeing with anyone here. I just wanted to point out too that those glass transom blocks are reproduced and could be installed in a brand new building today. I don't know the costs. I haven't seen any proposal to that effect. And when we talk about damaging the significance of the building, yes, this does damage the significance of the building. It will most likely not result in it losing its historic designation. However, the cumulative effects of things that damage the integrity eventually will catch up to it. I don't know at what point it is but it's something to bear in mind.

- We do know that there's one Bay that has the existed glass by transom intact 'cause that's exposed right now. We can see it on the Dousman facade, that's correct.

- Yes.

- Yes.

- And every other Bay, it's not known what we we're dealing with. It's, we're guessing about the presence of the original materials and also the condition.

- Well, in a couple of days, we know for fact that it's not present in one Bay, we have some evidence of it being there but I don't know the extent to which it remains. And then we have several bays where we just have no information. So I guess if you're looking to quantify it I think you're looking at somewhere between, let's see it was six bays on Dousman and five bays on Broadway if I remember correctly. So we know add them up, that's 11. I know for sure one out of 11 has on they're visible today. So at most I would think maybe half of them still have it, but that's probably at most, and maybe not what I would place my money on if I was betting so.

- Well where I'm going with this is I'll just say that an existing Bay that's exposed to the street right now and we can see it. I don't understand why we wouldn't maintain Eddy Stat Bay. The other conditions are sort of known sort of unknown but where we do have the historic materials in my mind those materials should remain and be repaired.

- If this was a tax credit project Skip, it would require that the other bays be exposed. So that that decision could be made once the condition of what's inside is known.

- Understood, but it's not, the owner's not utilizing those tax credits or they're no longer available for the property. I guess the question really remains is the solution to replace the transom materials with this mimicking of what was there is that's the place where we all wanna go or are we gonna revert back to saying, no we don't want to create mockery of history. We want something that clearly is not trying to replicate that.

- Can I recommend that we close the floor? I think we're done with public comment.

- So moved.

- Thank you.

- Second.

- All right. So we are discussing this project and I don't know if we're getting anywhere towards making a motion. Somebody else was about to speak.

- I mean, I'm prepared to put forth the motion to be honest with you. I mean, I personally think that both Skip and Brian Johnson were correct, and I think that we should put forth the motion to allow the plan to go forth as proposed. It would beautify the building and save the building and the alternatives to that could be devastating. And I think that that's what we're really all about is preserving the structure itself and perhaps not every little tiny detail. So that would be my motion.

- Second to the motion.

- The one before that.

- I believe to summarize Ron and I don't wanna speak on your behalf, but your motion is to approve the project as submitted.

- [Ron] That is correct.

- I'll second it.

- Paul, you said something that triggered a very important thought for me is that we just don't know if there are, if all those unknown transoms or could be identified as having original or not original that would sway my thoughts. So at this point I actually would vote against approving because I would like to know more about what's there, moving to what you're saying, Paul about preserving the original material, which has such an important goal for this commission.

- Well, I agree David with your thought, but quite frankly I think that's where we were in 2020. I believe that's the reason why this project wasn't approved back then is because we asked for verification of the existing conditions and nobody's been able to provide that for us.

- That's right. And they haven't provided it now.

- Do we want to ask for verification of the condition of all the transoms?

- [Stephanie] a point of procedure, we got a motion on the floor that's been seconded. Do we have to take a vote on that motion at this point?

- [Stephanie] You have to take a vote on it before we close this action. So if you want to have more discussion, you can do so or if you wanna vote on it right away. So someone could put a different motion on the floor you're able, or Dave, or I'm sorry. Ron can resend his motion.

- Then there'll be a second motion brought forth.

- There can be a motion to amend the active motion, either as a friendly or an unfriendly amendment.

- I didn't hear that.

- [Stephanie] Oh, he was saying that you can also amend the motion that's on the floor as a friendly or unfriendly amendment.

- Can I make another comment about the motion that's on the floor now, as far as replacing the glass and my concern is if we don't allow this and I don't wanna feel like we have a, we've been forced to approve of what they want, but the alternative is he could say, I'm gonna leave with . And that transom material that's out there.

- Agreed.

- Yeah, it's all, kind of, I hate to say but almost like held hostage to that as the alternative. My first choice is to of course have the original material. But if it's so far gone and again if the alternatives that he doesn't do anything, meaning the property owner.

- Does in your operative word, there was if, if the stuff has gone and we just don't know that.

- Yeah.

- That what's causing me to head dry it here in proceeding with the COA is because we just don't know. I don't recall Paul, perhaps I wasn't at that meeting where this was requested or I just don't recall it, but that's going to be my position is we need to know much better all of those transoms rather than just the couple or the .

- Yeah, perhaps we should amend and we request more information on the condition or to have information on the condition of all the other transoms.

- If I could offer chair, I mean, if you had that information would it make a difference? And here's what I mean by that. If you're going to preserve them you're still only, there's no uniformity, right? You're still only roughly half of them, right. You're still only preserving half and you still have the other half then that need replacement with some type of newer material. And I don't think, and I could be wrong but I still don't think the number changes in terms of the exp, which has been argued by the applicant would be cost prohibitive. So whether those are original or not that expense is still there. So I'm just certainly it's up to the commission's purview to decide what you'd like to do with that. But I'm just wondering if having that knowledge would authentically make a difference at the end of the day given those two points.

- If I could interject from a integrity perspective it would be a superior option to maintain say the half that are original and then have another half that are new, that don't match precisely. That's a preferable outcome than all new. And I guess not to be that guy, but as a reminder the ordinance doesn't really give any weight to economic argument on this. So although an important consideration from a realistic perspective, it's not an argument that necessarily carries the day by any means.

- By exposing the, taking the plywood or the wood siding material off of the transoms, to see what's there. We would at least understand the condition of the existing materials and the presence of them. I think that's what we'd be gaining by doing that. I was headed down a path of suggesting that the one Bay on Dousman street that has the existing materials in, should be left, intact and restored and the remainder of the bays could be something different. I'm not a fan of what's been proposed for those bays. Again, I think it's not accurate to what the building was. I would be more in favor of a more modern solution that potentially matches the storefront below to differentiate between the historic and the new. And that's kind of where I sit on it but I have a real hard time with when you've got one bay that actually it looks out and throw in the dumpster. I've got a problem with that.

- Paul you're , I've got a big problem with that as well. And Jason, your point's well taken that economics as much as the building itself is such a laudable achievement economics alone are not persuasive.

- [Man] If I get into, and I'm sorry that I wasn't able to join the initial part of this conversation and I'm gonna abstain from the voting 'cause I did not hear all of the arguments around it but in terms of where we're heading on this I think Paul's proposal, investigated further and it may have been covered earlier while I wasn't online but is there a reason that we haven't been able to identify what's behind the plywood to this point in time? Because I believe that that was requested a year ago when we reviewed this. I mean, I'm not sure if the plywood actually would need to be removed or if a scope camera could be put in there to see if that material exists. But I think, if indeed half of that building does exist with that original material then a decision to remove it in its entirety is gonna be detrimental to that building. If it's one, I would still advocate for keeping it. And again, maybe the cost of the windows that would be the replacement but the non historic ones that are in there would be a more economical option because it wouldn't need to mimic it. It should be a different element it should not be the same.

- I would agree with that last part. I believe that if we went to a more modern replacement, it would save the building owner dollars. And they should take some of that saving for at least the one Bay that we know that exists.

- And the one Bay that does exist is in pretty good shape or not?

- [Stephanie] I think so.
- I'm always so tall, it looks pretty good from where I sat but I didn't get up on a ladder and push on it or anything. I guess we have a photograph of it, right? We can go to slide 10 and there it is.
- [Stephanie] So, there is a motion on the floor.
- So, I mean, I'm willing to withdraw my motion. I hate to see the building just sit there and nothing happen to it too, that's not an alternative that I think we should be proud of either. I mean, I'm willing withdraw the motion. If somebody else has another motion go ahead and put it forth.
- I would make a motion that the property owner provides information on the condition of all the transoms.
- [Paul] I'll second that.
- Further discussion.
- [Stephanie] I'm sorry, just a point of clarity. Can we move to hold it until all of that information is provided?
- Susan is that what you meant with your motion?
- Yes, that we need information on all the other transoms, before we can give our opinion.
- [Stephanie] Okay, thank you.
- [Paul] I'll second that.
- Any other discussion? We call that motion for a vote, all in favor, signify by saying aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed?
- I am abstaining from the vote 'cause I wasn't involved in the entire proceedings this afternoon.
- We've got one abstention and a unanimous vote in favor of the motion who asked for more information from the building owner and put, okay, next item for consideration tonight is a Certificate of Appropriateness, A20-15 consideration with possible action on a updated design review for a new shed dormer located at.
- Sorry, our internet connection is a little unstable. I trust Paul you pinged me to talk to this, just to point out this is COA number 20-15. This is a repeat. It came to you in the year 2020, a little insight into our numbering system, COA 20, 15 of 2020. You'll recall this, the Landmarks Commission approved of a shed dormer on the back of this house. If we back up one image, Stephanie, that was awesome. So on the left side here towards the far left you see the rear of the house, on the right side with the two cars, that's the opposite side of the house. And you were looking towards the back of the house again. And what the Landmarks Commission did was to approve a shed lean to dormer on the backside. That would have been the left image, so to speak. That's what we're looking again at, on the left here. So those three, two over two windows that we see that's that elevated go weighing if you will of the roof line to provide that shed dormer. Then if we look straight on at the back of the house, in the right view there you see the existing roof line on the left, kind of a 45 and on the right, it's got that weighing up shed dormer. This was all approved. There's been a request to revise this

approval, specifically to just elevate the roof line in its entirety along that driveway side. So this is kind of a mock-up of that driveway side, to the left is the front of the house, to the right is the rear of the house, in the center that gable that's the side of the house where we have that wavy clapboard siding kind of underneath that diamond looking window. And what is currently present there on the right side is the roof line that Stephanie's got her mouse-over is currently lower than that by a fair bit. And so this revised application, if you will is to raise the wall and the roof line. And if you look at the Ridge of the roof here, from the front on the left to the back on the right, that would effectively make it a continuous Ridge line. Currently what's in the back. The Ridge is also lower probably by about an equal amount is what the eve is, the overhang is down below. So, let's see what's on the next slide. It shows here on the opposite side, basically what you had already approved. So that shed like dormer would remain if we go to the next slide, even you'll see that it's a hybrid kind of sorta, the wall on the far left gets raised. The roof light on the far left gets raised. The ridge at the top gets raised and the stuff at the right's instead of being a shed like dormer apparently the whole roof line has now made kind of uniform. So this is what was previously approved. And this is what the revised request is for. In my recommendation, I just call you to the very high level statement from the secretary of the interior standards that exterior alterations shouldn't mess up the materials that characterize the property and the new work should be differentiated from the old, and in my recommendation, I'm saying to you that this is a bit of a judgment call. I note that the work is going to be done on the rear of the house and will not be particularly noticeable. On other hand, on a Queen Anne house of this design it would be typical to see the back of the house shorter than the front of the house, and this revised design along the driveway side not really seeing the details proposed yet. It could be difficult to distinguish the new work from the old work. I don't really know. Again, this is a judgment call, so I'm not going to lose sleep about it either way but there's not a clear cut and dried answer to this one.

- [Stephanie] The applicant is also here if you wanna open the floor for questions and Jason missed a great opportunity to say they're gonna raise the roof. So I just had to throw that in there. I know he wanted to

- I see it's snowing outside. So there's that too.

- Do we want a motion to open the floor?

- I'll second it.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? The floor is open, questions for the property owner.

- [Woman] Hi everyone. It's like a neighborhood meeting I love landmarks. So the reason that we changed our minds was the cost was basically the same because of the design to raise the roof higher, which would give us more space in the back. Our thoughts on a differentiation on the side of the house we have that wavy clapboard and we would not wanna replicate that wavy clapboard. We'd probably wanna do the double purple band and then just clapboard it in the center and not do the wavy so we could continue to design, but it would clearly look different than the rest of the house. Or we could paint it all like a solid color green for example, instead of the different colors. So there'd be some indication on the back that it was that higher level was new. I feel like something's gotta go back there. I've seen houses that have had that wall and it's just blank. And I think that looks horrible. So I'd like to do something, on that side of the house, but.

- So looking in on the images here the photo on the right shows what we're talking about you see the wavy bands in this belt course that roof line and the back would be elevated to meet up with the bottom of the roof line of this Gable end. So where that belt course is I think the homeowner is proposing to have a belt course

in line with that on the new wall surface but of a different texture, if you will like just flat clapboards within the belt course that would set it apart visually to some degree. But again, judgment call.

- Well, I think this certainly falls under the precedent that we typically utilize in, is it or the building from the street that's visible to the past or buyer and I think it still falls within that guideline. I mean, we're not really in my mind significantly altering the project from what we approved last year. I do like the idea of potentially extending the purple bands, but not the waves as one solution but I don't think that decision alters my opinion on the project one or another.

- [Man] Another suggestion I might have is that we're current wavy peace ends that you keep a vertical element there. So it almost acts as a bookend to that. So it player as to where that corner of the building was originally and where that's kind of identified. But I agree, I think even if it was of a similar style but not mimicking that would, it would be appropriate.

- [Cheryl] Would you prefer the bands compared to like when those for example, or I've seen windows put in those back additions? I don't, I mean.

- [Man] I don't think I'd put window. I think running the two purple bands over I think would be appropriate, but it could all be the, it could be just the regular siding color. The field color could go either way. Just kind of, as it does on the front of the house there, where it terminates on the corner and then goes to a regular siding. I mean, there's precedent for it within the building itself, but to keep that corner, I think that somehow that needs to be identified.

- [Cheryl] Well there's no. Okay, there's no corner there now. It's just, are you thinking you'd run a band down the side of the house? Cause it's all flat--

- In the second story.

- [Cheryl] There's no corner where the rest is gonna come up. Are you talking about the top part or?

- [Man] Right where the cursor is.

- [Cheryl] Okay.

- [Man] Yep. So I think--

- [Cheryl] You do like, you'd keep that purple band in other words, the corner piece.

- [Man] Yep.

- [Cheryl] Okay.

- [Man] Just if you looked at the front elevation that would the image next to it.

- [Cheryl] Yep.

- [Man] You see where it's a and the other one terminates into it, just like that.

- [Cheryl] Okay.

- [Man] Yep.

- Any other questions for the property owner? None, I would make a motion to close the floor.

- Second that motion.
- All in favor.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? So any other further discussion on the commission, VF, hearing none, I'll make a motion to approve this as submitted.
- I'll second that.
- Further discussion. Call for a vote then all in favor.
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously.
- Thank you.
- Our next item is 21-05, consideration with possible action on a design review for a new sign located at 139 North Broadway for gather on Broadway, Jason.
- Yeah, this one's short and easy. The building is non-contributing. It's a new sign. The new sign has no impact on the historic integrity of the district. I think you should grant the request.
- I'll make a motion to approve.
- Second.
- Any further discussion?
- I'll just say, I thought the signage looked nice.
- Agreed.
- Yep.
- All right, call for a vote. All in favor signify by saying aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? Motion carries unanimously.
- Thank you.
- Last item under regular business Certificate of Appropriateness 21-06. Consideration of possible action on a design review for a new garage located at 704 South Jackson Street. Jason. Take us through this one.
- It's me again. 704 South Jackson Street built 1906. It's a contributing property in the Astro District. Before we get into it, this one's hard. So it's not gonna go too fast. Here's a map of it. What I'm about to show you is

some Sanborn maps and you'll have to come to your own conclusions here but I'll walk you through where I think it is. So the move in date for this house was November of 1906. It was Thanksgiving. The first Sanborn map available is dated 1907. I don't know, precisely in 1907 when it was published. And I don't know when the people were walking around drawing stuff. If they were doing that throughout 1906 I presume they were. So I present to you in the top left corner of the 1907 Sanborn map of this property noting that its credibility may be off. This may be a building under construction. This might be based on a description verbally and not a actual observation which takes me to the bottom left, which I found today. And I did not expect to see but it still doesn't change my opinion on anything. This is a 1911 edits to the 1907 map. We're lucky to have this at the Brown County Central Library. It's actually a 1917 map but this particular cut and paste appears to be from 1911. And I need to draw your attention of course to the one story garage. So in 1907 there appeared to be one story garage rectangular in shape maybe was right where it's shown maybe not. In 1911, again, I don't know if somebody came to investigate and they refined it. Or if this is another description that hey the garage wasn't in the right spot or to be honest I don't know how much effort the map company puts in to the accuracy of a garage on a building, but in full disclosure, this is the 1911 map showing a one-story automobile garage. On the right, you have the 1936, a clean copy of the Sanborn map which shows a fair bit more detail. And here it appears to me that we have the 1907 garage in its current position today. And if you want to nitpick maps, I mean the building the main house itself here, you see a Bay window on the bottom right corner where it's never been shown before. These are typical discrepancies within Sanborn maps. They result from just how much the person was being paid per hour versus per job. So that Bay window on the house I'm convinced was there ever since day one in 1906 but here you see a little more fidelity, if you will in the drawing. At the end of the day, note that there was a one-story garage or carriage house in 1906 that matches roughly the footprint and height and scale of the garage in 1936, which may be maybe not matches 1911. And so you're presented with a couple of, possibilities as to these discrepancies. The one that I subscribed to is that it's the same garage and they just didn't quite have it right each time. Another is that's the garage that was built in 1907. Maybe it was burned down, struck by a tree, replaced with a slightly smaller garage in 1911. And then by 1936, as you had a bigger garage. And I think that that's an incorrect interpretation based on the presence of the B board on the ceilings and the walls in existing garage. And I look at that kind of globally, 1929 we enter a depression in October. Nobody's going to be building a garage particularly one with bead board paneling everywhere between October of 1929 and 1936. But hey, maybe, another interpretation here is that looking solely at 1907 and 1936 that it's the same garage. And if the locations were correct then it could be that they picked it up and scooped it over or 10 or 15 feet. I don't know. I could tell you that my hunch based on looking at photographs of the garage is that the garage is original to the house 1906. And that here the mapmakers just kind of fudged it every year. Even so if that's immaterial, drawing your attention to the 1936 map, you see that the porte-cochère has been added to the house and you see a one-story garage of a particular scale and height sitting where a one story garage of a particular scale and height sit today. And that's within the period of historic significance for the property. So we can go through these other slides. The current garage has a number of issues, I noted cracked foundation, cracks in the floor. I see some areas of wall dry rot in that top right picture. Please note too that that's an area where the bead board paneling has been removed from the wall. So we don't know the extent of drywall in structure. The bottom, right photograph shows original clapboard siding kind of cool. Next page. Next page is scary, frankly, on the left we see the bead board ceiling and also at the top right and in the bottom left. That ceiling has a very pronounced sag in it. I see old time, two by fours some scary old wiring that's in disuse, as an engineer I will say that the ceiling looks to be generally unsafe and something should be done about this. At the bottom right, there's a picture of the garage as it stands today. Moving on to the next slide. This shows the site plan in approximate dimensions you have the residents. On the garage the proposed replacements is 36 feet by 22 feet. And within that rectangle of 22, by 36 you see some dash lines. Those dash lines represent the approximate sidewalls of the existing garage. So the proposed new garage has a larger footprint. Moving on to the next slide you see some architectural plans that have been drawn up for the proposed replacement garage. It looks lovely. For comparison sake, I've introduced a little picture of the existing garage with some lines to approximately illustrate the scale of change from the existing garage to the proposed new garage. That's not necessarily the scale, but when I put one over the other, the garage doors line up pretty good. So, it's a fair visualization. Next page, a Google street view of convenience. This illustrates the relationship between the house the porte-cochère and the existing garage. And if we jump to the end of my story you'll note in the packet that we have

correspondence you'll note in the packet that we have correspondence from two people at Shippo saying that garages where it can be demonstrated to be related to the building and the period of significance are contributing structures. And again, I remind you that I don't know the existing condition of the garage if it's totally unsafe. If dry rot is in one spot versus 20 spots I don't know the safety of the current garage. I do know that that ceiling is pretty scary looking. My hunch as an engineer is that that could be fixed. And I do have some experience with lifting buildings to pour new foundations and floors. This could all be done. Regardless of your thoughts on the current garage and its contribution to the integrity of the building and district. If you consider looking at a replacement garage I'd encourage you to keep in mind the design size scale and massing of the historic garage. And that having been said to the Green Bay municipal code has some very clear verbiage on what the proposed replacement garage can look like in terms of size. I think, although I'm not an expert on your local municipal code, I think the proposed replacement is too tall per municipal code and would need ...

- [Stephanie] Conditional use permit.

- Conditional use permit. Thank you. So even if you approve the garage as designed, it's not one and done there's other hoops to jump through on that. So my recommendation is to fix the existing garage but maybe that's not the right answer. Thank you.

- [Stephanie] The applicants are here as well if you'd like to open the floor. Paul you're muted.

- [Man] Do we need a motion to open the floor or?

- Yeah, I tried to do that while I was on mute. But I think Ian, you did that.

- [Ian] I did.

- I'll second that, all in favor of opening the floor?

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay, questions for the homeowner.

- I think the most significant question that Jason raised is about repairing. I would very much like to hear what assessment has been done in terms of repairing the structure.

- [Man] Other than self assessment done, I'd actually inquired whether an inspection was necessary prior to submitting this request. And I was told no, so I did not do a formal inspection but to assess the repairability of the structure, I can tell you from my own opinion the amount of deterioration is not even fairly represented in the pictures that you saw today and is extensive and really touches all aspects of the garage.

- [Man] Were there additional materials that weren't presented today on the condition of the garage?

- [Man] No there were not.

- [Man] Okay.

- [Man] I just wanted to make sure it wasn't being misrepresented.

- [Man] No, nope, nope. From what was submitted that is a fair representation.

- [Man] Okay, thank you.

- I would like to throw in something real quick. As the president of the Neighborhood Association. I got a call from the lenses and I went down and I toured the property. And I can verify that when he is saying that the dry rot and so forth is much more extensive than it shows in those photographs. If you look at the, basically above all that ceiling stuff, that sack there, it's all it's basically all dry rot. It's if a tree branch fell on it, it would collapse. I mean, it would be gone. Another element is that it is it's not on the original foundation, the original foundation was actually added to and brought forward a little bit. And that structure was lengthened outward probably to fit cars at some point because the fact cause we think it was, it was changed at some point so that a car could actually fit in there. What was I gonna say? Also those doors are not original as well. And there's other things too that have happened along the way, as far as the plastering, as far as the wood on the inside, as far as that lathe on the inside that lathe is in really, really bad shape as well and sagging and more than just the ceiling, there's big spots where it's gone, where carts have run into it over the years, it's kind of a mess and it looks nice from the outside because the house is so beautiful and they've kept the outside looking well. But that part in there for you guys.

- [Man] Yeah, thank you Ron. We did get it repainted when we did have the the house painted back in 2015. So yeah, aesthetically from the outside it does appear nice and certain with colors blend in with the house, but you are right. It was the footprint of the garage was increased at one point, several feet towards Car Street or towards the North and several towards the West and towards the interior property line there. And certainly the the structure in those particular points was expanded, is not uniform and it is not anywhere near or square in those particular places.

- Tyler, would you like to share with the group too exactly how much money you have spent on that house bringing it up to its historical beauty?

- [Tyler] Yeah, so we bought the house back in 2012. It was foreclosed at the time and had not been inhabited for several years. And we spent upwards of \$200,000 to restore mostly the exterior of the home. We still have actually a fair amount of work to do inside yet, especially up in the upper floors and the kitchen and bathrooms need some updates as well. So we've done the exterior painting. We did full restorations of the front porch. The side porch, the carport was completely disassembled and reassembled with new footings, resetting all the concrete block. And then we actually added in the front porch a similar project in which we had the front brick was actually leaning out probably at a 40 degree angle or so put something pretty scary. It looked like it was gonna fall down at any time and take the entire porch with it. So that was deconstructed a new and plenty of plumbing and electrical upgrades along the way along with new windows. At one point, we moved in or when we bought the house, there were windows that did not even have panes of glass in it. It's much different now than it was nine years ago when we bought it. And Susan, I don't remember which year that was, if that was 2017 or 2018, when the city gave us a stark preservation award for the work we'd done on the outside, but we certainly been recognized for what we've done. Turn to any questions. I've got a couple of comments. I mean, so the project itself, and it was conceived last year when I was in the garage and actually shut the garage door while I was inside of it and could see the the ceiling actually continue to sag under the later or excuse me, open the garage, could see the ceiling sag under the weight of the garage door. And I've certainly a lot of concerns about the safety of my family with the condition that the garage is in. I continued to look around it and it was just one thing after another that I could spot that just it concerns me about the longevity of this garage. And Jason certainly pointed out that, perhaps there's an opportunity. You'd have to lift it up. I'm not sure that the structure of the garage stain being lifted up even with the ceiling removed and the hip roof being supported from the inside, is not in good condition, the structure of it. So I'm not sure how it would survive that sort of movement in order to do the foundation work that needs to be done prior to doing any other restoration work on it. We've certainly would we, we respect the and enjoy the character of the historic nature of our home. And really we've looked to create in this new design a design that's complimentary to our home. We are not trying to replicate what's there. I know that's perhaps a little bit checker but we're trying to replicate really the home. So if you look at the style of the garage, and I don't know if we quite got that on a picture of the house itself, I'm not sure that was there no effect quite captured that, but that was our intention is to mimic that, mimic the styling of the windows. We are looking to reuse materials. So all of the siding would be salvaged as much as possible. And we will be really used on certainly the

front and the sides of the structure as much as possible where you would add into the ends, the Cedar shakes with the same exact styling that's on the house. Can I share and bring a picture of it? I'd like to what I'm talking about. That's all right. All right. You can see the screen here. There's a Gable on each of the four sides of the house. In addition to the turn there's 10 inches of Gables there's seizure shakes that are three different styles with the flat edge, the Sawtooth and then the way wood would replicate that on the new garage, in that same exact style and the same exact colors with the same patterns and amount of each of those particular design elements in the Gable ends of the garage. And this is a, it's a picture from last year from the front of the house. You can see the garage over here towards the left. Not sure how I stop sharing here, I'm sorry.

- There you go.

- Well, I'd like to interject here. My thoughts on this of everyone has painted a very ominous picture about the condition of this garage. It's very clear, and I certainly understand that, but Tyler you said a very operative word, a couple of times unsure. And what I'd like to see is a confident determination whether or not this can be repaired. If it can't be repaired, or if it's absurdly expensive, But until then, I'm not going to approve moving forward But until then, I'm not going to approve moving forward until there's a real about repairability of that garage. I did drive by there. I wanna commend you on your house. The pictures don't do it justice. It's phenomenal, very inspiring. And so I really am very impressed with what you've done there. So in the context of that, I just wanna wait until we can get a solid go-no-go answer on repairability.

- I was wondering why it's a two story garage instead of a one-story.

- Has a space, so I don't know.

- Which I can see. Yeah, walk up attic there. So you're going with the two stories. So you had more storage room?

- Yes, absolutely.

- I was wondering why two story garage instead of a one.

- We've got anyone who goes in an old house knows two things about old houses, right? One, we have incredibly small closets, my wife and I share a closet that's three by six. So you can talk about an uncomfortable circumstance. The other is that basements leak. So there's not a lot of things that you can store on the floor when you're constantly worried about water in the spring time, like now. So yeah, that was the intention of making that a larger spaces. So we could actually have some usable storage space in the home.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- Someone mentioned earlier that it's possibility that as it's drawn right now that this wouldn't be in compliance with city of Green Bay Ordinance, do we know that to be fact or?

- Yes, so the setback off the rail yard is only two feet. It's required to be four feet by code. And the height of the structure is not to exceed 16 feet without a Conditional Use Permit. So both of those things would be flagged during the standard site plan process for this. And then the Conditional Use Permit goes through our Plan Commission which we've seen a couple garage requests in the past few years. So they're not unfamiliar with that but it would need to get some additional approvals even with our approval.

- It seems to me that the amount of space between the top of the garage doors in the proposed solution and the amount of space between the current garage doors and the eve line is significantly different. And certainly I understand the building, the home itself has a real presence and is, a substantial home but I think it would only

help if that were reduced. I think one would bring your overall height down. And I think the proportion of it would be maybe more in keeping with the original garage to home ratio. So.

- I mean, does the original garage have a hip roof on it.

- It does.

- [Man] Yep.

- So from the left side of the garage you're not looking at a Gable end, you're looking at a roof line, just like the driveway side.

- [Tyler] That is correct.

- [Ian] Was the consideration of a hip roof

- [Griffiths] Was the consideration of a hip roof on all four sides in the new garage plan.

- [Tyler] I certainly considered it as an option but I was also looking for potential solution around storage space as well. So a hip roof does not offer anything

- [Ian] Right.

- [Griffiths] Right.

- What if the new garage didn't have the second story but it had maybe an additional Bay and at ground level.

- [Tyler] An additional Bay is not usable. I mean, it's certainly couldn't put another vehicle in there because of the orientation of the garage, even in its existing sandwich, we're not moving the garage doors. We have two factors that are really restraining it. One is the.

- Wasn't looking for vehicle storage. I was looking to replace this attic storage.

- Yeah.

- [Tyler] I guess I'm not sure the, how that would.

- Freestyle garage, but that far away I've stopped. Wouldn't be for vehicle storage would be for your stuff.

- [Tyler] Yeah, so I can't move the garage doors from the center orientation of the garage. They need to stay there 'cause otherwise you can not get a vehicle in or out of the garage there it's pretty close to the porch on the left side of the garage. And I think a vehicle out you need to be mindful of the stone column off the car port and have your, their vehicle. I can't move the doors, they need to stay in the center.

- No, I think what we're looking at is just having that drawing that you have of the two stalls but then adding a third stall on the left-hand that would look like you need to have an overhead door. It would look like a garage stall but you wouldn't actually park vehicles. And then you put your stuff in there.

- Remove the entire footprint of it. And the way that the plan that's join here move it down on the page. Is that what you're suggesting?

- Just adding on a third stall on the left side, as you look at the front of the garage, is that what you're thinking Ian, that's what I was thinking.

- [Ian] I think the 36 foot dimension on here would be to extend the garage in that orientation you'd keep the two garage doors as they currently are presented. So you'd have your access that you would need, but you'd end up with a single garage with a storage space at grade as opposed to a two-story garage with storage space above.

- That currently isn't in compliance with city ordinance anyways.

- Right.

- And by elimination of the stair you'd gain storage space on that side of the garage as well.

- True.

- It's just a thought that would maybe get you in compliance with the ordinance. It would certainly save you some money. It wouldn't be as intrusive to the neighborhood because the height of the building would be similar to what's there now. You would sacrifice the attic space as an attic and you'd sacrifice a little bit more of your rear yard. It's just a thought.

- [Tyler] Yeah, it becomes, to extend it further as it's shown here to the left, it becomes very close to the porch at that point I did actually have to remove a flowering tree which I don't wanna do. I'd prefer not to extend it any further over to the left.

- This is a tough one. If we look back at that 300 or 400 block of poorly air that monster garage that we approved over there, I mean that's the same style house that big red place. And they had to guess as well. And in that particular case, we approved a bigger garage which is as big as many of the houses in block. So I don't think it would be, it wouldn't be asking us to do something that we haven't done before. I think that they, obviously, they should check in with the compliance from the city to see if they can get the permits that they need.

- My memory is that that project was approved after the fact.

- Yeah, we didn't really approve that, that was like a fait accompli where it was done before you knew about it.

- Yeah, okay.

- No, that wasn't a corner lot, was it? Where you would see that from the other street?

- You could see it from .

- As much, as much.

- You don't see it I don't think from whenever the street that is, Jefferson.

- Yeah that wouldn't be as usable.

- I'm not concerned as much about the replacement of the existing garage as I am about the scale of what's being proposed. I think the drawing we're looking at on the screen right now it is definitely a much, much bigger structure. I understand why I just have some reservations about the size of the building we're talking about.

- I agree .

- [Ian] Yeah, it seems disproportionately tall.
- [Tyler] My opinion was the house that's over 35 feet tall. It wouldn't look out of place to have a garage that was the height that's proposed here.
- Okay, do we have any other questions for the property owner?
- It's a motion to close the floor. If there's another question.
- I'll second, all in favor.
- [Committee members] Aye.
- Any opposed? Alright. Lots of discussion. Fabulous property. I think David, you had started off with really questioning the overall need for replacement. Would you wanna entertain a motion there or does anybody else have a motion that they'd like to present?
- Well, I mean, I guess if I were to make a motion, I would motion to. Maybe learn a little bit more about the actual fate of the status of the building itself. But my motion would be to let them go forward with this project. It replicates their house. It would be a charm to the neighborhood. It wouldn't be done cheaply, just look at the place. I mean, when it was done it's not disproportionate to the size of the house. The house itself is a monster and it's beautiful. And I think that when that sitting back there if they got all the correct permits and all that I think it would be beautiful to the neighborhood, it would do, in my opinion. So I guess if I were to make a motion, I would motion that we allow them to go forward with the project as is. They're gonna try to use as much of the stuff as they can, they're gonna keep the doors they're gonna use as much of that siding as possible. I think we should move forward and let them do that. And we're not talking about the original landmark structure of the house itself here. We're talking about a garage and again, it's gonna look just like the house. It's gonna be beautiful. So that would be my motion.
- I appreciate what you have to say around about it fitting in with the neighborhood particularly 'cause you live in the neighborhood and you're really familiar with that house in that setting and that you think that this'll be fine. It is important to me. And I appreciate your input that way on that. I'm I still on mute.
- Jamie, I wanna second once more.
- You're a quiet group.
- So if we're not advancing Ron's motion, where are we going next, are we working for addition as to.
- I will make a motion to that effect. Paul I'll make a motion that the homeowner provide assessment about repairs.
- And how about also perhaps plans for a one-story garage?
- Yes, I'll be happy to amend that, that it in addition to assessing suitability of repair also submit plans that more match the existing structure.
- And or would be in compliance with city ordinance.
- That's a good addition by me.
- Yeah, yeah. I'll second that

- Further discussion.

- I didn't jump in before but I absolutely share the opinion that this what's proposed as two-story is disproportionate. I think it would have a significant impact because it's visible from two directions. I did drive by there and got in the way of the construction crews. So I had a flagman was unimpressed with me but I definitely see the proposed structure being out of place with that second story.

- I would kind of add to that, David that I'm not necessarily you're gonna post to the second story if it's maybe a little bit more reasonable and it's overall height. I think this is a large home, very tall very prominent on the corner. And so I don't think the second story garage would be out of place if that's where we end up. But I think as it's drawn right now it seems a little excessive and the proportions could be lowered a little bit and still gain the attic space that the, and so I think and then it would be in compliance with city ordinance and would save a lot of hassle on the backside. If indeed this would be approved.

- I concur Paul. I brought up the point about the height a little bit earlier. I'm not sure that they'll get down to the 16 feet which I believe is what I recall. The height maximum height being from 22 feet five and a half inches. That's a lot of height to shave off.

- Yeah, I don't think you'll get there either. You're right.

- But I do think that the proportion of the garage to the home would be better. We don't have a diagram of the profile of the garage relative to the profile of the house. So it's difficult to say, and I've gone back and forth and scrolled through the drawings in the photograph several times here to try to get a better handle on exactly how large it is. And I haven't driven by but I will on my way home from this meeting. I agree. I don't think the second story is necessarily a game changer, but I do think that the height is challenging.

- Stephanie, can you recapture on what the motion is? That we have on the floor right now?

- Sure, it's to hold for a more qualified report of if repairs can be made versus the replacement of the existing garage. And then to also submit something that complies with city code that maybe one story, but I think he may be adjusting that to say more height appropriate.

- Any other discussion regarding that motion?

- I guess there was additional discussion after Jason's presentation about the home being extent, the garage being extended. So we know it's not in its original form.

- What we also know though is that the current garage is appropriate to the district's period of significance. So even if not original, it's the right garage for the district and the property itself. And we know that it relates to the addition of the porte-cochère and relationship to sight lines and everything else that there's a clear link to the house via that porte-cochère.

- Yeah.

- So yes, as present, I guess, I'm not sure the far right-hand corner the back right-hand corner where the stair is where is that relative to the existing corner of the existing garage?

- Hold please. This is the stash line here is where they have an approximation of existing garage lines.

- Okay. Okay, that's helpful. So on the elevation, in looking at the front elevation the garage doors would be pretty close to where the current garage doors are and the building would be extended to the right and to the left of that.

- [Stephanie] Yes.
- [Ian] Is that correct?
- That's my understanding, yes.
- [Ian] I think that is an important piece as we look as you're walking by looking down the street or looking at the garage from the street yep. You would see something very similar to what's there in terms of the location of the doors, the height is a little concerning to me and continues to concern me. But.
- I think the fact that you would preserve the look that we're looking at right now, as far as the relationship of the doors or the of porte-cochère driveway, I think that's, you're going back in the same spot that it moved around from 1907, the 19 whatever. I think that the intent is there.
- Yep.
- So we have a motion on the floor right now. Is there any other discussion? Do we wanna vote?
- Can you repeat the motion again, I'm sorry. There's been some mixed discussion.
- Guys, no, I'm just kidding. So the motion would be to hold the application for a report on repairs to see if the existing garage can be salvaged, to submit, and also to submit a new plan for the garage that may be more height appropriate and complies with city code.
- Well, it's not my motion but I would recommend we strike what I had suggested about comply with city code. That's not the purview of this commission but I think the height appropriate is really what I was trying to get across. David, I think it was your motion.
- You're correct and I concur with that, entirely comfortable striking the issue. That is somebody else's concern, not ours. The one thing stuff on your first read back you used the term qualified in the assessment. I would like to include that in that motion that they assess was from a qualified source.
- Okay, I guess just to summarize, we're just looking for a little bit more information is what we're really saying. We'll take a vote, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Do we have a second on that motion.
- Susan.
- Okay, I'm sorry.
- So again, all in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Oh Susan you're muted. Sorry, I see your lips moving.

- I don't know it just flips over, has some mind of its own. Aye.
- All right, any opposed?
- Am a nay. So motion carries. Is that four, one? I was an aye.
- Okay, we'll work with you, Tyler and Jen will follow up for that inspection report. And then I think this may be a good situation in which we gotta do a site visit as a commission so that we can get a real feel for what's off the ground.
- Excellent suggestion.
- Yep, good idea. Okay, our ext item would be informational, staff level certificates, applications and repair orders.
- Yeah, it was nothing.
- I think there was one COA, right?
- I don't remember.
- It's meetings from my brain. There was one COA application for a greenhouse. So that's gonna be temporary in nature. It could be a permanent structure. They're not really sure yet but they're buying it as a temporary structure. So really no impact to the integrity of the PARP property. How was it? No, Paul you're muted.
- No other staff updates.
- Nope, we are beginning work with Legacy very soon here. So you guys will be getting an email with a proper introduction to their team and with a start date. So we already have all the phasing secured which you guys helped us figure out. Thank you for that. So we're just in the, behind the scenes work of making sure that they're introduced to all the proper staff city side and then getting our media push ready to go. But that should be the next week or two. So look forward to hearing to that. And then there'll be starting their survey work shortly after.
- Fantastic.
- Yeah, great.
- Is there any other items that anybody needs to bring forward. I would just thank everybody for their time tonight long meeting, difficult decisions, challenging projects, maybe remind everybody, let's go back and reread the purpose of the commission, just so that we're all comfortable and understand where we need to be and what our objectives are. And I think it's also, our goal is obviously to help property owners and guide them through the process. So, and I think everybody's doing that. So I appreciate everybody's efforts there, with that being said, I will look for a motion to adjourn.
- So moved.
- Second.
- All in favor.
- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, meeting adjourned. Thank you everybody.