



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2022, 4:30 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains Zoom information, instructions, and a link to the Virtual Comment Form.

B. ROLL CALL.

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

Present: Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Paul Martzke, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Rebecca Derenne (joined at 4:52 PM), Brian Johnson

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the April 20, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Brian Johnson, No- None,
Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the January 19, 2022, meeting, the February 1, 2022, special meeting, and the February 28, 2022, special meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Brian Johnson, No- None,
Abstain- None.

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 22-04) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a ramp installation at 722 S. Monroe Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Paul Martzke to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ron Dehn to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley to open the floor. Motion Passed.

Yes- Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Susan Ley to approve the aluminum ramp option and the owner may choose the location of the ramp on the property. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 22-07) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a mural located at 109 N. Broadway.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Susan Ley to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

3. (COA 22-08) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a mural located at 139 N. Broadway.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Susan Ley to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None.

Rebecca Derenne joined at 4:52 PM

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

3. Staff Update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, May 18, 2022

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, Brian Johnson,

No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Number A on the agenda is zoom item. So it is available on zoom. There are instructions on how to get there. Number two is roll call, I can see that everyone is here except Rebecca. And also I have been notified that Brian Johnson has been named is that alder of this area, is that correct? And thus Mark Soyer is no longer on . So thank you Mark for everything you did for us, we appreciate that. Number C, the items number C, do we have approval of the agenda? We have a motion to approve tonight's agenda to go forward.

- Moved.

- [Man] Second.

- Okay, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any mays? Okay, the aye's have it. And then approval of the minutes from the previous meeting from the January 19th meeting, do we have a motion to approve those?

- [Man] Motion moved.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any mays? All right, the ayes have it. Item number E, regular business. A certificate of appropriateness 22-04, consideration with possible action for a ramp installation at 722 south Monroe Avenue. Jason?

- So here you see a map 722 south Monroe Avenue sits at the corner of Spring Street and South Monroe Avenue. More or less in the center of your picture there. The COA is asking for a ramp either on the north side or on the south side. Roughly speaking the north side being towards the driveway. Yes, towards the driveway. Thank you in the bottom right. Or the south side being towards Spring Street. And so here you see two pictures of the same house. The ramp would connect to the porch at the first floor level. So next slide

shows the either or proposal. So in the top one proposal as per the COA application is a 30 foot long aluminum ramp from the porch towards Spring Street. You see that at the top, the ramp proposed as a easy access pathway 3G. I found a picture of what I think is the easy access pathway 3G there at the top left. The or option is proposed as pressure treated wood on the north side of the house towards the driveway which would be an L shape. And you see that at the lower left and then kind of center bottom in the sketch on the right. Let's skip ahead of slides, see what we got. So the recommendation is there is a preservation brief issued by the National Park Service, brief number 32 that deals specifically with ADA compliance, things like ramps. The recommendation is that we approve something and it appears to me that the best location is on the northern side between the house and the driveway. The preservation brief is pretty clear though that you should make the ramp fit in as best as possible with the historic character of the house. Although I'm recommending approval, the preservation brief specifically gives a shout out to pressure treated wood as being not so great. Aluminum also not so great, but it kind of raises the question is this a 30 year solution, is this a 10 year feature? I don't really know what we're looking at. And regardless, at the end of the day I want the landmarks commission to approve something. So that's where I'm at, thank you.

- All right. Team, should we open up the floor for discussion on this one, we have a motion open up the floor or do we wanna discuss within here or how do we wanna do this?

- I would like to make a motion to open the floor specifically to find out if the applicant is in attendance. So I do have questions.

- Do we have a second on that motion?

- Second.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, any nays? Okay, let's open up the floor.

- Both of the applicants are here. Jeff and Robin Smith.

- Whichever you're gonna... Whoever's gonna Okay, thank you.

- My question for the applicants are twofold. First of all, does this building remain a private residence and it's for your personal use?

- Yes.

- Okay, all right, fair enough. And then secondly, have you considered using a power lift?

- Yes, we have.

- Okay, and your thoughts on that?

- And our thoughts that that would work out well except people at the housing does, would not let us use it because they thought it takes too much time. The state has investigated and thought that because of our

ambulatory issue with one of our residents, that that would take him too long to get down to ground level to evacuate in case of an emergency. So, that's why we had to go back to the ramp idea again.

- I find that a very surprising position because in my career as a city firefighter, I find those power ramps, or power lifts

- Yeah.

- I would be surprised that somebody would have, would take position. And in either case, it's clearly necessary but my thought was that the power lift would be less obtrusive and less impact on the historic integrity.

- We agree.

- We both agree.

- We agree. And we had tried, we thought that was a great alternative, but the state of Wisconsin disagrees.

- Just outta curiosity, you're saying the state's been involved. So is this a private residence or some type of CBRF.

- It is an adult.

- Yep, an adult family home that we reside in. It's one of the people that live with us.

- Okay, all right. You've definitely answered my questions. I'm surprised that the state's position about the power lift, did they document that for you?

- No.

- I might be able to come up with an email. I might be able to come up with an email that they gave to me in regard to that not being appropriate.

- It might be, maybe some we can chase down a little bit further. We just didn't wanna spend any more time on it and decided to go with 'cause go with what we could get. They gave us 45 days from March 4th to have all of this installed. Well, there wasn't gonna be any construction done on our property during the winter, so.

- Well I think either any of the three proposals are adequate whether it's the aluminum ramp, the wooden ramp or a power lift. I would suggest you do look to see if they can substantiate that position because those power lifts are out there. So it's not like you'd be the only person doing this. And again, I'm skeptical that they'd be prohibited from say a fire rescue or emergency position. But you definitely have answered my questions adequately, so thank you.

- Thank you for the question.

- I guess I have a question as well. I guess out of the two, the designs, the aluminum or the wood, which do you prefer?

- Wood.

- And I think aluminum would suit our needs because we're looking at a short period of time, perhaps five years at the most, maybe three years. It's easy to put up, it doesn't have to be painted and it suits the needs.

And the other option is that the state recommended treated lumber which you're saying treated lumber isn't a problem also. So Cedar is so much more expensive if you're gonna build with Cedar and then paint it.

- Okay, and according to the recommendation, it was recommended that you be able to store the pieces of the porch in a safe place so that they could be re-installed at a later date. Are you able to accommodate that?

- Yep, not a problem. Absolutely.

- If I could interject too, that preservation brief discusses things like ramps as though these ramps are a permanent feature. So they're looking for something that'll fit in with the historic context, recognizing that that ramp should be there for 100 years or something. And that's why I kind of asked the question, what is the timeframe on the ramp because if it is a relatively short term solution, then I don't see it as being a terribly important thing to have painted wood or pretty spindles or that sort of thing.

- Right.

- Yeah.

- I agree because it's a short period of time and we would be even looking for a temporary permit if that was reasonable 'cause we feel that five years maximum is what we would need it for.

- Fair enough.

- [Man] Is there a reason why the aluminum option is presented on the south side of the residence as opposed to on the north side?

- I think that's more a cost. That's the only reason because we could get a straight 30 foot ramp at a reasonable cost. And if it's for a temporary reason, plus it's easy access for us on Spring Street and that's the basic reason.

- Any other questions folks?

- Sure. Can you hear me okay?

- Yeah.

- All right. The drawings don't reference or show it, but there already is an existing ramp to that property or that piece of lumber or that unit, that living unit.

- Correct, that's correct.

- They want to know.

- So it already has and it already met ramp requirements, now we're adding a second ramp. Was there any discussion about adjoining the two ramps, having the porch connected just to the side ramp, that already exists.

- That is a question that we have discussed that and that is a possibility as far as I'm concerned, the state does require two exits.

- Robin. I wonder if that would bump right into the bump out where Betty's room is. So in an angle.

- It would be difficult, but.
- Might not look geometrically correct.
- Yeah.
- Okay, and not to be a crappy neighbor, but Spring Street, I do live. I will say that since the historic district encompasses a large area, half east side of the city, quarter of east side of the city, yet they only notified two neighbors, one on each side. So the notification, diameter, distance is really, really limited. You're not gonna get much input if you just ask them who's trying to be polite anyway.
- Yeah. We don't have a problem if you disagree with it, that's fine.
- Right, so just as a general concept, I would say that I oppose.
- Okay.
- Would you provide your name and address for the record please?
- Sure. It's Brian Keehan My address is 515 Spring Street.
- Thank you.
- Spring Street's only a one block long street, so there's only four of us.
- Any other questions?
- And two of the four weren't notified.
- Okay.
- Are there any other questions here?
- I'll make a motion to close the floor.
- I'll second that motion. All in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Any nays? Okay, let's just close the floor and.
- Thank you.
- Thank you. Well I mean, it sounds to me Jason, like they're leaning towards the north side like you had preferred. Well one is one isn't. But it obviously, is this ramp it's actually required by the state, correct?
- Yes.
- Yes.

- [Man] So I'm gonna present an opinion here. I think that the aluminum ramp solution, I would prefer from a historical nature. We talk a lot on this commission about not trying to replicate a historic building improperly. Too many times I see treated wood applications being utilized on these historic homes. We've had instances in the same neighborhood where we've had some problems with porch reconstruction out of the treated materials and the modern aesthetic materials. And the philosophy that we've taken on a lot of these things is if you can't match the historic character of the building, you should try and take a different approach so that it's not confused as being part of the original structure. To me, the aluminum option is never gonna be confused as part of this historic home. We're talking about this as a temporary thing. I think it's a lot easier to remove and take that out in the future. And I think for the residents, the property owners, I think it'll be a lot less maintenance over time even if it is several years, as opposed to the treated lumber. Doesn't look good after a couple years. So I'm personally in favor of the aluminum option.

- I agree. And I think too, the aluminum one doesn't look as bulky as the wood.

- I agree also Paul, and I guess my question to you is would you like to make a motion outta that?

- [Man] Well, I certainly can hurry this along if.

- No, I'm not trying to rush anything.

- I would make a motion to approve the aluminum option for the south side of the residence as it was presented.

- And do we have a second?

- I'll second.

- Just a bit of clarity, do we want a sunset on this or is this just until the end of time?

- Oh, it's a good question.

- I would suggest making it no end point on this because we're up against the ADA, which is incredibly powerful legislation. And I don't think at any point we should do anything that would be... The times I've been aware of ADA issues, that always triumphs and I think we shouldn't have any sort of sunset on this. Leave it to the applicants.

- Okay. So, we have Paul's motion and Susan's second. How do we wanna vote on this? Do we want just roll call or do we want to.

- That motion includes

- Let's go down the line. I mean I'm the chair. I would vote to approve Bob Paul's motion.

- Is there any other discussion before we go on to vote?

- That's good. Yeah, sorry.

- I think in the interest of expediency, you can just call for a voice vote.

- I see that Jeff is trying to, should we re-open the floor and let Jeff say what he wants to say here real quick or.

- Motion to open the floor.

- Okay.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor? Jeff, go ahead.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Does it specifically have to be on the south side or could it go to the north side, the aluminum? It goes either way.
- Well, I had made the motion and so I really personally don't care. I was more concerned with the aesthetic effect on the property and the ease of maintenance of the aluminum versus wood. And for that matter construction too, 'cause it's pre-assembled, I believe. So if you can get it on the north side, if it works out, I have no issue one way or another.
- Okay, thank you.
- Jason, were you waving your hand at somebody or did you wanna say something?
- Yeah, I was waving my hand at somebody that walked by.
- Okay, fair enough.
- Okay, so we have a motion and a second. I guess they all...
- Motion to close the floor.
- Sorry, close the floor.
- Second that.
- Okay, floors closed. All in favor.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Are there anybody opposed? Is there anyone opposed?
- I have a question. Is that on the amended motion that it could go to either location or was the motion specific to a specific location?
- Gosh, I would leave that up to Pulsar, he didn't care.
- The current motion is for the South side only. So he would have to make an amendment to his motion, Susan would have to affirm her second.

- Okay Stephanie, so I will amend my motion to approve the installation of the aluminum ramp on the property and leave the exact location up to the property owners.

- Okay, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye

- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. They have permission to build the aluminum ramp where they need it most. Thank you.

- Thank you, we appreciate that.

- Okay. All right, next item. Certificate of appropriateness 22-07, consideration with possible action on a design review for a mural located on 109 North Broadway.

- So 109 North Broadway is at the corner of North Broadway and Walnut, right? So here we see it. At the bottom right you see the front and Walnut side, side facade. At the top left, we're really talking about this white washed wall behind the building tucked in on the alley. So a COA is proposing painting a mural on this wall. It may or may not look like this, but these are samples of the artist's work. And skipping ahead then the recommendation is to approve it recognizing that the wall has been previously painted. Also recognizing that the paint proposed to be used is in line with what Shippo recommends as a vapor permeable acrylic. So I see no reason to object to painting a mural on this wall, thank you.

- Does anyone want to open the floor for discussion? Would anybody like to make a motion?

- Motion to approve.

- I second that.

- Okay, all in favor aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. Item number three. Certificate of appropriateness 22-08, consideration with possible action on a design review for a mural located at 139, North Broadway.

- So similar issue here. This is the gather on Broadway building, it's noncontributing in the district. We're talking about a mural on the alley side, the back facade. It's the white painted brick. And next slide shows an idea of what the mural may look like. And once again recognizing too that this is non-contributing, staff recommends approval of a mural here. No objections, thank you.

- Anyone wanna open the floor of any questions, comments, concerns? And do we have any motions?

- I'll make a motion to approve.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. Item F, informational staff level COA applications.
- There are two.
- Yes, we had two. The somewhat familiar at this point, 722 South Monroe is getting a roof. So we think anyway. That has been approved and the letter stated of course too that if they talked to Shippo, they could probably get tax credits for that work. 708 South Quincy similar situation, roof and gutters. Letter stated that tax credits around the table if they so choose to pursue those. And I think that's the only two staff level COAs we had this month.
- Yes.
- Okay. Number two, review city rays repair orders.
- 148 North Oakland is across the street from our Oakland-Dousman National Register District. Stephanie and I were there today and saw people working on it. I don't know if that means that it won't actually be raised. I don't really know how many get raised after they get the raise repair order. I know a lot don't, but that's okay. So there it is, it's not in a district. And as you can see, there's probably not a lot of historic material that's gonna be on the outside of it. So nothing to get too worked up about I don't think. 524 11th street. Late 19th century, early 20th century. Worker's cottage. Again, I don't really know the story here except that there's a lot of them around town that are similar to this house and in better shape with higher integrity. So those are the two with Ray's repair orders for this month.
- Thank you Jason. Any staff updates?
- We sent out annual letters, this is gonna be our first year doing that. We have been getting some calls from people who are not in historic properties because our mapping grabbed anything that was on a personal line and called that historic too. So we're working through that right now, but the letters did go. The funding sources we have available, remainder of COAs, discussed some of the upcoming things. There's a tax credit seminar in De Pier on May 24th. So we sent that out so people could sign up for that. We also have, our intern has been working diligently this semester on making story maps and they're almost complete. They're very well put together, she did an excellent job. So they're district by district, so people will be able to use them for personal walking maps to find more information out. I'm hoping that different groups and agencies will use them for walking tours as well. So I'm really looking to launching those before the summer. So we'll be getting those out to you soon as they're ready.
- Great. Well, thank you.

- Stephanie, just a quick question for you.

- Yeah.

- So as you may know, my district was redrawn to include parts of . And so I had, I'm learning a little bit more about the neighborhood and I had an interesting question because they received that letter that you referenced recently. In about a week or two prior to that letter, they also received the letter from DPW. You know that they're reconstructing their street and their carriage walk is going to be removed unless they choose to replace it and repair it. And so he was like hey, these letters seem to be in conflict with each other. I would love some perspective on that.

- So this has been coming up for the past two to three years. Our department public works, their initial policy was to always remove carriage walks as they find them. Carriage walk is the one that goes between the road and the sidewalk. Pretty normal in our downtown or in historic districts. This got to where they started redoing some roadways taking out the carriage walks and many people had complaints about it because it does decrease the character of the neighborhood. So I think that the current policy is now if you want it, you can put it back yourself or something similar. We are very opposed to this policy. We believe that the carriage walks really add a lot of character to the neighborhoods. However, we've had minimal luck getting anything changed. 'Cause I think that that constituent is right it is in conflict to say we have these historic properties, we have these historic districts and we're trying to maintain their characters. You have to apply for these things and have all these different steps and then to say, but our department of public works is gonna come through and take out something that we believe is character defining. So if we have any ideas on how you think that like the landmarks commission can put in a communication to our council to ask for that policy to be reviewed. If you wanted to as an older from the district and for the landmarks commission do something, we definitely are supportive. Our department has talked about at length and we've been just as frustrated as people who own historic homes and just as people who are trying to do community development. So any guidance would be great.

- Brian, I will add to that that over here in Astor we were able to get the city to put carriage walks back in. You should talk to Cheryl Renier-Wigg. She spearheaded that effort and I believe that what happened was that the people had to pay the cost of the concrete. They still had to pay something, but they had to actually pay I believe it was the cost of the concrete.

- Yeah, so that must be what that letter is stating that they can put them back in but that's on the burden of the property owner.

- Right.

- I'm not sure I agree with that policy is what I'm saying. So I don't know if like there's a direction we wanna take as a commission to get that changed or just to get some eyes on it, I'm not sure.

- Sure. I know that people found that if they were gonna try to do it themselves, to try to get a concrete truck here with what's left from a different job and all that. So it was much easier to do it What was coming through and

- Well the policy, if the property owner's responsible for the cost, it's no different than the sidewalk itself.

- Right.

- Correct?

- Yeah. But I believe so, I think that's what it was. It was just strictly the policy.

- I think in this issue though Paul. And again, we don't have to, it's not an agenda item, We don't have to go too far down the path. But in this case, the Department of Public Works, they're reconstructing the street, they're pulling out carriage walks that are in perfectly fine condition.

- Yeah, I understand the problem and I disagree with it too. I don't think public works should be doing that. But I also think that if a property owner wants the carriage walk put back in during reconstruction, well there's a cost to it just like the sidewalk. And so I don't think that's unfair. I think that the property owner is responsible for it. I'm assuming that a carriage walk doesn't have to be maintained by a property owner like a sidewalk does.

- They do.

- So they have to be shoveled in the wintertime if you have one?

- If you're using it, it's not required. I mean, if you want to use it, you have to shovel it. No one else is going to do that. But it's not like the regular sidewalk where you have to have it shoveled for public access. It's not like that. But if you want a shovel, you're doing the shoveling.

- So I think really what's at the debate I guess would be whether or not it should be the default standard that when a street is resurface or reconstructed and we pull out a carriage walk that it automatically gets put back in is part of the reconstruction budget as opposed to giving properties the owner or the option to do it at their own expense, which I'm sure many of them do not do. And that, your point Stephanie is what erodes at the historical integrity of the neighborhood then.

- This also came up on when they redid parts of Mather, there are a ton of carriage walks in the neighborhood and it's not protected and it's not full of people. They're a little bit more low to middle class people, so they didn't have the funds to be able to do this. They didn't have the advocacy behind them to be able to do this. So a lot of their carriage walks were just taken out and there was no option for them. And now that project's done so that's it, they don't have a carriage walk anymore. So I think something needs to change but I'm just not sure if that is something that of this body will take up or not.

- Yeah, I'll connect with you offline on this one. Stephanie again, it's not an agenda item but since you brought up the letter and I'm literally like, it's right here. I wanted to talk, I just thought I'd bring it up. So thank you for the perspective.

- Yeah, thank you.

- Okay, thank you all. And remember four date of next meeting is and I guess with that, do we have a motion for adjournment?

- [Man] I got a question.

- Oh yes.

- [Man] When are we meeting in person again?

- That's kind of up to you all. There aren't a lot of commissions that meet on Wednesdays and Jason and I already meet in the council chambers. The direction has been that if people want to start coming in for meetings that you're able to, but that has to be down in council chambers. So we'd have to make sure that the spot is always secured for us. The other rooms in City Hall are not set up for hybrid meetings yet. So if it's a discussion that you all want to have, or if you just wanna say like yep, whoever wants to come in join step and Jason council chambers, you're more than welcome to. But then we would have to still have separate screens,

like get back logged into civic clerk, do those sorts of things. So there'll be some tech updates that we need to do as well. And maybe retraining, 'cause I haven't used civic clerk in a while either. for our next meeting?

- Sure.

- It certainly isn't required by any means, so.

- Yeah, we had our first neighborhood association meeting in person last night, so it was interesting. Excuse me, Monday night. So yeah. Okay, that being said, so then Wednesday, May 18th we already know one of the agenda items. So do we have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anybody against it? Okay, see you all soon.

- Thank you.

- And thank you.