



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 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, Ian Griffiths, Susan Ley, David Siegel, and Rebecca Derenne

Present: Ron Dehn, Mark Steuer, Ian Griffiths, David Siegel, Rebecca Derenne, Susan Ley, Excused: Paul Martzke

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the October 20, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the September 15, 2021, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Rebecca Derenne to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 21-24) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a building addition located at 400 S. Washington Street.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to Open the Floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to Close the Floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ian Griffiths to Open the Floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to Close the Floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve the vestibule addition on the west side and deny the egress/exit door on the north facade. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ron Dehn to Open the Floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to Close the Floor. Motion Passed .

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

2. (COA 21-27) Consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement windows located at 644 S. Quincy Street.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by David Siegel to approve the replacement of the historic windows. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Public Meeting regarding Phases 2, 3, and 4 of Intensive Survey Project

2. Staff-Level COA Applications.

3. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

4. Staff Update.

5. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, November 17, 2021.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- **Item A, Zoom Meeting Informational.** This item contains documents which provide common information and instructions for the Zoom meeting. Roll call, let it be known that all members are here except for Paul, who has previously told us he wouldn't be able to make the meeting tonight, so, other than that, all members are here. I don't see approval of the agenda for tonight's meeting. Do we've a motion to approve tonight's agenda?

- Motion approved.

- Approved.

- I second. All in favor? Aye?

- Aye.

- Any nays? Okay the ayes have it. Approval of the minute from the September 15th meeting. Everybody take a look at those and any questions, comments or concerns? Do we have a motion to approve them?

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay. Any nays? For the record, the ayes have it. Regular business, Certificate Of Appropriateness. Before I read number one, do we wanna do One first or do we wanna do number Two first? Or we wanna switch them around? Any comments anyone? Okay, let's just start. Certificate Of Appropriateness Number One, Okay COA 21-24, consideration with possible action on a design review for a building addition located at 400 South Washington. Mr. Jason, please take it away.

- [Jason] Hi. I'm gonna assume you can hear me.

- Yes.

- 400 South Washington is the old, one of the old train depots in town, and here you see it on a map at the corner of Crooks in South Washington. While we're looking at the map, I just wanna point out, of course, when I mention north facade, it's the gable ends towards the top of the building, and of course the east facade faces Washington, The west facade faces the river, so just kinda get your bearings there as we go forward. Next slide please. Here you see a historic view of said depot in a postcard, I can't really attest to the colors 'cause they were often colorized, fictitiously, after the fact. I do wanna point out in the north facade, that gable ends towards the right, you see two windows, and then the east facade facing Washington street, you see in the center of the building, looks like one door and some windows, where maybe those windows would be a door. Indeed if we move to the next slide, I think you'll see at the time of the national register nomination, on the next slide, and indeed, that whole section had become doors. So, for reference, here we're looking at some pictures that were taken in 1996 as part of the National Register Nomination Paperwork Package. So, briefly, this is an east facade, moving on, next up I think we have the north facade and I took a more recent photograph there in the upper right, just to show you, yeah, it's still that. Moving on to the next picture, the west facade... Nope, not the west facade either. Another National register Nomination paperwork bit. We're not gonna be talking too much about this side of the building. Next slide is the west facade. This is the side that faces the river. Please note, here in 1996, you see there's some skylights. Sometime after that they added a pair of dormers with walkout balconies, and also sometime following 1996, they added the little vestibule, somewhere along that loading dock area underneath the covered walkways, just to keep in mind. So next slide. Another fairly recent photograph. I wanna point out that where you would expect to see doors facing Washington streets, in the center of the building, those have been turned into windows and I know it's kind of a dad joke, but I'm always serious when I say that any window can be opened, it's just not any window can be closed. So I'm sure they open, they don't close. Next slide. Just a little refresher, the historic postcard, so you see what it looked like back in the day, the horse and wagon days. More recent photograph shows you it looks pretty similar. Again, don't get wrapped up on the color 'cause the color was done by somebody who didn't know what color it was in the postcard. Moving on to the next slide, here we see some of the proposed changes in this COA, and pointing out the two most important ones on the, now you gotta turn this in your mind, on the river-facing side, the proposal calls for increasing the size of the vestibule addition. So there's already a vestibule addition, this increases the size of that addition. And then on the north facade, which is towards the right, the request calls for turning an extent window into a door, So part of that vestibule addition there on that river-facing facade turns a window into a door two, but, we're looking at these two discrete changes. There's also some landscaping which really doesn't fall under the Landmarks Commission jurisdiction. So you see a sculptural element surrounded by some landscaping plaza. That's all well and good, I'm sure it'll be beautiful, It's not really for us to discuss. Next slide, regarding the vestibule addition on the river side, that's the west facade. On the upper portion of your screen you see a current floor plan, and then I've gone and drawn what I think is an orange line, vertically, through, from the current to the proposed, so that you get a sense of the current vestibule up there along the edge of the building. You come on down to the proposed side, and then in green it shows you where that proposed vestibule addition is, while we're on the slide two, towards the right of the lower image, in the north facade, that's the proposed window to become a door. So, two separate issues in the COA that we'll be addressing. First of all, with that vestibule, if we can go to the next slide. Yeah, that's the one. So, what they're proposing on the left is largely a glass enclosure to increase the size of the vestibule. And within that glass enclosure in that proposal sketch, you see a window, and just so we're real clear, in the photograph towards the right, that window within the proposed vestibule is that existing window that you see there. I don't know that I have a lot of other information on this proposed vestibule enlargement, but to cut to the chase, I'm inclined to recommend the approval, given that this facade, although publicly visible from the river, and the walking trail, has already been muddled a bit, and frankly, isn't the facade that you associate so much with this

building in your mind. Moving on to the next slide. On the left you see the proposal to change a window to a door, with a little stair stoop, if you will. The color photograph, you see how it is currently. I had to use my phone-a-friend option with the State Historic Preservation Office, give you one or two of those a year. And to be clear, this is not a tax credit project, but to continue to be clear, this is an individually listed National Register property, so it's held to a much higher standard than say, contributing properties in the district, or certainly much more than non-contributing properties in the district. And in my phone-a-friend with the State Preservation architect, he hinted fairly clearly, that turning this window into a door would seem to be a conjectural feature, and I would put "conjectural feature" in quotations, those sorts of things are to be avoided. So in the recommendation, which I think is on the next slide, if I remember what I was doing that day, I think I said that I recommend approval of the vestibule work, and recommend denial of the exit egress door, and I encourage you to have some good conversation on that, in my conversation with the applicant, they suggested that both of these requests were for safety, and I suppose indeed, it may make the building safer, but there was no code that could be cited that would require these safety changes. And as funny as it may be, I'm dead serious when I say a window can be opened. So I don't so much see a compelling argument that a safety requirement exists here. So again, recommend enlargement of the vestibule addition, denial of the window to a door on the north facade. Thank you.

- I guess, would anybody like to motion to open the floor for discussion on this? Obviously we need to-

- I'll motion to that. Open the floor.

- Okay. So give me a second. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Okay, any nays? Okay. Ian, I'll start with you, anything off the top of your head, right from the beginning here?

- I guess I'd like to hear from the owners'-

- Yeah

- representative on it, to get a better understanding of what's driving the change.

- I agree, that's a great idea. And who would that be that's on our screen here?

- This is Colin Arndt from Somerville.

- Okay.

- Here. Yes, so I'm representing the Green Bay Community Foundation with these exterior changes. The vestibule, was pretty obvious that we wanted to extend that for accessibility, right now you enter in the building, and 36 inches in front of you is a stair, and we just wanted to expand that a little bit, come into the existing exterior window and into a new waiting reception area, so that you're not walking in front of the stair, that one was pretty clear. The other one that was a little bit trickier is throwing that door in the north facade, where there's an existing window, really what's driving that is, primarily all of their staff is in this open office space to the Northeast end of the building, and there's concerns going from breakthroughs, the tenant in the building, as a corporate office, and now a more public building, where it's open to the community, they're afraid that that opens up a threat for anybody to come in, whether it's an

active shooter or even if you look at it as a fire, in that main lobby space, there's no way for, primarily, all of the staff to exit the building without going through that vestibule, albeit, without jumping through a window, without throwing a door and a stoop with a couple of stairs in that north facade. So, really it's our tenant, our client, the Green Bay Community Foundation that has brought this to our attention, it wasn't a code, or an exiting egress issue. It's more or less them, the new tenant, being concerned with living in a space where they may feel trapped at some point. That's really all I have.

- Is there any other occupants of the building or owners of the building that would like to speak up?

- Motion to close the floor, as there's no one else.

- I'll second that motion.

- Unless we must have questions to ask.

- Not in particular. I understand the need for, you know, secondary means of egress, I mean, I understand that, but by the same token, it doesn't look like it's a dead end, it doesn't look like it's from a code standpoint, an occupancy of 49 or more, that would require a second means of egress. So I can see the need, but I can also see the challenge of trying to cut in a new door, and changing that north facade. Can it be done in a manner that it can be retroactively returned in the future? I can't tell from the diagram, whether it's a reversible type of approach,

- We haven't closed the floor, I don't know if we-

- I guess those are questions essentially, to Collin.

- Sure. You know, and I think both those changes there where you're essentially taking the exterior window, and turning it into a door, there's not a good way to reverse that, unless you can find the perfect match on that historic brick, which could be very difficult to do. Yeah, I don't really see that being reversible in any way.

- Okay.

- I guess I'd motioned to close the floor.

- I beg your pardon?

- Mark, did you motion?

- Yeah, I motioned. You can second that.

- I'll second that, if there's no other discussion.

- To close the floor?

- Yup.

- Okay. Are all in favor?

- Aye. Any nays? Okay, the floor is closed.

- Got a question to Jason, if he could clarify something, Jason, would you say that both of these proposals, in terms of irreversibly or permanently altering the historic material?

- You know, I don't have much more detail on this than what I presented in the slides. It would appear to me that the vestibule on the river side of the building, is not going to be reversible, once that window is turned into a door.

- Yep.

- That having been said, I feel like that side of the building has been altered, a fair bit. I think those second story dormers, for example, could be reversed and not with too much difficulty. The vestibule that's already there, I think was a pretty big change that's irreversible, but I don't really have a good understanding of what had been there before. So, on the river side, I think we're tinkering with a change that was already made, that really this doesn't add a whole lot more change to that change that's already been made, whereas on the north facade, you have seen from the pictures that that gable end of the building is as it was, and now we kinda be letting changes creep around the corner to another wall on the building. And that kinda creep is hard to stop, once you let it get going, and-

- Well, I think your point about the west side, the vestibule, that there's already been the alteration, but this is adding to the alteration, and my first reaction is that these are both permanent changes to historic material, and are altering, in one case, what's already been altered, on the north end, what is not been altered, but nonetheless, I'm looking at these as fairly equivalent changes to the historic material.

- And I think you're correct.

- And I'm very much inclined at this point to deny both.

- Well, you know, I try to keep my personal feelings out of it. I'm not a big fan of either one, but, professionally, I wanna point out too, that, you know, in the east facade, facing Washington street, you do have windows, currently, that had been doors, and those lend themselves quite well to being turned back into doors.

- Right.

- Unfortunately they're in, you know, like, the middle of the long access of the building. But you know, when I think about, when I worked at the shipyard, I had a fire extinguisher and batten weights next to my window, the window would open, I'm confident, that that was my plan, and indeed we had incidences too, so that was a good plan to have, you know. The one facing the river, there's been damage done, you'd be doing some more damage. But, would you notice putting a new dent in another dent that's already on your car, as opposed to putting a new dent on the other side of your car that's never had a dent? You know, that's kind of where I am, as a realistic person, looking at this.

- Okay. Any other comments, any motions?

- I think for me, you know, some good points were brought up by David. You know, it's 123 year old building, very prominent in our community. I realize it's gone through a couple of different renovations, and that over time, I think the windows to doors and doors to windows, if we had that opportunity to do it, you know, like, you can go back to it, I think that that would be a good option, but you know, when you change the actual elements of the building where it's irreversible, I think I have a harder time with that, and I don't know if there's another solution

where you could like, with a vestibule, if you could just add something to the outside without compromising the brick, or get solved, through some way you could add to that, without actually cutting into the building. I would opt to see if there's something that could be done that way. Maybe it can't, but you know, I'm into the structure of the building itself. So I'm a little torn on this right now, but those are initial comments.

- I guess I'll interject here too, that I'm torn, I mean, I worked on the YMCA building downtown, and we put it in the ramp, the front of the building, and we did take an existing exterior window, in that location, go down and take out, basically the foundation wall, underneath the window, to replace it and have that as a point of entry. I think it was a little more discreet than, it was certainly trying to address it at the main entrance itself, and trying to bring a big ramp into the front entry. So, I mean, is it reversible, sure, I mean, if you could toot the brick back in, you could get the stone, replicate the stone, rebuild it in the future. It's just kind of an odd single intervention in that north facade, that isn't being driven by a code requirement. So that's where I'm having a hard time, it's not like it's been done to get ADA access to the building, it's not being done to make it more welcoming to, you know, the east facade, west facade, against the river, is providing more accommodation for people with mobility issues. So, there's a positive there, I just don't see the positive in the north elevation.

- I don't know, I'd make one more comment, because it's a long, narrow building, you know, you've got the exit to the west, and the exit to the east, and I think it seems like the folks that are asking for this change are in another part of the building, that's a little further away, and it just has a different type of access to it. Or as you have the exit to the front and back, and if you're talking about an active shooter, there's not a whole lot of room to go between the west and the east, it's just a very short distance. So I mean, that's my first reaction on that, but they're looking to put it further away so that it spreads things out, so you can get out easier. And like you said Ian, there's no code that really talks about that. So, I know Jason had talked to someone in Madison about this. I'd be interested to hear what, I thought he was here online, or here at the meeting. There's anybody else I could talk to that? I don't know. Just a comment.

- I'd like to add that, to me, it seems like that the vestibule side, again, that's the west side, correct?

- Yep.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- Then, that actually adds to the safety, going in and out of that building as well, because that gets pretty slippery over there. Six months out of the year, it's kind of nasty, actually. And I think that's actually a safety feature, which wasn't even meant, and I've been in and out of that building quite a few times, and it is awkward getting in and out, on that side over there, and how people have to wait in that area where they do enter the building, I tend to agree with Jason there, that's a change there which change And I don't really see a problem with finishing that side off, in my opinion.

- I guess, has there been a review of what the door access requirements are, on that west facade? So, is it gonna be locked down, or is it gonna be a free entry? I mean, could that west facade be a permitted-entry-only so that you don't have the active shooter in the space? You stop them at the door before they get there?

- Yeah, that's a good point, and that's something that the Community Foundation has also discussed in their security reviews. And I think that's something that they would have to consider too. If it isn't going to work to exit them out through the east. But yeah, and just to mitigate any threat through that, essentially, that's the only entrance and exit to the building other than the far Southwest door from the community space. Yeah.

- Should we open the floor again? You know, just to be official, well, I make a motion to open the floor.

- I second that.

- Second, yeah. All in favor?

- Aye. Any nays? Ayes have it, okay, go ahead Collin, sorry.

- No, that was pretty much it from me, you know, reviewing the security. Their goal would be to keep this open to the public at all times and keep the doors unlocked. But then again, that's a security issue that they would have, with not having a solid exit from their main office area, without coming back into the more public reception waiting area, into the only exit from that side of the building.

- Well. I was just wondering, is there any, you know, I know that you folks have looked at this, this is for Collin, you know, looked at all different aspects of this, and you know, you probably might've anticipated that there might be some questions like this coming forward. So I wasn't sure if you had any other possible alternatives to kind of take care of that, just in case, like a plan B.

- Sure. Well, looking back at that vestibule addition, we really wouldn't want that anywhere else, that's their main entrance. A couple of feet to avoid that main stair. It gives improved accessibility into the building, you know, but that door, or that transition from a window to a door on that east facade. The only alternative for us would be, if it remains a window, is to review the security function of the doors in that main vestibule, and just monitor who's coming in and out of that building, to prevent, you know, any threat, you know, it doesn't really prevent a fire from happening in that area, which would be another need for egress, out of the open office, but the threat of violence would be, you know, somewhat eliminated.

- This is a function interesting dynamic, when you talk about buildings now, though, we're talking about situations like this, where we, you know, years ago, we weren't really able to deal with it. So it was like a setting, another layer of study,

- Correct.

- that we're not normally used to. And I don't know if this is just the nature of the beast and we have to keep pulling that rob. I mean, have you, you do this with other buildings as well, and other studies that you've done with other projects?

- Yeah. You know, it's something that definitely comes up everywhere, especially in K-12 schools nowadays.

- Yeah.

- But a building like this, that's gonna be turned into a public space, and not a corporate office. It's something that's come up in discussions with the Community Foundation, for sure.

- Yeah, I'd concur, I don't think, you know, this is unique, a unique discussion to this client. It is a discussion that, quite honestly, we have regularly, and oftentimes it'll come down to hardware, and maybe there's an emergency switch at reception that gets flicked, if there's a sense that, you know, something's going down outside or there's has been a threat, that locks the doors in place, and so, you know, you prevent the intruder from coming in at that point, then it's selective when it's used. I mean, we've talked about it here in our office, we have the same situation.

- Yeah, that's a good point, Ian.

- Yeah.

- I'd like to just interject here, I'm hearing what you're saying about how this is such a unique concern, something that wasn't considered, not that long ago, but what I would suggest is, we remember this, that our mission is about historic preservation, that's our lane. And we've got the guideline from the secretary of the interior that staff refers to repeatedly, that's so helpful, And that's what it addresses, is historic preservation. I'm reluctant to begin second-guessing the standard, because we are now looking at safety features, whether it's for an active shooter, fire, or whatever hazard. Our concern, I think should be limited to historic preservation, and it's up to others to address concerns about safety.

- Good point.

- I think one of the points with that though, too, is, you know, there's several steps. So whenever a site plan is reviewed, and n'okay'd at the city, Public Works looks at it, Inspection looks at it, Planning looks at it, and I'm sure the Fire department looks at things too, though it's kind of like you have to check off all these boxes. So it seems like in a case like this, that you would check off most of the boxes, but not all of 'em. So getting to that point is gonna be really difficult as we add more and more layers to this. I agree with David that, you know, we are historic preservation, we have to maintain that, you know, want to say "maintain at all costs," but there are times where there might be some slight changes to the dynamic that will help the project move forward and still maintain integrity. I'm just not a hundred percent sure on this one yet. You know, it's such an iconic building, you know, very historic building, and I think that's a good thing, but it's also can be a tough thing for anybody that goes into a place like this, because they've got that hanging over, whether they like it or not. You know, so you got the good and the bad of that, but I don't know, you know, Jason kind of talked about the vestibule okaying that, I probably would lean toward that, but as far as the north facade, I'd be a little more inclined to deny that. So I'm kinda leaning toward what Jason was talking about on this, I kinda concur with him, so, I would make that motion.

- Oh, the floor is still open, if we could close that first?

- Oh.

- Yeah.

- I would make a motion to close the floor.

- Thank you.

- I second that motion.

- Okay. Are all in favor?

- Aye.
- Any nays?
- No.
- Okay. Floor is closed. Mark, Alder.
- Yeah.
- You have a motion?
- Yeah, the motion would be to concur with Jason, what he said about accepting the vestibule alteration, but the north facade, denying that, so that would be my motion.
- I would second that motion, I concur with respect to what you said. Are all in favor?
- Aye. Any nays?
- I'll vote nay.
- Okay. Well, the ayes have it. Guess that's the end of this matter, you know, Collin I think you could probably still hear me.
- Yes.
- You know you may, I guess we should motion to reopen the floor one more time here.
- Motion to open the floor.
- I'll second that.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- You know Collin, if that is real concern and I believe that it is, I mean, with what's going on in the world, in this country today, you might want to do some further research on that with different departments and, you know, get different opinions and standpoints, on standards, like an escape route out of the building and, you know, and perhaps revisit the second issue at a later date. But for now, you know, obviously like, just like David said, I mean, David was right on, it's like, our mission is to preserve, so, you know, the vestibule's one thing, but altering that, that I 20, what is it? I 23 year old back building, you know, is a different story, so.
- Understandable.
- Thank you. With that, I'll motion to close the floor.
- Almost

- Okay, all in favor? Aye, any nays? Okay, motion carries. Okay. Item number, remember here, 12. Certificate of Appropriateness 21-27, consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement windows located at 644 South Quincy. Jason.

- Hey, that's me. Stephanie, can we see the pretty pictures too?

- I am working on it, but I think that I'm about to get booted off of here. Let me see. There we go.

- Awesome, so 644 South Quincy. You don't do that Massachusetts thing like where it's Quinsy, do you?. We have a map of it, but, I don't know if I'm gonna show you the map or not.

- [Stephanie] It should be coming.

- Yeah, there it is, a corner lot. So the COA is requesting to change out the number of windows with new windows. And when I first looked at this, I thought, "Oh, well, that's fine, all those windows are new windows anyway." But as I reviewed the materials submitted to us, it appears that what I thought were new windows, were actually old windows hidden by new storm windows. And you know, I suppose that's well and good. If we can go to the next slide, there's some pictures of the house on the right, you see, you know, it's hard, I study what we get, and it looks like the pictures on the right are of the same window overlooking the garage. And I think those are the only pictures we received of the existing windows, so I know that window is old, I don't know about the other windows, I'm supposing they're old too, even though I thought they were new, but if we jump forward a little bit, I'm all for replacing these windows, I mean, we wouldn't know any better, it's a contributing building, but it's relatively low integrity, because of the replacement siding that's already there. I had a little bit of a hiccup when I wrote the recommendation, because State Historic Preservation Office says that the visible light transmittance should be 72 or higher or 0.72. And I had a conversation with SHPO today about this, and my feeling is that the manufacturer here, maybe has internally conflicting information, manufacturer data says that there's no tint, but the visible light rating is only 0.6. I asked myself, "Well, how can that be?" Anyway, the good folks at SHPO, I used my second phone-a-friend. They said, "Jason, don't worry about it it's not individually listed, it's, you know, contributing in a district, but that 72 from State Historic Preservation Office may be not such a critical number here. My hunch is that the windows indeed are not tinted. Excuse me. That's maybe there's, you know, some decrease in the light transmittance because most new windows have that, you know, they're double pane with some gas in between. I'm going less concerned about this, but I just want to point out, indeed, SHPO does have a 72 requirement, these are apparently 60, I'll trust it. So I think my recommendation is still to approve.

- Jason, could you elaborate a little bit on the siding? You started to say something about it.

- So if we go back to the picture of the house that you're hovering over, all of the exterior siding here is relatively modern, it's vinyl siding. If you're looking at individually eligible and individually listed houses, replacement siding like this, no matter how tastefully done, and this was very tastefully done, that's basically a nail in the coffin for individual eligibility. So when we look at all of the houses and asked her, "You know, there are several that are prominent, priority properties." I always point those out. This is not one of those priority properties, This is part of the scenery that makes the priority properties all the more special. So considering it as scenery and considering that, I always thought the windows were new in the first place, when I looked at it. I'm not going to be able to tell the difference that the windows have been replaced, once they've been replaced. So, there's a positive here, the COA calls for removing the storm windows, which will actually enhance the property, but at the end of it all, really, I won't notice

as an observer, even as a relatively trained observer, that the windows have been replaced. So, with that in mind, I'm inclined to recommend approval.

- So is it fair enough to say that, even though, as you mentioned, the vinyl siding is pretty good, that much of the historic integrity has already been lost. Is that fair enough?

- Yes. If this house was going up for an individual nomination, it wouldn't make it, changing the windows at this point. Well, let me put it this way, keeping the windows at this point, isn't gonna help it, make it at any point in the future, but it's done. But you know, that's not to say that if they someday come back and want to put new siding on and the new siding is very poor taste. I think you should deny that, I mean, they've done a good job to date, maintaining an appropriate historic appearance of the house, despite the newer materials, nonetheless, those new materials are noticeable. So, if you're one of the snobbier architectural historians, you're gonna point that out and be less interested.

- Are they gonna replace the windows with similar windows, one over one double-hung?

- Right. Yes, one over one double-hung. As best I can tell, I wouldn't be able to see any noticeable difference in the before and after of this.

- It seems to me that, you know, there's been numerous homes over time that have done this with vinyl siding and other things, historically, historic type homes. And the fact that we weren't in CLG status, and we didn't have a preservation ordinance on the books, a lot of things just went by the wayside, because of that, and through no fault of the government or the citizens, you know, it's just the way it was. But you know, it's a little stricter now. So, you know, I know it is tastefully done, but you wonder what it would cost to get credits, you know, the owners may decide it's not worth it, you know, if you all that siding off, and tried to get back to the original. Might be cost prohibitive at this stage, so, it's kinda like you have already altered at once, you can't really reverse it, so the windows are very nice, you know, that would just kinda move along with what's already happened, so without, unless somebody else can change my mind, I would be inclined to go along with Jason's recommendation. I would, I would make that, I would ask that, I would make that a motion, unless other people want to talk about it, I would make a motion to accept it as is,

- I'll second that.

- Okay, all in favor?

- Aye. Any nays? Any nays? Nope? Then the ayes have it, okay. Next item on the agenda, F Informational, the public meeting regarding phases two, three, and four of the Intensive Survey Project, is that you Stephanie?

- It is. So today we have two people here to present. We've got Jason Tish, from the State Historic Preservation Office, and Rowan Davidson from Legacy Architecture, who we've contracted to do this, phases 2, 3, and 4 of our update to our historic survey. So this is the first of two public meetings for these phases. The initial one is just to give people background information about the intensive survey itself, the update that's happening. And then the final one will be the presentation of the survey results. So I'm not sure who's kicking it off. Jason? Rowan? Jason, All right, take it away.

- Yeah. Why don't I go first? Thanks. My name is Jason Tish. I work with the State Historic Preservation Office and the Wisconsin Historical Society. Stephanie, can I share my screen? I've got a few slides to help illustrate what I'm talking about.

- Yes, you should be able to, but if not, let me know.

- Yes, okay, thank you. Hang on just a second. Okay, can you see my whole slide, Stephanie?

- Yes.

- Okay, good. Jason Tish, with the Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office, and this is the kickoff meeting for the Architecture and History Survey, phase 2 of Green Bay. You all know that you completed phase 1 earlier this year, and it's a few points that I wanna make, the funding for these projects come from our office because Green Bay is a Certified Local Government. It's a formal partnership between my office, and actually, the National Park Service as well. So the funding from this comes from a grant, from my office, this grant is a \$50,000 grant. Green Bay became a CLG in 2019, that newest CLG. And this is, kind of an update of the previous survey of Green Bay, which was done over 30 years ago. So this is an update of an earlier survey work. Last year, or maybe earlier this year, a proposed phasing plan was drawn up by Legacy Architecture, who is also here. Section 1 was completed during the first phase. This section, this phase, this recently funded phase is gonna entail sections 2, 3 and 4. Because of the large amount of the grant, it enables the city to survey more areas than just one section at a time, so that's actually good, a couple of points that I wanted to make on this slide as well. So about the grants, it's a no-match grant, so it's no expense to the city of Green Bay, no match required, and we worked with the city to develop a memorandum of understanding that kinda lays out all the stipulation, and all the strings attached, to be honest, with federal funding, on something onerous, just compliance with a lot of federal guidelines and such. And we work with the city and the consultant to make sure everything is above board, and complies with all the federal and state laws. And we also worked out a scope of work with Jason, which is then passed on to the consultant. So really quickly, what does the survey look like? Most of you are familiar with this from the last time, but basically, the survey looks like consultants driving every public right-of-way, every street in survey area, looking at every property in the survey area, and evaluating that pretty quickly, against eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. And what they're looking for is, well, first of all, they occasionally stop and get out, take some photos, take some notes, and move along. So, what the survey physically looks like is pretty low profile, it's consultants, driving streets, taking pictures. They do everything from the public right-of-way, they do not step onto public property, they will not ask to go inside buildings, They do all of their evaluation from a public right-of-way, And then in research facilities, like the Historical Society here. So what they're looking for. What will the survey record? they're looking for properties that meet two very basic criteria, an age criteria for the National Register, and then they're looking at integrity. So it's pretty easy to spot buildings that are more than 50 years old, for these folks who are trained in architecture history. And they're looking for properties that meet that age criteria, but also have integrity of the architectural design, integrity of materials, so they have most of the original materials that they were designed with, they exhibit their design intent, there's not a lot of additions on them or alterations, and then consultants will record those properties that meet the criteria. They do some baseline research on these properties. They often get the date of construction, if there was an architect involved, the builder, and any historic events that happened there, or historic people, historic figures who lived there. So the properties that best exemplified each property type. So, residential, commercial, churches, schools, all the different property types, they identify the ones that best exemplify each type, the ones that best exemplify each architectural style, so they will record the top five or 10% of all the colonial houses in the city, or in the survey area, the top representatives of craftsmen style, international style, whatever, the best examples of each type and style, and then they put all that together in a final report with a photo of each survey property, just because it's in the report does not mean that it is eligible for the National Register, doesn't mean that it's eligible for local designation, it's just the top five or 10% of those properties that exemplify that style. When will

the survey work happen? It's kind of up to the consultant, but as far as our timeline, the project needs to be done by the end of August of 2022. So there's plenty of time to do it, and when it actually gets done, is kinda up to the consultants. So I will turn it over to Rowan, You can talk a little more about that.

- Okay, thank you, Jason.

- Jason already covered, what I intended to go over. Oh, by the way, my name is Rowan Davidson with Legacy Architecture, we're the consultants on the various surveys in Green Bay that are taking place right now. Stephanie, is it okay if I share my screen on the spot?

- Yep.

- Okay. Go ahead and do that. As I said, Jason has already discussed a little bit about what a survey actually is, and you've actually heard some of this before, already from us in the past. We're currently in the field right now, this last week we began documenting properties in the second phase of the survey work, noting the property's location, names, use, styles, each one with a photograph. We'll follow that up, of course, in a week or two, with local historical research, in Brown County and specifically the city of Green Bay, supported by newspaper research, and general public history research as well, to dig up those dates and names, and the identities of those properties, and their specific histories. As Jason also already mentioned, all the resources are evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places. So that's really the main point of doing these surveys in the first place. There's other benefits as well, of course, just documenting the history and documenting the built environment of a specific place, but the main outcome, what most people turn the page to find is what is actually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. And there are the four criteria which Jason already mentioned, as well, whether it's associated with significant event, the history of a property, whether it's associated with a significant person, someone happened to live there or work there that's deemed historically important to the history of Green Bay or even the state or the nation or, and by far, the most common, is whether property might represent a specific architectural type, its period, its method, or even a master builder or designer, that is usually the most common one that's identified at first, because the first thing we look at is the exterior of properties of buildings, houses, commercial buildings, industrial buildings, and so on. So the first thing we have to judge is its basic appearance, further research finds the other possible criteria. And fourth criteria, Criteria D means that it has or may yield important historic or prehistoric information, this essentially archeological distinction. These are fairly rare in surveys, however, in the last one, in phase one, we actually did come across a property which qualified. The survey report itself is then broken down into chapters. These are generally the same regardless of who the consultant is, And they have been the same for over 30 years now, based on certain aspects of history of society, religion, education, agriculture, architecture itself, notable people, and so on. In the last phase, which was just completed this last summer, we updated 760 resources, of which only 283, we deemed still be survey-worthy. That gets to what Jason was talking about with integrity. Properties have obviously changed since the last survey work was done in the city, 35 years, a great deal have been altered, and sometimes that's not always for the best, and so some things were left out. However, we did update the information about those properties, and there are still, of course, records. We identified 55 new properties to add to the records, of which 13 were individually eligible. I already discussed this, again, this last summer, and we can go over them again, if you like. And that was just in phase 1, phase 2 is actually a combination of three As Jason mentioned, conveniently combined into one for efficiency sake. The survey phase 2 area is sort of the core of historic Green Bay and Aster. Phase three is north of East River, an industrial area along the lake shore, and phase 4 is back on the west side of Green Bay and kinda the suburban developments and post-war neighborhoods. We're gonna combine all three, and each one has about the same or similar number of properties that we found in the first survey

area. So there'll be about three times the scale and scope of the first work that we were doing. That's about it. I think Jason, essentially the process quite well, are there any questions or comments for either of us?

- [Stephanie] Yeah, just to give you some, you know, background on what we're doing here. So this portion of the meeting is a public meeting, so there's no need to open the floor, if you're from the public, and you're not on our Landmarks Commission, commissioners can feel free to ask questions, anyone from the audience can also feel free to ask questions, You can do that in our chat, or you can simply unmute yourself and begin talking. Those questions can be directed to the Landmarks Commission, to Rowan, to Jason or to myself, or Jason Flatt. So, feel free to interact if you would like to.

- I have a general question, Rowan or Stephanie, some of my citizens in my district, Aldermanic district, are getting a document in the mail, a document in the mail, talking about the survey, and some of the folks are a little confused by it. I guess I just wanted to get clarification on that. I suppose you might be saying "I'm gonna be coming, enter into your area." Some folks like myself, I've got a ranch home that was built in 1969. It doesn't seem historic to me, but you know, it's over 50 years old. So I don't know if anybody could clarify that, as far as what these letters are, that are going out to the public. I don't know if that's the city or the consultant driving that.

- [Stephanie] That's from our. Sorry, Rowan that's from our office. So we sent out to every property owner within all three survey areas that are being completed, and it lets them know that somebody will be out, driving slow on their street, possibly taking photos of their home, it gives the identity of the car, the license plate, And then it alerts the police department and neighborhood associations as well that that's happening in case people have calls saying, "There's this really slow white car on my road." You know, then they kind of have a heads up on what's happening. So it's really just to alert people that there may be somebody taking photos of their house.

- That's kinda what I thought, but I just wanted clarification on that. I was gonna ask Rowan, phase four is my area, a good chunk of it, and it's, you know, the homes are from the early to mid 60s, all the way down to the 19, late 20s. Some of the newer farm building there, I would presume that you would be driving, let's say long Bond street. I mean, it's really easy to tell. There's a couple of fill ins here and there, where you go "Wow, that is, that looks like an original property on Bond street." Then I would think that you would detect that, and I would think that that'd be no issue at all.

- No, it shouldn't be, yeah. That often does happen in the kind of quote unquote "post-suburban neighborhood", "post-war suburban neighborhoods." Now we're gonna drive up and down every street and look at every property regardless, and in fact, we're actually gonna spend a great deal of attention on some of the ranch homes, maybe yours as well. They are, as you pointed out, your house is over 50 years old at this point, so it's fair game. A lot of those neighborhoods on the west side of Green Bay have a very large number, deep concentration of nice ranch houses.

- Okay.

- Yeah, Mr. Steuer, I wanna interject too. I personally have been betting like five or \$6 that somewhere around your neighborhood, somewhere around there, there's a mid century modern district in the making. It may prove to be eligible once Rowan takes the drive-through.

- Well, it'd be interesting. I know the survey in 1988, which I happened to work on. So I'm dating myself a little bit. There were districts that were proposed, and Mullica Westside Vernacular

District, for example, their west high school, and I'm sure things haven't changed a whole lot since then because some of the homes put vinyl siding on, and kinda compromised the building. So I would think that it would be hard to say that some of that's been reversed over the last 30 years, you know, some of them are deteriorated further from that, So I don't know if you've ever found where an older area, which looks like it could be a potentially historic district has reversed and gone better, as far as what it should be. Is that ever happened?

- It's fairly rare.

- Yeah, I would say, probably.

- Specially in the period-

- Although, Mr. Steuer, in your case, as you age, I think you're looking much better, so you're just getting better, like fine wine.

- I'll take that as a compliment.

- Yeah, we are aware of the various districts and things identified in those extensive 80s surveys. So we definitely are using that information to guide kind of what we're looking at now, we see the records themselves, we consciously looking at every single record and update, so a good clue.

- [Mark] Right. Thank you.

- Question for either Jason or Rowan. Hi, my name is Shannon. I'm a citizen that got one of those lovely letters, and actually, I just purchased my home last year and through my research discovered that it was part of the 1988 survey. And I'm just curious, when you talk about integrity, include, if something was altered on the building to bring it up to current code, would that disqualify it? I point to my front porch. I know when they did the 1988 survey, I could tell from the way the porch was done, that that was pretty close to what it was when they first built the house. It's much different now, but I know that it's because of code regulations as far as height. So just using that as an example, would something like that disqualify a home from the survey?

- It would not disqualify it from the survey, the bar that anyone needs to cross to get in the surveys, I mean, there is a bar to cross, but it's not extremely high, and things like vinyl siding, replacement windows, things that are immediately apparent or alterations to a building that really change its basic form, So that if you squint at it, it no longer looks like the same thing that it did, when it was originally constructed, something like changing the porch, or certainly just the railing on the porch, would not necessarily be disqualifying from the survey, it might be disqualifying from the National Register of Historic Places, however, which is sort of-

- Which I don't think my house was at any point.

- It might, districts get identified all the time, in which case, your house probably would be considered, certainly, yeah.

- And then I see Steph, Chad, and everybody, I'm gonna email her with some specific questions to my house, and specifically like, where I can find out more about it, just because I like the fact that it's built in 1918, has a lot

- Good.

- Thank you for your time, by the way.

- If it was in the 1980s survey, we will survey it again, It will be in the next document as well. just automatically, yeah.

- Okay.

- One other question, Rowan. You know, I noticed like, you know, when you look at the architectural styles said, were so prominent in the late 1800s, early 1900s, you know, the kind of the heyday of a lot of the architectural styles, there are the high styles, it seems like Green Bay has a number of styles that are kind of morphed, from one or two, or maybe even three different styles. Is there, will that be designated as well? You know, like, you know, the high style versus maybe an altered version of that, or what have you.

- Yes, we do discuss variations within styles, obviously they're not perfect, it's very rare to find a perfect example of a textbook architectural style. It's not how buildings work.

- Right.

- They're combinations, they're amalgamations of many different ideas, builders, architects, and so on. Yeah, we discuss those in the architecture chapter in some detail, under the styles, and in fact, we have a fairly extensive discussion of vernacular architecture as well, which is fairly common in Green Bay, from that very same period.

- You find that it's true about a lot of cities, like, in the Midwest, I mean, other areas you've done, is it pretty standard that-

- Yes.

- things like that have happened?

- Yes, absolutely.

- Okay.

- Green Bay has some unique ones though, which we do discuss, sort of combinations, particularly of sort of Victorian Queen Anne types that, while there's this general broad heading called Progressive Architecture, specifically American styles, like Craftsman, Prairie, and so on and so forth. In Green Bay, there seems to be a sort of a tendency to combine some sort of latent 19th century aspects into those new styles, which you don't always see elsewhere.

- Right. Well, that's interesting unto itself, you know, I find that one bit, when folks come to Green Bay and then I've gone on tours with folks, I kinda point some of that all, so.

- Yeah, that's good.

- I think it's a good feature, so thanks, thank you.

- [Rowan] Sure.

- [Stephanie] Are there any other members of the public that have any questions? I don't see any hands being raised, if anyone does have any history of their property that they would like to

share with us, I did put my email in the chat, so please feel free to send me an email, or if you would like further property information or information about the survey, I am the main staff contact here, So please feel free to use that email as often as you would like.

- Yes, that's good. We're always very welcoming of any kind of public input, especially about their own properties. Very welcome.

- Okay. Well thank you both for your time, it's very interesting.

- [Rowan] Thank you.

- Okay, the next item on the agenda under informational staff-level COA applications.

- Yes, one second.

- I'm sorry?

- Just got to pull up the screen here.

- Okay.

- [Stephanie] All right, Jason.

- Yes, yes. I forgot that I was doing more. We had a couple of fences and a couple of roofs, I think. So here at 740 South Jefferson, there's a fence or partial fence, I've lost track, regardless, we've approved it, as we've had no basis not to approve it. So, that's how I got on 740 South Jefferson. Oh, a new roof. Yeah, pretty iconic building in Green Bay. So it's got an asphalt shingle roof, they're replacing it with new asphalt shingle roof, wasn't entirely clear to me if it was in every spot on the building, or just in the spot photographed, nonetheless, the new shingles look just like the old shingles, without the morning frost on them. That's something that we approved internally. This is a section of fence, see, I get confused with which fence is which, so here there's a 16 foot long section of fence, that's to be replaced with fence, nothing too exciting, generally not visible, so we've approved that. A roof on Kavarna, you see a picture of the existing, old membrane roof. We'll be putting on a new membrane roof with condition that there will be no visible changes from only public right-of-way, and that includes any coping material that's along the top of the parapet. So we had no push back on it, that's gonna happen. Another fence, I'm gonna be a fence expert. So this one is a decorative metal fence on a fairly prominent corner lot in Aster, again, there was no basis on which to deny that, so, regardless of whether or not you liked the way the fence looks, it's approved. This one, I think there's some continuing discussion on, but it's also another membrane roof. I approved this on a condition again, that there would be no visible changes from a public right-of-way. So since that time, we not gonna call a pushback. We received an inquiry on the alley side, on the back of this building, bear in mind, you're looking at like three, I think, discreet buildings that have been kinda unified to look like one building. So on one of those three buildings, on the alley side, there is some metal coping along the parapets that they would like to replace with new coping material. I'm inclined to approve that, but I think, by the letter of the law, you would need to weigh in on that. Nonetheless, I'm still inclined to approve it. If we had going a little discussion on that, Would anybody be too upset, if on one third of the length of the alley side of this, where there's some visible coping that was replaced with a new coping material as part of the membrane roof replacements?

- I think, as long as it aligns similarly in size, and similarly in-

- Well, I think so too, and to elaborate on-
- in it's character, I think it would be just fine.
- To elaborate on these three buildings that are one building, it's also non-contributing within the district.
- Right.
- So as long as it's not on fire, I'll be inclined to be pretty lenient with the roof.
- Do we need to make that a motion, from Ian?
- I don't know that it's an action item.
- Okay, got it, yeah, fine.
- I was just gauging how much you'd yell at me next month, if I told you I stepped out of my lane a little bit.
- Sure, sure.
- Jason, is there a way to reverse that building at all or was it built that way? I can't remember what it was underneath, Is there any, is it possible to revert back, or is it just what it is?
- So, you know, I'm eternally optimistic, it might be reversible, but at this point, any reversing of it would be kind of a Disneyland version, it wouldn't be the authentic thing, It would be a reconstruction of what you think the authentic thing was, and given is that it was non-contributing at the time that it was a designated district in 1999. I don't know that reversing it, whatever would bolster it to become contributing, I mean, we could ask Jason Tish if he came back suddenly, you treasure the memory, I suppose, I don't know that I hold your breath, that it would ever be what it once was, so.
- Right, well, that's good. Thanks, thanks for that.
- Was that everything we did, Steph?
- Yes, that was everything.
- Item number three, reviews city arrays, repair orders and demolitions.
- There were none this month.
- Okay. Item number four, staff update.
- I have no update aside from all of the roofs and fences that we approved in the past month. Jason?
- I don't have anything either, except that the next three phases, or the next year worth of intensive survey report work has begun. That was going along pretty well until I ran into some personal issues here. I guess it's off topic. I have two children, a 14 year old, and 11 year old, the 14 year old who is fully vaccinated, has tested positive for COVID. So, I live in a big house with a lot of doors, and no kitchen, and now we've got it all subdivided, so it's kind of a crazy time here.

- Good luck.
- Boy, yeah.
- Thanks, it's just, the 11 year old tested negative, So, you know, we're still holding the line.
- Take care.
- Wow.
- Oh, something else, the Wisconsin Historical Society. I think that's who's having the conference that's happening right now. So if you're not on their **LISTSERV**, the sessions are, I think, \$50 to sign up, and then the sessions, they send you the links for them. So there were sessions today, sessions tomorrow, and then some on Friday as well. So if anyone is interested, I think it's \$50 to sign up.
- Yeah, I sat in today's sessions. You might have to move some obstacles to get registered at this point. The closing date is the 18th, but you know, they're usually pretty workable with that.
- Okay. By the way, Stephanie, I'd like to add that I think you're missing your calling as a judge, sitting there in that chair with the flags behind you. You look like-
- I do feel very judicial when I'm sitting in chambers.
- We should be calling you "Your honor".
- I think you should, actually, that's how I'm going to be referred to now, thank you.
- Date of the next meeting will be **Wednesday, November 17th at 4:30 PM**, I presume, unless something changes.
- Yes.
- And then do we have a motion for adjourn?
- Motion to adjourn.
- And the second.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor.
- Aye.
- All right, bye everybody.
- Good evening.