



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 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, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer,
Excused:

Others present: Alder Bill Galvin

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the May 19, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ron Dehn to amend the agenda moving Agenda Item E2 to be discussed first. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No-None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No-None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 21, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer,
Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Mark Steuer to open the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No-
None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to close the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No-
None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve the design review for a new garage located at 704 S. Jackson Street. Motion was withdrawn prior to a vote.

Yes- None, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to hold the COA with the request of a drawing of the relationship between the garage and the house concerning location and scale of those buildings.

Justin Balsley left meeting at 5:54 pm

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Paul Martzke to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

A motion was previously made by Susan Ley, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 21-09) Consideration with possible action on a design review for partial window replacement at 902 S. Madison Street

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to open the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer,
Abstain- None.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to close the floor and return to regular order of business. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to approve the design review for a partial window replacement at 902 S. Madison Street. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Justin Balsley, Mark Steuer, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

Stephanie Hummel and Jason Flatt present staff-level COA applications.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

Stephanie Hummel review city raze/repair orders and demolitions. No orders or demolitions received.

3. Staff Update.

Stephanie Hummel and Jason Flatt present staff updates.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, June 16, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to adjourn. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Mark Steuer, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Can everybody hear me? Somebody nod?

- I can hear you.

- Perfect. Wednesday, May 19th, 2021 meeting of the Landmarks Commission. The first item on the agenda is the roll call. Ron. Hey Ron.

- Sorry I am here.

- Alderman Steuer.

- I'm here.

- Now, welcome back.

- Thank you.

- Ian Griffiths.

- Here.

- Susan.

- Hear.

- David.

- Present.

- All right we're all here. Thank you very much. Item C is the approval of tonight's agenda. The agenda is in the packet. I'm going to go ahead and make a motion to revise the agenda. I would like to change the order of the two items in section E. The certificates of appropriateness. I would like to start with 902 South Madison Street and then follow with Jackson Street. So I would make that motion

- I will second.

- I will second that motion.

- Any discussion? All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries and I'm sorry. I probably made a procedural error there. Do we also need a motion to approve that agenda?

- Yes, please.

- So moved.

- Seconds.

- Seconds.

- All right, all in favor of approving the revised agenda.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Thank you for that. Next item is item D, approval of the minutes from the April 21st, 2021 meeting at the Landmarks Commission. The meeting minutes are in the packet. Did anybody have any comments, changes, corrections to that meeting?

- No.

- Hearing none. I'll make a motion to approve those minutes.

- So moved.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? The meeting minutes from April 21st have been approved. Now we're on to item E regular business. So tonight the first item for concern review is certificate of appropriateness 21-09 consideration with possible action on a design review for partial window replacement at 902 South Madison Street. Jason, do you wanna take us through staff's review the project first?

- Sure 902 South Madison Street is a magnificent big brick house in the Astor District its contributing. It was identified as a priority property. This COA requests replacing three windows along the South Madison Street facade and the one paired casement window on the... I forget which direction that is the other street. So in this slide, if you can see what I can see on the left-hand side, you see it says six windows but I believe it's three windows. We're talking about uppers and lowers maybe. And then the right side is the casement window. So next slide. Representative detail of the windows in the bay window there you'll note that they have some fancy leaded cut glass details. And then the one casement window it's on the right hand side. Going to the next slide. These are the proposed replacements. They appear to be high quality Pella windows, generally of the type that I would expect Landmarks Commission to look favorably upon and cutting to the end of all this as a formality, I note that the secretary of the interior standards prefer maintenance of windows rather than replacement but if we're going to replace them we need to confirm that the fancy bevel cutlet a glass panes on the South Madison facade should stay. And furthermore, it should probably be specified that the replacements have non-reflective clear glass with a light transmittance value of 72 or higher. But yeah, there you go.

- This is David, Jason your voice was weak and then got very weak to the point of losing. Did anybody else have that issue?

- A little bit?

- Yeah, I could also could not hear Jason.

- Can you guys hear me?

- Yes.

- Sorry.

- We are in the same room, so.

- There we go.

- Am so sorry, everyone. So we're looking to replace some windows high quality pillar replacements. We want to make sure that the sash windows keep the fancy bevel cut leaded glass panes that exist.

- Its fixed.

- [Jason] There you go. And the casements, it looks like a simple swap out.

- So Patrick is here representing the property owner I think is the contractor. I'd make a motion that we open the floor so we can discuss with Pat the proposed project.

- Taking the motion.

- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye

- Any opposed? Alright, I'll get right to the point maybe the first question I think everybody else has. So in looking at the replacement window drawing there's a lower sash that's about two thirds or three quarters of the window opening. And then the upper sash is the sash that has the decorative leaded glass, beveled cut windows. Are those windows being proposed to be replaced or are you maintaining those leaded glass windows?

- We are definitely going to maintain the leaded glass windows. The sashes we're replacing are the operable sashes that are basically on the inside. So there's just single pane glass. And we have the... If you look at the pictures that Jason if someone can pull that up there's actually like the aluminum storm windows on there that are not authentic to the house or actually just a storm window to help the windows survive. So those cheap aluminum storm windows are coming off. They're gonna bring a brand new sash on the bottom. The leaded glass is staying or not gonna cover it with storm window. We're gonna cover it with a real insulated glass. And Jason will supply the paperwork that shows has a proper clear glass value because one of the things we're really focused on is we don't wanna take anything away from the this cut glass course real nice sparkles inside the house. We don't wanna dim that with any covering. So we're gonna have an argon gas gasketed window pane over top of the leaded glass, but then we'll have a operating sash with the argon gas and a double pane glass that operates. And we will be connecting the old counterweights and ropes. So I hope that sort of says what we're doing there.

- Nice.

- Mostly, Mark and some of you guys, Jason know what we do. There is no way in hell, those leaded glass windows are going anywhere.

- No, those have to stay there.

- My question for the owner is then are you replacing anything that is historic, that is original?

- No, but everything we're replacing is outside of the sashes the original wooden sashes with the weights outside of them. No, those are getting replaced. The one crank out window that is on the side on the poor Lear side of the house. We had a picture of it that cranks out that is documented in the Pella window order.

And that operates the same way as an old cranking, she has one of the original casements here but the woods rotten and the seals are gone and there's no way to salvage it.

- No for what can't be salvaged, what is going in there is going to be historically accurate as well.

- Yes, yes, well, it's gonna be done, built with today's standards that the case has been armature and things like that but it's gonna operate the same way. It's gonna have two panels with true divided light windows opening outward. And your old one works that's how this is gonna work.

- But in particular sidewalk view, it would be unchanged. Is that fair enough?

- Correct, yes, exactly. Yeah that's a must. When you go down on the street actually the thing you're gonna notice is not having what I call those aluminum storm windows on the front of the building. It's gonna look a lot nicer. 'Cause a little more storm will does, were put on in what 80, 70 or 80 or something. Yeah whatever some they've been they've been on they're just single-pane just like almost like a mobile home window. The tabs on it are just like an old fashioned mobile home window and those are coming off and a new sash which will be historically correct.

- Does anybody have any other questions for Mr. Drury?

- I guess I have one question for Jason. Jason, do you believe that the changes who will impact the stark tax credit availability for that property?

- No, I believe that losing original window material is a slight negative impact to the historic integrity of the building. But no, I don't anticipate this jeopardizing the individual eligibility of the building or having much impact on the district as a whole, okay.

- Thank you, Jason.

- Do you have any other questions?

- Mr. Ron, I was gonna ask that how Pam those windows that you replaced any idea how old those were. They'd been there for some time.

- What's that?

- As early 1900s when the building was built.

- The addition--

- The one window on the side is actually an addition from what was it?

- 1917 so that that's not... That was an addition 'cause it was really built in 1900. And then it did addition 17 years later when the daughter-in-law came back, her daughter came back. So that window replaced it on the side, probably was actually from 1917.

- Okay, all right I thought it might be a little bit later, but that's fine, that's all I needed thank you.

- Okay thank you. And just to let everyone know, we are gonna make this our showcase remodel homes this year. So we're doing some work in the bathrooms. I'm gonna show that, so this house will be open to the public the last week in September during the Brown County Home Builders showcase. So we'll be doing tours. I'm sure it will be people will come. It will be pretty house to show.

- So I haven't seen that house. So definitely I'd like to see it.
- Yeah so we'll be proud to show it. We've done a lot of work in this house through the years. So it'll be a good one to show.
- Great.
- Any other questions? If not I would make a motion to close the floor.
- So I moved.
- All in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any opposed? Okay so we've gotten staff. So review, we've heard from the contractor for the property owner. Any other discussion among the commission?
- I feel it's a very good fit for the building. Jason gave some good report on that and Pat has an impeccable reputation in the community for this type of work. I would propose to approve.
- I will second it.
- Okay so we have a motion to approve. Any other discussion? We will do a roll call vote. Ron
- Approve or yes.
- Susan.
- Approve.
- Ian.
- Approve.
- Justin.
- Yay.
- Alderman Steuer.
- Approve.
- David.
- Approve.

- And I also vote to approve. So motion carries unanimously.
- Thank you all very much.
- Thank you wonderful property.
- Thank you, take care.
- All right next item then on the agenda is certificate of appropriateness 21-06 consideration with possible action on a design review for a new garage located at 704 South Jackson Street. We've gone through this property very recently. Is there anything additional from your previous comments that you want to note or or expand on?
- [David] No, I have nothing to add at this time. I understand that many of the Landmarks Commission members have gone and toured the garage and I would defer to their observations to determine whether or not the garage is safe or it needs to be removed.
- [Stephanie] I would also like to add that we've discussed with the applicant that we would like to only approve or deny the demolition at this point and then work on if it does have the approval for the demo then work on the renderings for a new garage just so we can have some cost savings there. We didn't want him to have to redo them right away. If the demo wasn't gonna get approved we also are not requiring an inspection report as part of this demolition since so many commissioners have been to the site. So we're depending on your professional opinions on if this is a salvageable garage or not.
- I wish I could speak up 'cause it's not I know it, I know the garage.
- Okay discussion on a committee level.
- Sure I could chime in a little bit. when was Susan couple several weeks back when we both look at it from what I saw first of all they were talking about, the pitch of the roof would show it had a little concern with if they build a new garage, but what I saw the floor the ceiling, it wasn't for repair, if you will. And I'm not a 100% sure that could be fixed well enough. That's just my first reaction. And I'll wait for the discussion from the rest of the committee. My first reaction was that it didn't look good enough to really salvage.
- It doesn't look salvageable to me either but I'm not in favor of the two-storey garage. So if we're talking for us about salvageability I'd say, no, I don't think it's salvageable. It just seems to need so much.
- I'd like to add I believe last week I may have jumped the gun a little bit by wanting to approve the new garage, however that's because I had already toured it. And I also thought that it was not salvageable. And so I do agree with both of you so far that garage in the shape that it's in is probably not salvageable and that's my opinion.
- So what do we do? A two-part thing first vote on the garage not being salvageable and then a part two as the replacement garage, will replacement garage coming down the line or--
- I think that we agreed that today we would just be voting on demolition. So if you believe that the demolition, and then we would do the second, once we have updated renderings on a more properly scaled garage. So I think that if you guys want to open the floor we can discuss that with Tyler 'cause I kind of left it to him how much discussion he wants to have about the new design in a public forum versus just via emails. So I'll leave that to you all.
- So I'll share my comments. I think maybe before we open the floor. I think there's a couple of things at play here. And first of all, I'll state that I believe the review of this application by staff is in my mind, correct. As it

relates to our charter and the directives from the National Park Service. In reviewing the condition of the existing building the question is could it be repaired? And my response is absolutely it could be. I think that there's certainly significant problems with the structure, but it certainly could be fixed. And I would add although it's not relevant to this discussion it could be certainly repaired a lot more economically than a new structure could be built. But the cost is not the responsibility of this commission and we shouldn't let that enter into our decision-making process but I do think that it could be repaired but I also then look at the other portion of what we're trying to determine here. And that's the historic nature of the property. And I look at is the garage a contributing factor to the property and the language that we have says does it display prominence or a role in the property? And I'm going to suggest quite frankly that it really doesn't have either thing as it relates to this property. It is on the back corner of the property isolated from both streets, Jackson and Cass even though it is visible, we know that it's in the original location of a garage. If it's exactly the original structure or not clearly the doors had been replaced. The original doors are gone forever. And so I will throw out the opinion that the garage is not necessarily in my mind necessary for the historic nature of this property. And if it was rebuilt I don't believe it would be detrimental to the property or the neighborhood. The one thing I think that the proposed project has going forward which I do think is important is that the existing garage has an orientation to the existing porte cochere that is visible from the street, those garage doors centrally line up centered on the driveway. And that's the view that everybody would associate with historically the proposed solution is to essentially build a new garage maintaining that same relationship doors, the driveway and the porte cochere. And so in my mind that view is to some extent maintained even though the proposed new garage is gonna be a little different. I think that the second question that we're we're struggling with is the scale of the building. My personal opinion is as well the proposed garage is slated to be larger. It's not out of proportion when compared with the residence which is extremely tall, especially when compared to some of the neighboring residences. And I believe that the proposed architectural style of the new garage is not something that this commission would be embarrassed about improving from the standpoint of the average passer buyer or resident in the Astor neighborhood would not object or the new structure is potentially not objectionable with the other historic buildings in the neighborhood. It seems to be done in a sensitive manner and style that's consistent with this property and quite honestly several of the other neighboring properties. And so what I'm saying, I guess, to summarize my comments. Yeah I disagree with some of you about the repairability of the garage. I may disagree with the opinions of staff as to whether it's necessary to maintain the historic integrity of the property. But I think what's been proposed is something that's sympathetic and quite frankly with maybe some adjustments to height, but maybe not. I think the new building will fit in with the neighborhood. And so that's kind of where my opinions on this whole matter I'm stop talking now and find out if other commissioners would like to add in.

- I'll jump in here. I didn't visit the property directly I did drive around and I chose not to visit the property because determining whether or not it can be saved is outside my skillset. I certainly can look at it and see the same things. Anybody, I don't have the background to make a determination if it can be repaired or not. So what I'd like to ask those members that did go out there is particularly the contrasting opinions is what is it that sways you one way or the other about repairability versus not being repairable?

- I'll chime in here. My opinion is actually very close to that of Paul's. Could it be salvaged? Absolutely. Things need to be in pretty dire shape to not be salvaged or salvageable at some point. So I think there are certainly issues with it. There's no doubt in my mind that there's stuff that needs to get corrected if it's not taken down. But in regards to the proposed I have similar feelings on the new proposed garages as Paul, I think the new garage as proposed again depending on the height what I would like to see is a profile section of the house and a profile section of the garage just in terms of height, one against the other. So I can kind of see where some of those line up where they don't line up. And I don't think that would be difficult to do you already have the drawing for the garage and I'm not sure if you have plans for the building but really they would be just bringing those two to the same scale. I think the design is complimentary to the existing building. If, for instance, that was being proposed in that style made out of brick or precast panel, then it would be a no-go but that's not what's being proposed. What's being proposed is a building using similar materials scale siding that is either salvaged from or very similar in size and exposure to what's there. So I think there are a lot of complimentary elements to it. I went back through and looked at kind of our charter and yeah, item D in 13.214 says stabilize

and improve the property values in the area. And that this proposal as presented I believe would do that, would both preserve and enhance the property values in that area. Not that that's the only factor that we should consider but it is a factor in what we're doing here. So that's my true sense on it. And I'm open to hear another suggestions and comments obviously.

- Some other commissioners.

- It wouldn't be nice to hear the open on the floor eventually, 'cause I think Mr. Drury could even add some good points to it. And like I said, I share I'm a ex photographer I appreciate history very much. And I look at things, I think just from the initial reaction, just looking at the building it looked like it definitely was in need of repair. I didn't say necessarily tear it down completely or anything, but just looking at it it looked like it needed quite a bit of work. And I guess the concern I had was the age of the building. It's not how original is it to the original structure, and I want her to get a specific day. I know the owners to talk about that a little bit but it seemed like it was after the fact as far as the building, the original home. So I don't know how much that comes into play as well. So just a pointed discussion.

- Whether it's right wrong or indifferent, if this discussion was on a different level, if for instance the porte cochere that's on the house was in bad shape and the homeowner was requesting permission to remove it. That to me is a totally different discussion because that's critical to the primary building on the property. It's critical to that original architecture. I think, again this is an accessory building that as I stated earlier, I don't feel... I don't think it's 100% original that also factors into my thinking on this. And I think that this project has been definitely the most difficult one that I think this commission has reviewed in the last couple of years. And I would just add for the committee members that we've gotten caught up in times of trying to make decisions looking backwards and forwards as it relates to precedent and what we approve or deny. And I feel it's our responsibility as commissioners to judge each project on its own merits. And each situation is definitely individual. And I don't have any hesitation to recommend something for this project and worry about somebody coming back to us in the future and holding us accountable that will you approve it for one but not another because every project has its own circumstances and its own situations I guess.

- Each one is unique.

- Yes.

- Paul, maybe to add on that, if the garage is being proposed with access from a different side or different street elevation I think that completely changes the whole argument. Yeah so that one factor that the garage is been positioned relative to the original layout of the house and the framework, which you'd look down that driveway and into the front of the garage is unique to that facility or that property. And I think as proposed it builds on that, it doesn't counter that, yeah.

- Anybody else have any comments? So Stephanie, I turn this back to you to maybe give us a little bit of clarification. I know that the property owner is concerned with responding to our comments previously about the height and the scale. Ian had comments again tonight about that. If we make a motion tonight we simply just approving the... Let me say it a different way. I don't know that I'm comfortable making a motion to approve demolition of a structure without something replacing it.

- So you guys have a lot of different options here at minimum we needed a decision or a hold or some sort of action on the demolition. So that way we can give the applicant some direction on how we're intending to proceed. If you guys want to take the entire COA as one thing tonight you're welcome to do that with the caveat that it would have to go before a plan commission to get a conditional use permit and they would have that final approval through city council then for the height restrictions. So even if it does get approved as proposed with Landmarks Commission there would be a condition on that that it has to go for a planning commission also. So just keep that in mind as well. But if you guys all feel comfortable and the applicant feels comfortable discussing the COA in its entirety tonight. You're absolutely welcome to do that. If you want to

do just a partial approval for the demo which leaves the other half of that COA open it would still be an open application that we could work through with the applicant. So whatever you guys are almost comfortable with including the applicant himself.

- Stephanie I have a followup question to that when it goes for the variance for the height, what is needed at that point for the variance to be approved is one of the things requested or required what I suggested with the profile of the existing and the profile of the new?

- Basically so we've seen a couple of years of planning commission. We don't get the requests a lot. If they do come from another body then that recommendation gets added in with our planning commission recommendation. But then they'd be looking for a profile of the building that it's going to be adjacent to and then anything that's in the surrounding area. So we'd basically just do a site visit around probably 300 feet of that block to see if it would be indirect conflict with any of those structures. Aside from that conditional use permits are highly regulated by the state. So basically if it meets or can meet all of the conditions that are within state code they get approved. So it would only be if it's detrimental to life safety, historic fabric, historic character but that's where you guys come in. So there are some pretty strict requirements on that that we have to follow through the plan commission but if we're able to condition, so it's met. So if it's even like adding additional landscaping, that's what the conditional use permit does is gives the approving body more leniency with wall. Okay, add more trees, get a new fence that kind of stuff. So when it comes to the height of a structure they're really just trying to make sure that it's not having a negative impact on the neighboring properties. So that's also what you guys are looking to review when you're doing the scaling as well. So it kind of be the same, but it's a required process for over 16 feet.

- Well, I would like to just address the issue of whether or not we're going to concur that demolition can be permitted. I would like to hear from the homeowner about that if it's repairable not repairable and particular, I'm waiting, I'm still I would like to be convinced one way or the other based on people's observations. So unless there's any objection I'll make an motion to open the floor to hear from others.

- Welcome.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed. Floor is open. We can talk to the property owner, but I guess David my response to your question is as I stated earlier tonight I'd absolutely feel the building could be salvaged. It's not an easy process. There's certainly lots of major repairs that need to be made but it certainly could be fixed. But I also will take off my Landmarks Commission hat and just add a sense of practicality to the request by the property owner in that one of the issues that I see here is that we have a property owner that simply is trying to improve the property for 2021 standards and not 1906 standards. We all have quite a bit more stuff in today's day and age than we might have a 100 years ago. And people just need that kind of space. From a historic standpoint, if we were to deny this request that doesn't relieve the homeowner of a need to have more space for their property. And I would throw out the scenario of the hypothetical scenario. What if we insisted the homeowner keep the small garage that doesn't necessarily meet their expectations for today's lifestyle and then their response as well. Now I'm gonna have to add the garden shed from a big box store that I'm gonna put in my side yard which is probably permissible under the city ordinance. What's the detriment to the historic property when we have homeowners starting to do those types of things as opposed to what this property owner is suggesting. So there's a lot of things that you can throw out there as far as if we insist that

they have to repair this existing structure. How do we protect the historic ordinance that we're serving and yet allow property owners to have the conveniences of modern day society on their parcels.

- That's very well put Paul and that's one of the things that I felt when I first toured the property myself. Again yeah is there a chance that it could be salvaged? Sure but whether we like the height of the new model or whether he changes that slightly to meet somebody needs, I mean ultimately it has to work for the property owner. Who's already stuck a tremendous amount of money into the structure. And like you said the newer one and all that would enhance rather than take away. I think that was Ian that said that that the new structure would probably actually more enhance the neighborhood than trying to repair this old ones. So I think that was Ian. So again I concur with you Paul and everything you just said. I mean, you made some really good points, Sir.

- So the floor is open. Do we wanna hear from the property owner?

- I'm good with that.

- All right again, I heard a couple of comments and then I appreciate everybody having their expert opinions and thank you for the folks who came in and spend time with me and Jen at the site to take a look at the garage and the home as well. A couple of things that I wrote down that I think he has wanted to cover one being around the age and whether the garage was original. And I think Jason did a very good job. The last meeting presenting the information that we have on the garage which unfortunately isn't incredibly conclusive. I think it is indicative of what was done at the time. It appears as though there certainly was a garage that moved around on the Sanborn Maps in the same spot, likely the structure that's there, there's at least one portion of it that is original. I can say confidently that it was expanded. And I think the folks who all came to see it would agree that the portions that I pointed out where the foundation was expanded where the walls were expanded, does lean credibility to the fact that it is not a 100% original. In fact probably it's likely less than 50% original at this point and time. David, you specifically asked about my opinion on the reparability and or salvageability of the garage. I would agree wholeheartedly with Paul's comments on can it be salvaged? It's pretty hard not to sell. It's got to really be in a point where a strong wind would blow it over or the materials are completely rooted. There is a significant deterioration to figure out there's significant repair work that would need to be done to salvage it. And in my opinion that amount of work for this structure is not worth the effort to it. And I agree with Paul's comments on is it truly a contributing structure to this property and its historic value? I answered that with a very simple set of two questions. Would the house be considered historic without the garage? I think all of us on this call have the answer wholeheartedly yes. Would the garage be considered historic without the house. I'm not sure that that answers is quite as I felt in my mind that hesitation leads me to believe that this garage is not truly the contributing factor of what makes this property historic. And replacing it with something that is in much better condition. And as Paul mentioned, suits the needs that we have today enhances the property, it truly does. So it could be salvaged. It could be repaired thinking about the ceiling that's not so bad, the roof and the walls that becomes a little the roof is fine, probably easy to do. The walls becomes a bit of a challenge, but in my mind dealing with the foundation and the cracks and repairing all of that concrete that becomes a significant challenge because now you're you're not just talking about some small repairs and you're not talking about, replacing some wood structure, you're talking about a significant movement of the existing building in order to pour concrete underneath it and then trying to set it back in a manner that doesn't do any damage to it. I don't think that's a riskless proposition and for those folks who have experienced with it and would do it well but I think that would be a very, very big challenge. And frankly not one that I really even entertain and I'm trying to do I think that's not money well spent. As it relates to the proposed replacement. And I mentioned to a number of you that came that I'm not dead set on exactly what we presented if we need to make some modifications to it. I look at this commission as a collaborative group and you all have a lot to add. And if there's ways that we can improve upon what we've presented through the collaboration of this group, I'm open and willing to take your suggestions on that. Paul and Ian, you both pointed out the exact intent of why we proposal what we did. We wanted it to be in the same footprint. We wanted to have that same view of the garage doors in the same position. Well, in relation to the driveway and the porte cochere and we wanted the enhancements to it with the roof and the

gable ends, and neither the windows styling and the cedar shakes with the matching design of the sawtooth edge and the curb. We wanted all of that to match the house in a way that adds to the property and brings that significance that we see in the house over to this new structure. So that was the intent of it, as far as procedurally what my expectations would be is to have a determination on whether or not the commission would approve removing the garage and I understand the question, but I think it's fully conditional on an approved replacement as well. I mean, I'm not gonna go down there tomorrow or knock it down and have no garage, that's not practical. And until I have the blessing of this commission it's gonna stay there in its current state. So we can determine together that there's an acceptable solution that we can agree on to move forward with.

- I have a quick question.

- Yes.

- Tyler, thank you for your testimony. So with the... Let's just say we move forward the garage is taken down and then you would build a new garage. What is the timeframe? Are you trying to do that immediately afterwards?

- No I mentioned this to Paul, lumber prices right now are prohibitively expensive. I understand they've gotten a little bit better this week but they've got a ways to go. We're not foolhardy in how we spend our money. So we are certainly patient enough that we can do in this time that makes financial sense certainly from that perspective. But we don't have a specific timeline that we've outlined. We know, obviously the steps we mentioned we need to get the conditional please on it. So we don't have a timeline that we're trying to meet objectively here.

- Thank you.

- I guess I have a follow-up question to that for Stephanie or for Jason, if approved, what is the timeline that this approval would be granted for? Is there a sunset on it?

- COA have a life of one year and then a conditional use permit also has the life of a year to basically implement whatever your condition is. And then the process to get a conditional use permit approved is typically six to eight weeks kind of depending on the plan commission and city council schedule but it's only one of each of those meetings. So if they're back to back, that works out really well. But sometimes in summer the schedule is a little bit more walkie.

- So they have a 10 month approval really?

- 10 months?

- If the council does approves it and we approved it two months before does it only last the COA or at the time of the council approval?

- Well I guess from the city's perspective, we'd be looking at it from the time of the CUP approval since that it would be conditioned on that. So you would need that. So that's how I would look at it. And I'm the one who enforces it. So that's on--

- It would be a 14 month approval essentially.

- Yeah.

- If it was a two. Okay I just wanna make sure that the homeowner was aware of what that timeline might be in which of those approvals might be the determining factor for getting it completed.

- I do have a follow-up for Tyler. You mentioned about lifting the building and putting in a new foundation, new floor. I've seen that done, but like everything else that's outside my skillset. My question for you is for that part of the project or any other parts of a potential renovation repair have you had assessments done by anyone in the business quotes or just assessments?

- I have not recently had anyone come to take a look at it to get any sort of assessment. The contractor who's done the most work at our house who would be the one that I would look to give that assessment would be Pat Drury and briefly outside of the the open session yard and give his comments on what he thought of the structure.

- I'd like to hear what Pat has to say as well as the committee would be okay with that.

- He's not on the call anymore.

- Oh, he isn't, okay.

- No, that at the beginning he said that it wasn't--

- He didn't mention.

- Yeah.

- Pat, has again many times. And he did patted all of the work on our house to restore the porte cochere and do significant work on both portes that we have on the side and front. So he is very familiar with the property.

- Have you tried to plans for a one-storey garage with a pull-down staircase to like an attic area where you could still store things but it wouldn't be a full height second floor.

- I've not had any done additionally from the ones on it.

- I'm okay with a demolition. My thought is to have something like demolition of the garage is approved contingent upon the replacement garage being approved by the Landmarks Commission.

- I would opt for something like that as well. Other discussion, I guess.

- Ill take a contrast right here. I haven't been convinced that demolition is appropriate. Just I haven't gotten convinced yet. I also feel though in contrast that the garage does contribute to the historic nature of the property, whether it's all original or partially original, it's all historic. So removal and replacement I think would impact the historic nature of the property in its entirety, which is why was looking to be convinced a demolition would be appropriate. I also feel that the large garage that was proposed would be inappropriate for the property and the neighborhood in particular. While it's practically desirable to have that much storage space. The fact is there's the historic restriction. A large garage like that belongs out in the new construction in the suburbs. Similarly, a small garage like on the property we're talking now that would be an anomaly out were where large garages are the norm. I drove around the neighborhood and I looked very hard to see any of those large garages. And I just didn't see any.

- There's one directly across Cass Street.

- Yep.

- To the north that's a more modern home if I recall correctly.

- It is not, it is not.

- Okay all right. Well, I just, at this point I'm unconvinced of the need of demolition nor am I convinced that the initially proposed garage, well I get the desirability of having a lot of storage space. I'm just not convinced that that's appropriate for the neighborhood given historical preservation.

- Paul

- Definitely can I do a screen share?

- Sure, do you have permission?

- Yeah.

- Okay go ahead.

- I don't know if you guys can see that but that's across the street.

- We don't see that--

- I can't see it but remember it, I remember it looking at that garage.

- I saw it as well.

- I can imagine that.

- [Stephanie] There.

- Now the picture's up.

- Yep I see it now, Paul.

- Yeah so that was something that tripped me up as well that I realized that structure was built before this commission was established and clearly is not of historic proportions. I just struggle with the situation of, I guess favoritism or lack thereof.

- The property directly was that one Paul as well has a similar side of garage as well. I like Ian comment earlier when he talked about if this new garage is being proposed that would alter how the property is utilized. Meaning if the garage was supposedly facing Jackson Street and a driveway was being added off of Jackson or the garage was being placed in the front of the property in front of the porte cochere and access even off of the existing driveway. That to me is a detrimental change to the property. But I've looked at coming around to thinking that because it's maintaining the same location on the property even though the footprint is slightly larger. I don't see a big detriment to the property in general. I'm concerned a little bit. We talked about the height a lot and I agree with Ian's comment that comparison drawing that shows the house or even photograph that was done to scale with the new garage in it. But in looking at the design that was presented in the packet, one thing I would say that I believe is as Ian used the word complimentary? And I think that's a great word. The gables that are on both the ends of this new structure and on the front elevation those gables are essentially the same proportion or pitches the gambles on the residence. And so, again it's complimentary. It doesn't mimic what was there in the past. And that's something that sometimes we get that's something that we try and do is that don't do something new that tries to match the past perfectly and is imitation. So I think Ian's word of complimentary is I think the correct descriptor of this project.

- Paul I don't know how do I share my screen if I can.

- [Stephanie] Sure one second.

- Share.

- Should it be a button on the bottom of your screen that says share screen?

- Okay let's see if this works. Yup are you seeing a house with an addition on it?

- Yes.

- Yes.

- Yeah.

- So this is out of the department of the interior standards for historic preservation and talks about new exterior additions on related to new construction. And I looked at this earlier on today as an in preparation for this meeting. And this structure this addition is not identical to that building, right? But it's also not built out of siding brick building. It is a brick structure next to a brick building. It has windows that are similar in proportion. It's complimentary to the other building. There's a clear distinction between the original and the new. So I think there's a balance between copying the past and providing a solution that's complimentary to what's on the site existing. If this was all precast it would be a completely different story. If these windows were different it would be completely different. This does not hit the belt line on that building intentionally. And so it's a fine balance. There's no doubt about it. And I think it goes to Paul's question or comment earlier about looking at each of these uniquely. I just wanted to share that because it is right out of the department of the interior standards for which ordinances is based.

- Does anybody have any more questions or comments or asking anything more of Tyler?

- No.

- Then I guess I would make a motion and we close the floor and go back into discussion.

- So moved.

- Second.

- All in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? I didn't think so. So where we're at right now is the biggest question maybe there's two questions is demolition okay or not, and is the proposed structure okay. I'm gonna go ahead and make a motion to approve the certificate of application as it's submitted both demolition and construction of the new structure. I would look for a second on that.

- I'll second.

- Okay.

- Could you also add a condition about the condition use permit.

- Yeah we can throw that in there. I didn't know if that's our responsibility but I appreciate letting applicant understand that this committee is not the end all to the city permitting process and that there may be numerous other permits and committees that they need to stand before to proceed with a project.

- Yeah government.

- So we have a motion it's been seconded. I certainly feel that there's probably more discussion to be had here on this motion or maybe not.

- I'll share, I'll just say that I think the lenses have been very forthright and trying to work with the commission over time, but didn't know, like I said this Landmarks Commission has been around for a couple of years and other buildings around the neighborhood have been built differently. They did things before but I think that they're very forthright in their efforts to keep the pitch the same as the house and a few other things, like I said the building could be repaired, but you'd have to do the concrete would have to be completely redone. And I don't know if the doors to doors just looking at them, trying to fit in structures or build or cars and such like that into the garage you had I think it would be very, very difficult. So I'm looking at it from a practical standpoint as well. And I agree partly with Paul's comments on this so I'll go along with that, thank you.

- Further discussion, Jason.

- I don't know if it's really my place. I just wanted to point out a few things. Having listened to everybody's discussion, good discussion. I think you're definitely on the right track but I did wanna note from my perspective that the garage that exists there, it is a historic garage. It may not have been built at the same time with the house but then again, the porte cochere was not built at the same time as the original construction of the house. The loss of the current garage does negatively impact the integrity of the property. Not enough to make it no longer eligible for national register listing, but it does have some impact. When looking at the scale of anyone's new garage, when it comes to the need for a variance or conditional use permit, I look for a compelling reason and that compelling reason I look for based on the historic nature of the property. So if you had a small house that had a really big carriage house, I would see, well historically you have a compelling reason. You historically had a big carriage house. In this case, you don't have any historic precedent for this property to say that's a compelling reason. The compelling reason that you're stating here is that the property value could be improved by having a much larger garage. And I certainly can't argue with that but from a preservation perspective that also is not a compelling reason. And I would also say too, we've never discussed the scale of the neighboring houses relative to say outbuildings and garages. I haven't gone out and surveyed measured anything but it looks to me like the proposed two storey garage is the equal of the house on one side and maybe larger than the non-contributing house in the other direction. So we can talk about what a wonderful thing it is to have a new garage and it is. But when we start saying that this enhances the property, no from a historic preservation perspective new construction does not enhance it. It does not improve the historic integrity by mimicking architectural details. We're not making it better. And I have a little bit of concern, granted we're looking at each property individually as we go, but if we're saying that a compelling reason is met when we say it increases property value. Well there's a lot of improvements that can be made based on that same compelling reason. So I have some hesitation on that. Just as brand new vinyl siding may improve a property value that maybe isn't what we want to start looking at either. And I'm not suggesting that we would but I question what your compelling reason is to say that we should have a conditional use permit or a variance or whatever to get around the building heights and setback heights. There's also the property setback issue still at play too. Thank you.

- Jason actually, my response to the issue of the height and the neighboring properties 'cause I did consider that as well situationally this building if my geography is right, it sits to the property just to the south of that is a smaller scale residents and garage. But because this new building will be situated to the north you don't have issues with blockage of sunlight which I would say is super critical. If the situation was reversed that this new garage was being proposed south of a smaller structure or a yard, I would probably object to it because I feel that that would be taking away from the neighboring properties ability to enjoy sunlight because of the taller structure, but situationally that's not what we have here. We have the Northern most property building the taller structure. And in theory to me, because it's on the north end of the block, it kind of gets a pass that way. That was just one thing I considered in my decision on this. And I also, again, looking at the drawing they presented because I do think the gables are the same pitch as what the residence is. And I think I didn't use the word enhance I liked Ian's word of compliment. I think there's a difference there. I don't think if the property owner is gonna go back and redraw it to scale this thing down to get it within the ordinance, I'm not sure that you'll be able to maintain those same gables maybe you are, maybe you're just scaling it down and maybe it's two-thirds of the height or the size that the building is now but there's something about the proportions of it the way it's drawn, that look acceptable to me. And I think you're going to lose that. If we scale it down, I don't think the proportions are gonna be able to be maintained. And then--

- I think you are right? Note, however that the historic garage the original article here does not have these gables. We're trying to thread the needle between a complimentary new design and something that looks like it might be mistaken for having been there originally. And maybe this design threads that needle quite nicely, I don't know, but scaling it down. I don't see as being a bad thing because it upsets these gable lines that were never on the historic garage in the first place.

- Well, I'll be blunt. I think we run the risk if we scale it down we run the risk of having a really ugly garage built taking all the historic nature out of it, whether it's happy or it's complimentary or whatever word we wanna use. I think proportionally the garage looks pretty good if you just were judging it on its own merit. When we started messing with those proportions and heights and things like that the designer is gonna have to do a heck of a job, I think to get that same proportionality out of this structure based on the length and width the four plans. But I guess that's not really what we're here to judge.

- I guess my desire, whether it's for this commission or for the other approvals that are needed to have a profiled section of this raw relative structure to the house. In my mind that question hasn't been answered and I just haven't seen them side by side. I would like to see that. But other than that...

- I think when Mark and I are out there we were talking of Tyler about that whether he projected the peak of the garage off of calm. And it seemed like if I remember correctly, it would be about the same height as top of the second floor. Am I remembering that correctly Mark, do you recall that? When we discussed that with Tyler.

- Yeah I think we did discuss that. We were looking at the original pitch of the existing garage and looking at the proposed, and it seemed like it was up towards the second, it was toward the bottom of the second floor, I thought.

- Yeah like the second floor to ceiling height I thought it was somewhere around there.

- Right and I know that he's--

- As we were concerned about like how tall is this thing going to be that you're proposing? Well, I mean, they were looking, I think they were looking for extra storage space in that, but looking at the garage now, the existing garage it's got a nice style and nice designed to it. And although the slope line is different than but I don't know, I think it would be interesting to see how much it would cost to restore a garage like this. I don't know if anybody has any kind of figures on that. And we went up to reopen the floor but I don't know if that came out in a previous meeting how much would it cost to restore this particular building?

- I don't think they got it. It seems to me with my experience it would just be expensive. You can do anything but it will cost an awful lot.

- Yeah that is something I definitely would have liked to have seen was a cost estimate and that is absent and that's... For me it's unconvincing that to approve the demolition. I also I'm thinking back to what we just approved with the windows and what made that easy is that they were recreating what is there? That there was a preservation. And while again, I'll reiterate what I said before having a large garage is a modern feature. I understand it's desirable, but it's not historic. And for that reason I haven't been swayed to approve this. And at this point I'm intending to vote against the motion.

- So I respect that comment David but I do wanna go back and I understand maybe why you're interested in the cost but I would go back and state that that really should never factor into this commission's decision.

- Okay.

- That's my thought maybe I'm wrong and I need to reread our charter but we have told property owners in the past that cost was not relevant and we expected them to do things for better or worse. And I guess I just don't know why cost would factor into it. It would think to me that if we're gonna base the decision on the principle of doing what's right by the historic aspects which is what I think you're saying is your primary concern David then I'm with you, but I guess I just I think the cost thing is a slippery slope for this commission to be discussing.

- I concur with that, but it is a piece of information to be provided and it's absent here.

- But I think we can argue then the window that we just approved at the last item on the agenda was a replacement of an existing window. We didn't ask them for the cost of maintaining that existing window to repair it. If you draw the line of that.

- I think it was good points on both sides there. I just I think I was sort of agreeing with David in the sense, so just trying to get a perspective of what the costs would be, but like I said there might be beyond our purview, like was stated.

- So Stephanie, a point of procedural clarification again and I'm sorry, I'm supposed to know this stuff, but so we've got a motion on the floor that was seconded. Do we have to take a vote on this motion? And I'm asking this question on behalf the other commissioners, 'cause it's my motion is on the floor or can one of the other commissioners make a another motion without voting on the first one?

- You have to complete a vote on something. 'Cause it's been seconded. So the commission needs to take action on that first motion, other commissioners can friendly amendments to your motion but you have to vote and if it fails then another motion can be added.

- Okay so--

- We revoke or--

- Paul can take his motion off the table for sure. We can do that at any point with any motion that you make. So if you don't wanna vote on this action you can remove that motion Paul, but then from there since it's in seconded a vote needs to occur.

- So I'm also willing to listen to one of the commissioners wants to propose that I amend my motion because I did hear concern for several people about what the replacement structure would look like. And so yes I can either withdraw the motion if somebody has something else they'd like to propose or I could amend mine.

- I guess my only request for amendment would be before final approval. It would be to have the buildings drawn a profile so that that could be established and reviewed. That's the only piece that I'm struggling with here.

- Yeah is there a time sensitivity to this? Like anything else?

- No I think they better waiting for lumber prices to drop.

- All right okay.

- Some more concern about lumber prices, then the timeframe for getting this done.

- Well so then just discussing the concerns. I think realistically they would need to resubmit some new documents that show these buildings to scale and together, whether it's an actual drawing or a photograph with some things placed on it there's different ways to get us the scale images we need. But I guess I am are you thinking that it's simple or are we just talking about approving the removal of the existing structure as a vote and they're gonna resubmit the new structure at a later date?

- I think it would be appropriate to see the profiles before approving but I think it may be just a modification to that. I think I brought up at the last meeting, the amount of height between the top of the garage door, floor above. I don't know if that's the appropriate height relative to the existing building, I can't tell. It might be executive what it needs to be or it may be completely the inverse of that. And we need to bring it back down. So that's my reservation. We have partially approved COS before we just added the language that one portion was approved and then condition the rest of the approval on something else. So if that's coming back before the Landmarks Commission with those specific documents you're able to do that as well.

- So like demolition of the garage is approved contingent upon the approval of the... What would we call that drawing?

- Section profile or...

- Height study.

- Height study.

- A drawing showing the garage in relation to the house.

- Can I ask you or if your firm do you have a drawing of the home itself?

- I don't think we did the home originally.

- Okay well it would be you would think there'd be a drawing out there somewhere that you could somehow take that and superimpose the drawing here on it. So you won't have to reinvent the wheel.

- Jason, I'm guessing you did not find a drawing of the home in your studies for this application.

- I think he went to the restroom. But I would assume he would have added them in if he did but maybe he knows a place we can look to.

- Understood.

- On the picture he could do that. You just think there's probably some computer program that could handle that.
- We've even like for simple scaling, you can just from the middle of the right of way, take a photo do the dimensions based off of that. So there are ways to do it without having to pay somebody to do it.
- Okay so do I simply just Stephanie I'd like to withdraw my motion.
- Okay.
- And then I would ask if somebody else would like to make a new motion?
- I'm thinking about the wording for that.
- Yeah.
- That we request a drawing showing the relationship between the house and the proposed garage, as far as location and scale.
- But would you leave the demolition part out of it?
- Right, we just leave that out for now. That we'd before we talk about demolition that we wanna see we want more on the proposed structure in relation to the house.
- So are you proposing holding with that condition?
- That would probably be the right one to bill. That's your motion, Susan?
- It is.
- I'll second for discussion.
- If we pass this motion have we advanced this project at all?
- No.
- That'd be held.
- So we've made no progress in two meetings. I guess, I apologize for that. We have made progress. We've had a lot of great discussion and everybody's been out to see the property or--
- A lot of information gallery.
- I guess to be more clear, is the property owner going to feel comfortable advancing this design in discussion with the aspect of the removal of the existing building still not decided upon?
- I make a motion on the floor.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- [All] Aye.

- Any opposed? And we're back to an open floor.

- Just one thing I'm thinking is with this, proposal that I had is that it helps us I feel make an informed decision on this project.

- Well, I think very simply titled the question is are you comfortable going forward with a little bit of redesign on this, knowing that we haven't made a decision on the fate of the existing structure?

- Yeah, that's fine. I think that really what I'm gauging from the commission is that if we can get to an X design that people can accept and we can see that the profile, but the high comparison that, the that's really the what's the roadblock here. So yeah, I'm comfortable with that.

- Any other discussion while the floor is open?

- I guess, Tyler, do you understand why we're asking this additional information, not only you're comfortable with it? It's hard for me sitting here to be able to say that 22 foot five and a half inch to the region line is gonna be where on your building, I don't know. To me this isn't, it is a standalone building but it's part of that site, and part of that complex just the way that it's situated behind the porte cochere and the orientation of all of that is part of that. And I think we're just missing that hide element that to me I don't think we would have done a due diligence if we don't see that information.

- Yeah, I understand that. I think it's a reasonable. I think and Susan you made the comment before about the relative height when we were out there thinking about the proportion of the home itself, there's about a little more than it's almost four feet of the basement that's exposed. You've got, obviously a structure supporting first floor a template ceiling on the first floor not floor plus a nine foot ceiling up to the second floor. You add those together, the 22 feet is not going to be at the top of the second floor. That's not it. I think our original estimates were off. I think you're likely to see it more in line with the middle of the windows on the second floor.

- Okay.

- To be correct, just looking at the photograph from the street, I think that would help put a lot of minds at rest.

- You know him talking about the basement and the way they changed it up a little bit, 'cause we were Susan and I were looking at it from the top the second floor that changes it a little bit. I don't know if that helps to make a better decision today or are you still wanna see their profile.

- To me, I'd like to see a profile.

- Yeah, seeing the profile.

- It can be simply a photo montage of the photograph that we see and the end elevation. It doesn't need to be complicated. Well, do we have any other questions that Tyler? I think that's a big thing. The floor is still open. If nobody else says I'm a close the floor.

- Second.

- All in favor.

- [Everyone] Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay, we're back to discussion, I think Susan, I heard them. Was it seconded?
- Yes.
- Stephanie, can you reread Susan's motion for us?
- That's a whole the COA, with the request of a drawing of the relationship between the garage and the house concerning location and scale of those buildings.
- Okay, any add on that? If not, I would call for a vote. I'll do it by role. Ron.
- Hmm, I guess yeah. Yes.
- Alderman Steuer
- Aye.
- Justin.
- Oh, Justin must've left.
- Yeah he's out of the boardroom.
- Okay. Ian?
- Yes.
- Susan?
- Yes.
- David?
- Yes.
- My vote, nay. So motion carries. All right, I think Stephanie, I think you know where we're at and what we are looking for from the property owner.
- Yeah Tyler I can work with all the scaling if you need any help with that.
- Subsequent weeks or months? Next item for businesses, is item F for informational. So staff level, certificate of application?
- Yes, we had two since our last meeting let me pull up my screen quickly.
- This one was a chimney repair and the other one was a fence.
- [Stephanie] There we go.
- [Jason] Chimney repair. I think it was tuckpointing.
- Yes.

- [Jason] Awesome, okay. We approved that. And then a new fence, is it, is that the picture there? Yep, there it is cool. A new fence South Van Buren, nothing that detracts from the district might go away in 20 years. These things come and go.
- And that was it for staff all COAs.
- Did you review a raise and repair orders?
- None received.
- Okay, and item three would be a staff update.
- What is a clerical issue? So apparently our department was the only department adding our minutes from the last meeting into our agenda packets. So we have been given direction to remove those from our agenda packets. So going forward, you will not have less meetings minutes in your packet, you'll have to log onto civic clerks to view the meeting minutes from the last meeting prior to the next meeting for agenda approval. So we'll still be approving the minutes but they won't be in packet. If anyone has any questions on where to find that please shoot me an email and I will show you how to. We started--
- That seems like a poor decision on somebody's part, but I guess that how--
- I absolutely agree with you. So I don't know why the other departments were doing it. It seems like the easiest way to review something but this is the direction I've been given. Today we started the update to our historic survey, which is yay. Legacy has begun doing survey work, we put out a letter to all the property owners in the phase one survey area. We did an introduction with the police department, DPW, mayor's office, pretty much anyone who might get a call of there are people driving slowly through my neighborhood. So everyone should be pretty much aware. We do have a press release and a Facebook post going out either later tonight or tomorrow morning regarding this as well. So if you see it and feel free to share it tell your neighbors whatever you need to do. We wanna make sure that everyone knows that this survey is happening, not only because we want people to know why people are driving slowly through the neighborhood, but also just to make sure that people understand that this is not at the burden of any taxpayers this is taxpayer free dollars. And then just to promote the certified local government program more. So I think that those are the only staff updates that I have for you, Jason?
- Yeah, I don't think I have any either or nothing to add to that to anyway.
- Okay David the next meeting is Wednesday, June 16th, 2021. Does anybody have any other issues, items?
- I have one sure. I'm gonna talk to Stephanie tomorrow but I met with Will Peter's at the city today and we're talking about putting together one or two tours. so the Oakland-Dousman District and potentially other historic districts are looking at the idea of maybe getting something online as well as possibly an app per use so they'll people that are coming to Green Bay from outside or even living in the area and access that so we've got some hard copy, books on Oakland-Dousman and Astor but we're gonna kind of look at potentially other types of information for something like that. So I've done these tours before and we'll probably ask other folks, from the commission, to join us on that though when we get some information, we'll probably be mid I would say late June, middle of July or early August on a Thursday. So that's the initial thing, I'm gonna be in touch with Stephanie on that she'll let the commission know. So that's one thing that we're working on.
- Thank you for that information and Dousman story. That's a fantastic idea and I hope that you're successful in winning that.
- Thank you.

- Anybody have anything else? I just wanna thank everybody. Obviously the Jackson Street property has taken a lot of time on this commission, both at our meeting but also I know a lot of us went out and met with the property owner and took our own time to do that. And I appreciate the discussion tonight. Clearly there this was the most divisive submission we've ever had as a commission since I've been on, and yet I think everybody agrees that the property owners and the residents are definitely great matters of the Astor neighborhood district. So I can understand why it's taken so much discussion and that's important, but I appreciate everybody's opinions and their professionalism continued to diligence in trying to solve this one. With that I guess I'd look for a motion to adjourn.

- One last--

- Go ahead Ron.

- If those photos do come in, in a relatively short time, is everybody holding a special meeting to try to resolve this issue? Okay, thank you. Thanks, Paul.

- Yeah so good suggestion, Ron. Thank you for bringing that up. Still looking for a motion to adjourn then.

- I'll make a motion.

- Second.

- Our discussion would be long gone are the days of 12 minute meetings apparently. So all in favor to adjourn?

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries, thank you everybody have a good evening.