



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 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. Brian Johnson, Ian Griffiths, Susan Ley, David Siegel, and Rebecca Derenne

Present: Ron Dehn, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Rebecca Derenne, Susan Ley (joined at 4:31 pm during Item D1), Excused: Brian Johnson

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the May 18, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by David Siegel to move Item F1 to go before regular business and approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the April 20, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Paul Martzke to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 22-04) Consideration with possible action on an updated design review for a lift located at 722 S. Monroe Avenue.

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

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

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

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Susan Ley to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 22-11) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a carport removal located at 625 S. Quincy Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

3. (COA 22-12) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new sign located at 400 S. Washington Street.

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, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

4. (COA 22-14) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new driveway and retaining wall located at 1130 S. Monroe Avenue.

Moved by Rebecca Derenne, seconded by Paul Martzke to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

5. (COA 22-15) Consideration with possible action on a design review for new siding located at 945 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Ron Dehn to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Susan Ley to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Susan Ley to deny as requested. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Public Meeting for Report on Phases 2, 3, and 4 of the Intensive Survey Update.
2. Staff-Level COA Applications.
3. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.
4. Staff Update.
5. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, June 15, 2022.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Rebecca Derenne, seconded by Susan Ley to adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Okay, so that would take care of the roll. As far as approval of the night's agenda, we have a request to move item F to the beginning of the meeting because so many people have joined us for that. So with that in mind, would somebody like to motion to... I guess I will make the motion to approve tonight's agenda and also moving item F to the front of the pack.
- I'll second that.
- Okay, all in favor, aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Are there any nays? Okay, then let's do that. We'll start at the meeting tonight. Oh, sorry, approval of the minutes from the last meeting, they look fine to me. I dunno, anybody else? Do we have a motion to approve the minutes from the April 20th meeting?
- Motion to approve.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor, aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Any opposed? Okay, the ayes have it. Let's see. Okay, regular business. We're gonna skip now to item number F and the public meeting for report on phases two, three, and four of the intensive survey update. Stephanie, who did you say was gonna handle that?
- So we have Rowan from Legacy Architecture and Jason Tish from SHPO. This portion of the meeting is going to be a public meeting. So once the presentation is complete, if anybody has any questions, comments, or

feedback from the public, please feel free to unmute yourself. Or there's the raise the hand function within Zoom, if you'd like to use that as well. And I'll keep an eye on that, if anyone has any questions for the presenters. So Rowan, if you want to take it away, I believe that you are first up.

- Okay, well, hello everyone. It's good to see you all again and hear from you. My name is Rowan Davidson with Legacy Architecture. We conducted the first phase of the intensive survey at Green Bay, and most recently completed the second, third and fourth phases as well. Can I share my screen as well, Steph?

- Yes, you should have access to that, if not-

- Okay, I'll go right ahead and do that then. All right. A quick little PowerPoint for everyone to share. What is the purpose of these intensive surveys? Well, first and foremost, and Jason will probably talk about this as well, is it's to identify structures and districts and pretty much any kind of resource that has architectural integrity and or historical significance, and therefore is potentially eligible for a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. In addition to that, we try to make these documents as thorough as possible as does pretty much all consultants work on intensive surveys. And so these also conserve as historical documents for public awareness, history and architecture in the city of Green Bay. Surveys are conducted with a reconnaissance survey. That's essentially one or two people, usually in a car, with a bunch of maps and a computer and spreadsheets, and of course, a camera driving around documenting everything that we possibly can see and updating the information which already exists in the architectural and history inventory managed by the Wisconsin Historical Society. All of that is then followed by research on, again, the architecture of usually buildings though, sometimes other sites as well and historical research on the city of Green Bay specific to the survey phase areas that we were working in. Then we evaluate significant resources. We consult with SHPO, the State Historic Preservation Officer in determining which of the things that we have found might possibly be eligible. And then the report is written. This one is about 250 pages, and it's broken down into a bunch of different sections. The way that we evaluate this in the midst of resources and the way that SHPO does as well, is based on criteria for the National Register. There's really four categories. The first A, is whether something is associated with significant historic events, it's history, and then that's quite possible for some of the resources that we identified in Green Bay recently. B, as associated with a good person, did a famous or influential character in Green Bay's history live or work at a certain location? And C, and by far, the most common is architecture. Whether resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a tight period or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master or that possesses a high artistic value, or that represents significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. And D, the last one, is yield important historical information. This is primarily archeological and we did not find any that would qualify under D and we rarely do. The survey report as I was trying to mention earlier, is broken down into chapters that cover all kinds of aspects of Green Bay's history. The largest by far again, is architecture. We'll talk about style and designers and engineers and builders and examples from all over the city of everything. But besides that, there's also sections on settlement history, industry, religion, commercial buildings, planning and landscape architecture, and notable people, and many more. For this three phases of the survey that we just completed, the results on the eastern side of the Fox River, Downtown, Astor, north of the East River and then also the northwest side of the city as well, we found 1,150 resources of historic interest that were identified and cataloged and 707 previously surveyed properties that no longer possess integrity. These are resources that we also took a picture of, documented and are included in the report, but are deemed to no longer have architectural integrity, which really means they no longer resemble what they originally were, siding additions and so on and so forth. Among all of these round 1800, we identified 19 resources that are potentially individually eligible for listing the National Register of Historical places. And beyond those 19, four other church complexes, usually on a single city block that could be nominated altogether, half dozen buildings, or maybe less, and then two large residential districts, which I'm going to talk about in a little bit. I'm just quickly gonna go through the ones that were individually eligible, potentially individually eligible as the results of the survey. This first one is the Christiansen house, it's on Cherry Street. It's a second empire dating from 1860 remarkable in its age, and also its integrity to its style. Another is the Central Assembly of God Church also in Cherry Street, built just a few years later. It's a excellent example of a wood surviving Greek Revival Church, quite uncommon. And this one is unusual too. This is Christiansen

house, it's on Irwin Avenue and it's a simple brick front gabled house from the mid 19th century built in 1868. This is remarkable in and of itself at Green Bay, especially this part of Green Bay was dotted with these buildings at one time, 150 years ago and perhaps 100 years ago as well. But very few of them remain, certainly ones that have architectural integrity. This one likely does because it's been well cared for and also because it is main street reconstruction. This house is also, and probably most notably known in Green Bay as the childhood home of a very famous Packer. Curly Lambeau's childhood home. we went to school across the street as well. So this could actually be nominated for its association with Lambeau, but also for its architecture. This is the Frisque house on South Jackson Street. It's an excellent example of Queen Anne style dating from 1893. There are quite a few good Queen Annes in Green Bay. So it's difficult to find ones that rise above the others, especially considering that in the Astor Neighborhood, which is already one very large residential historic district, there are dozens of them and we have to compare any resource in Green Bay, even to the ones which are already listed, including that district. This is the first Christ scientist on North Monroe Avenue completed in 1904. It's an excellent example to neoclassical style. This is the Hudson house, one of the better four squares. It was originally a farmhouse apparently on the west side of Green Bay when it was constructed in 1917. This is the Green Bay and Western Railroad Grain Elevator on 12th Avenue. Some of you probably recognize it from a distance at least, it was originally completed 1917 with considerable additions and alterations in 1928 and 1948. It's a stylistic utilitarian, which means that it doesn't have a style as architecture per se. It is essentially an industrial utilitarian building, but it's history related to the railway and related to food, transportation, packing and distribution in the history of Green Bay is remarkable. Another industrial building. This is the Wernig or Cob Sunlit Bakery on Cedar Street. It's a production shed type completed the 1923. And this is the Vaniten house on North Baird Street. It's one of the finer bungalows in the city completed the 1926. This is the first Methodist Episcopal Church on Howe Street. It's neogothic revival style church completed in 1928 and is another good example of its style. And for history, getting back to the industrial history of Green Bay a little more, this is the Northern Paper Mills Office, not the whole mills, just the office buildings in particular finished in 1929 with the laboratory extension completed in 1931 in neoclassical. They've been altered considerably since then, but the history is so strong in this case that is possibly eligible for the National Register. Basically, have any of you ever used toilet paper? And it's not something we think about very often, but modern toilet paper is something that is significant to the history of Green Bay, and this is essentially where it was developed. This is the Grace Manor Apartments located on South Monroe Avenue, done in the Mediterranean Revival style in 1931. It's designed by Russell Barr Williamson. This is the Riverside Dance Pavilion and Restaurant on New Hall Street finished in 1936 in the Art Moderne style. The interior is just as, not more than the

- [Stephanie] Is he frozen for everyone else too?

- [Chad] Yep.

- [Stephanie] Okay.

- [Lisa] Yes.

- [Chad] I can text him.

- In our survey area or other iterations of the same firm.

- [Stephanie] Rowan, we actually lost your entire audio during that last slide.

- Oh, sorry, can you hear me now?

- [Stephanie] Yes.

- It says my internet is unstable. Okay, I'll repeat this one or this one, which did you wanna hear about?

- [Stephanie] Riverside?

- This is the Riverside Dance Pavilion Art Moderne building, built in 1936 entertainment venue since the 1930s in Green Bay with long history of hosting many and important acts and entertainers and the interior arguably has even finer integrity to its architecture than the exterior does to this day. This is Fire Station No. 3, Georgian Revival style fire station on the west side, completed the 1937 and designed by one of Berners Schober architects, who, as I said, designed about half of the architect design buildings that we actually included in our survey. Including this one, Washington Junior High School on South Baird Street completed in 1939 is one of the finer schools. It still has its architectural integrity recognizable as an art deco building from that period. This is the Malcore Funeral Home on North Baird Street completed in 1946 in the Colonial Revival style also potentially eligible. And this is Eugene Brusky and family's house 1334 Kellogg Street on the west side. It's a ranch house, obviously with quite a great deal inspired styling completed in 1954. This is one of the nicest ranch, both in terms of integrity and also architectural distinction in the city. Ranch houses are increasingly becoming a subject of possible National Register nominations. And this is Fire Station No. 2 on University Avenue done kind of the modernist style popular at the time and completed in 1964. Green Bay actually has quite a lot of what we would call brutalist architecture of that period, concrete and masonry off kilter designs far more than many other cities in Wisconsin. So this is one of the finer examples of it. And this is the Green Bay Housing Authorities Mason Manor completed in 1971. It was by far the largest public housing development in any city outside of Milwaukee in the state at that time. And obviously is in a contemporary apartment, built with a great deal of integrity. And last but not least, we're kind of pushing at the boundaries of what can be nominated to the National Register restore places. Typically, there's a 50 year rule in place where something has to be at least 50 years an age. If there isn't some other concern to be nominated, this breaks that mold, this is not quite 50 years old. The first portion of the first Northern and savings and loan bank was completed in 1975 on North Monroe Avenue. And the addition, which is very similar and equal in scale was completed four years later to the same building. It's a great example of its style, both on the interior and exterior and someday could be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Beyond the individual buildings, like I mentioned, there's other complexes in districts, groupings of buildings and resources that are also potentially eligible. A number of them are church complexes. The churches in most of these cases would probably stand alone as individually eligible, but since we can and we'll include other buildings on the same sites along with site nominations potentially, that's what are often done with churches. This is the Saints Peter and Paul Catholic complex. It's just four buildings, built between 1910, which is the church with editions and 1966, which is the school and gym edition. And this is the St. Willebrord Catholic Church complex. It's just two buildings, the church itself and an adjacent house built between 1891 and 1912. And this is the St. Francis Xavier Catholic cathedral complex, which I'm sure most people in Green Bay are familiar with built between 1870 and 1946. The church and the, I guess you could call it the rectory it was once the diocese's main offices were probably both individually eligible, but the school and additional office buildings on the same site could also be included. And this is the St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church complex built between 1911 and 1932. St. Johns. And as far as larger districts go, we did identify two large residential districts, almost entirely houses. The first one is the Astor Park Historic District. It includes 155 contributing buildings, and 22 non-contributing buildings, all built between 1869 and 1957. Many of them are just a vernacular wood frame, builders homes, quite a few were bungalows, and many other examples of the revival styles popular from the 1910s and 1930s. Is quite large, obviously, as you know, it's not Astor, which is, immediately to the west. This is on the other side of Webster Avenue and is often sort of the smaller, more middle class versions of the same styles and same forms, which you see in Astor. And this is the ranch district centered around that ranch house actually showed earlier, the Brusky house on Kellogg Street on the west side, there is 30 ranch houses. All of them would be contributing since they all maintain their architectural integrity. Most of them are masonry ranches sometimes with colonial influence. And yeah, it makes a very nice little district. All of them built between 1953 and the latest one in 1966. So, all of those would be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. And that's what we found in our recent phase two through to four. Any questions or comments?

- [Stephanie] I'd just like to reiterate. I think I've talked to many people who are on this meeting on the phone or via email, if something is eligible, that does not mean that we will immediately list it on the National

Register. This just gives us the information in case you wanted to move forward with that registration process. There's a significant amount of time and money that goes into that. And we are concentrating currently on updating the intensive survey throughout the entirety of the city. So I think we have four or five more phases left of that to do, and then we would look heavily at doing some nomination packets at that time. But if anyone from the public or from our commission have any questions about this, please feel free to unmute yourself and begin asking them at this point.

- Jeff, St. Mary's of the Angels, wondering if St. Mary's of the Angels was on this list. I didn't see it during the presentation.

- St. Mary's? It was included in the survey, but it was not selected as one of the ones that would be potentially eligible.

- Okay, thank you.

- You're welcome. We share a lot with SHPO with the historical society and not everything always makes the grade I'm afraid, but doesn't mean that it can't be, it just means that on our initial findings, it wasn't included, that's all.

- Hi there, I'm Chad. I jumped in a little late and I wasn't sure I had some interest in the cannery alpha main street, which houses the garage. And we were just curious if that was looked at.

- I'm trying to remember which off main street cannery.

- [Stephanie] It'd be near main and Baird.

- [Lisa] And Cedar.

- Yeah, Cedar. I believe that is also in the report. Again, I'd have to say the same thing though. We did look at a lot of them and did share a lot of them in this case. It was a very large survey area in the end. I don't think it is one of the ones that we obviously outlined this potentially eligible, but it doesn't mean that it could not be.

- Okay.

- [Rowan] Yeah.

- Thank you.

- [Stephanie] Casey, you can go ahead and unmute yourself.

- [Troy] Hi, my name is Troy, actually, I'm the owner of a Queen Anne. That's a couple doors down from one that it was eligible on there. And I was just wondering... 802 East Jacks or East Walnut, excuse me. I was just wondering, I mean, if I'm not on the list, does that mean.... It was my goal to eventually to be on the National Historical Registry. So what would be the next steps for me to become eligible or look into that?

- Yeah, just because it didn't make the list in this report doesn't mean that it is indelible. As I said, we actually looked at lots of Queen lands. There are quite a few good ones in the city. Yours I believe was also included. So it will be in the report. You'll give a little bit of background actually to the next step for you, which if you were interested in nominating it, would be to pursue with a questionnaire to the Wisconsin Historical Society. You could either do that yourself, or you could hire someone to do it along with you. And then you'd send in basically documentation photos, a little write up on its history, things like that. And then SHPO, State Historic Preservation Office would review what you sent and get back to you with the letter, usually in about a month, sometimes even less.

- [Casey] Cool.

- [Troy] Okay, thank you.

- You're welcome. I think Jason Tish may be would able to address some of that a little better than I can as well, the process.

- I don't see any other hands raises, anybody else interested in asking questions or getting more information on this process?

- [Tom] Yes, just one question is, is that report available anywhere online or in printed package?

- It will be shortly, it's nearly complete. We're just finishing the maps at the moment, but yes, the report will be freely shared with the public, I hope. We're gonna give it to the city of Green Bay, the Wisconsin Historical Society. Usually these end up in the public libraries, or even posted online as a PDF accessible to everyone. I hope that's the case here as well.

- Yes, they get shared on the city's website. There's a historic preservation page that has everything about the landmarks commission, but then also about our survey and it's update. So it'll be uploaded there once we have that document.

- Yeah, we'll get it soon.

- Lisa, go ahead.

- [Lisa] Just wondering if on the west side, the ranch house district Kellogg was the only residential area that was identified as a potential?

- The Astor Park one was as well found towards the edge of Allway next to the Astor District. That's even larger still.

- [Lisa] The west side.

- On the west side, no. The only one that we found so far, we're not done with the west side yet. We've only done about half of it, but in the sort of Northwest side of the city, that's the only residential one we found, yes.

- [Lisa] Okay.

- [Chees] I don't know how to do the hand raise, I apologize, I can't find it anywhere on here.

- That's fine, go ahead.

- [Chees] On Michigan, I was in your meeting in October. My property made the historical survey last time in 1985. And I know you mentioned some properties may have fallen off that list, but they would still be listed in the report.

- Yes.

- [Chees] If my property has done that, and I suspect it may have due to some things done by the previous owner, what would be my next steps to try and restore its status as historically significant?

- Well, quite a lot. If you have documentation from the previous earlier report that might have a photo in there that will help you enormously. Essentially, what we try to encourage, and I imagine the city of Green Bay does too, and you can speak up for me if I'm saying something out of place, but is try to encourage you to sort of restore it back to its original materials, which I'm guessing is probably the reason why it would fall off the list. Say siding is one of the greatest culprits, windows as well. If the previous owner maybe covered in vinyl or something like that, we would keep it, but we would take a photograph and some, but we would remove it from the list as it were. If it's say vinyl sided, when it was originally wood sided in the 1980s, as an example, that would be one case, you could return it back to wood, essentially, basically just an effort in maintaining the historic appearance of your property.

- [Chees] Okay, in the case of a porch, because it was redone, it is now up to code, whereas the original configuration, the porch would not be up to modern code. How do you guys handle that?

- Ah, that is tricky. Sometimes those two conflict, often they conflict. There are ways around that that comes more into the design of the porch that you make. I don't have a picture of your porch offhand to say for sure, but there are ways that we can do that, or Green Bay can also assist you in directing you to people who can.

- [Chees] Okay, thank, you.

- You're welcome. It's not out of the question, it can still happen.

- [Chees] Yeah, it's maintenance, the height of the railing is probably the biggest issue.

- Ah, okay, that again, yeah.

- We're trying to find a way within our code to remedy that situation, but generally speaking, we just take it case by case and try to work with the applicant to find a proper design that would be historically sensitive as well.

- [Chees] Okay. Thank you.

- Any other questions? All right, I don't see any, thank you so much, Rowan, for that information. Again, everything will be posted on the city's website as soon as we have the report available. So just keep an eye there if you're looking for further information on that.

- Thank you, everyone.

- If you all would like to stick around, you're welcome to, we're gonna continue on with our landmarks commission meeting and do our regular business items at this point, if you would like to leave, you're able to do so at this point, the public meeting is now over.

- Thank you, Stephanie. And thank you, Rowan. So we are now moving back to item E, regular business. The first item being certificate of appropriateness 22-04, consideration with possible action on an updated design review for a lift located at 722 South Monroe.

- I'm gonna start talking now, this is Jason.

- If you may recall, last month we had an application for an accessibility ramp at this same property. Apparently, the property owner went back and did a little more figuring and now figures that perhaps a lift is potentially in the cards. So here we see the map again, we're talking about the corner property at Monroe and Spring. Next slide, you would remember these two pictures from last month's meeting. Moving ahead again, a throwback to last month, we discussed ramps at two locations on the house, but now we're considering instead of a ramp, a lift made in Wisconsin. It wasn't clear from the application this month where precisely this

would be going, but I do know that the landmarks commission was keen on discussing the possibility of a lift. And so here it is and here we are. That's really all I have right now. I suppose the recommendation is to approve a lift provided that we know exactly where it's going. And just like last month, I recommend that any components moved from a historic porch, for example, be kept on hand at the property for future reinstallation, if owner so chooses to in the future, thank you.

- And do we have any motions to open the floor for discussion?

- I'll make a motion to open the floor. I would like to hear the applicants if they're present.

- I'll second that motion. Okay, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye. Anybody opposed? Okay, let's open up the floor. Are the owners present?

- I don't see them.

- Are anyone from the property present? David, is there something that you would like to add?

- Well, would we have to close the floors before discussion?

- Sure, do we have a motion to close the floor?

- I'll make that motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- All in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Anybody opposed? Okay, the floor is now closed.

- Yeah, I advocated this and suggested they come forward because I'm familiar with these devices and they're entirely suitable. In fact, it's much better in alignment with our interest as a preservation committee, that this is a much lower profile. Knowing these devices, I think likely it's going to be on what I believe is the northern end of the porch immediately adjacent to the driveway. Just because this is a wheelchair-bound person, they're unlikely gonna want to move through the lawn, particularly in the winter. So more than likely, it's right there adjacent to the driveway, little narrow strip. Because of that, I absolutely would approve this.

- And that is a motion?

- I'll make a motion to approve as requested.

- Do we have a second?

- I'll second.

- Okay, all in favor, aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Anybody opposed? The ayes have it, motion is approved. Item number two, certificate of appropriateness 22-11, consideration with possible action on a design review for a carport removal located at 625 South Quincy.

- [Jason] So here you see on the map, 625 South Quincy. It's a nice house in the Astor Neighborhood, a few photographs at the top left. You see a nice photograph of the house and I wanna draw your attention to the little two car garage to the left. Below that, a clipping from the 1936 Sanborn map, just to show you that indeed a garage was there in 1936, looks like perhaps the two car garage. Then if you move over to the right side of the screen, this COA is proposing removal of the car port lean to addition to the historic garage. So that's it there with the shallow lean-to roof. And below that you see a side view with the gray asphalt shingle siding and the rafter tails that's in the bottom right. So in short, landmarks commission staff, it's me who recommends approval of the request to remove the one story, lean-to carport addition on the existing garage. It's an old carport, but it's a later addition. And regardless of whether it's present or not, it's largely hidden from view by the house from any public right away.

- Thank you, Jason. Do we have any motions to discuss this? To open up the floor for discussion?

- I'll make a motion to approve as submitted.

- I'll second that.

- Okay, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye. Has anyone approved disapprove, no? Okay, well, the ayes have it, motion is approved. Item number three, certificate of appropriateness 22-12, consideration with possible action on design review for a new sign located at 400 South Washington Street.

- [Jason] I think we'll mostly remember this one as well. It's come to the landmarks commission, not too long ago for doors and window changes. So on the map you see, we're talking about the former train depot along the river, South Washington Street. At the top right, is a relatively recent street view of that same depot. And at the bottom right, you see a artist's concept drawing or computer rendering of what the proposed sign near the bottom left of that image will look like. So moving ahead, here's some details on the sign, looks like eight feet wide by about three foot, something tall in copper and other shade of copper and snazzy dressed mannequin. Next to sign, probably won't be there, but that's okay. Recommendation is to approve the sign and we don't so much get into landscaping, so I'm not too worried about that, thank you.

- Thank you, Jason. Would anybody like to motion for discussion or for approval?

- Motion to approve as presented.

- Second.

- No one wants to discuss, correct? All in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Anyone opposed? The ayes have it, approved. Item number four, certificate of appropriateness consideration with possible action on a design review for a new driveway and retaining wall located at 1130 South Monroe.

- [Jason] So here we're talking primarily about a driveway that is shared between adjacent houses, the applications coming to us under 1130 South Monroe, but it also has to do with the house immediately to the south of that. Here, you see 1130 kind of in the center of the oval with, I forget the number of the house to

the south, but that's where we're at. So that driveway in between there. Next slide shows us some details. At the top left, we have a street view, 1130 South Monroe is on the right hand side of that top image. And then the kind of Japanese inspired bungalow on the left side. And we're talking about the driveway in between the two. So if I can draw your attention to the large vertically oriented picture on the right hand of the screen, welcome to my colorblind world, ha ha ha. I'm not that colorblind, but you can see where somebody's sketched in with kind of a paint brush thing, the boundaries of the proposed work site. Here, I want to call your attention to the house itself, the Southern wall, that's the right hand wall there's a dormer there. I think the proposal calls for the driveway to be widened to a point right up to the exterior of that southern wall. Beyond that you see the proposed scope of work includes the parking pad where the pickup truck is located in the right hand side photo. And yes, we have other photographs here. So at the bottom left corner, that's a view of the driveway looking towards the river in between the two houses. Again, you see what's currently kind of a grassy area along the Southern wall of 1130 South Monroe. The second photograph centered in the bottom of the screen, that's another view of the driveway looking from the river out towards south Monroe. And again, you see a gravel area and a grass area. My understanding is that the gravel area and grass area would become a widened driveway pad, which was probably fine. But what's the next slide say, maybe I'm mistaken. All right, recommendation is to approve the request. I do think that it's prudent for the property owner to give some consideration to drainage issues, having a impermeable surface right next to the house wall might cause problems down the road or down the driveway. But I don't know that for sure, and I don't know if they've already thought of that and well, I'm gonna leave it to you to discuss if you think it warrants discussion, so thank you.

- Thank you, Jason. Do we have any motions for discussion, to open the floor?

- I don't wanna open the floor, but I would just point out that for the property owner to make certain that their contractor applies for the appropriate permits with the city of Green Bay, they're gonna be working in the public right of way. And the department of public works is pretty specific about the apron and the sidewalk replacement. So we don't want to get them caught up in having that improperly constructed.

- Yes, I should note that once this gets approved through your body, we're just approving an expansion project. We don't really have dimensions associated with it. It would go then forwarded to our inspection division who would then go through the driveway permit process, where they would deal with setbacks, impervious coverage, all those things that go with our code. So we are just doing the, is the expansion in general, an okay project for a historic home? So it doesn't necessarily grant any dimensional information with this application.

- Thank you for that, Stephanie. Well, with that in mind, do we have any motions to approve the measure?

- Motion to approve it.

- I'll second.

- All in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Any nays? The ayes have it, unanimously. Item number five, a certificate of appropriateness 22-15, consideration with possible action on a design review for new siding located at 945 South Jackson Street.

- So 1045 South Jackson Street is a corner lot with two facades that are adjacent to a public right of way. Here it is. You see, it's not too far from the hospital corridor. But moving on next slide, what do we have? This is a photograph that I took in November of 2019. I just wanna point out that as we were taking notes on properties, this one at that time had the historic shingle siding and the presumably original windows. It's a contributing property in Astor built sometime around 1919 per the National Register nomination paperwork.

Next slide, two photographs that I took today, just pointing out that in 2019, there was a COA that was approved for some chimney work. I think that was a staff level COA. I note that the windows have been replaced sometime between November of 2019 and today, we don't have a COA on file for that, so that's some homework for Stephanie and myself. Moving on to the next slide. What we're talking about today is a COA application to replace all of the wood shingle siding with new vinyl siding. And what's proposed is a shingle style siding in, I think that's a brownish color.

- [Stephanie] It would be in white.

- It would be in white. So shingle style siding, like what you see there in white on the front of the house and then a clapboard profile vinyl siding elsewhere on the house. So, as we heard from Rowan earlier, there are four criteria under which a property can be added to the National Register, excuse me, too much soda. So criterion A, is event, loosely speaking, criterion B, is association with a person criterion C, is architecture. Criterion D has to do with archeological type stuff. Beyond those four criteria, there's also the seven aspects of integrity. So a property has to meet one of those four criteria and it has to have integrity. Here's how you figure out if it has integrity, there's location, is where it was constructed. Is the setting still historic? Think of the little house in the movie "Up," it was surrounded by big office buildings and setting was compromised. Integrity of design, that's, does the thing still look like it did back in the day, the form, the plan, the space, structure, style? Materials, these are the physical materials of the property, including siding and windows. The workmanship, workmanship is evident in how the materials were put together, perhaps in wood carvings or in the case of exterior siding that somebody had to nail up the shingles. Then you have feeling, does the property feel like it did back in the day? Does it give you that aesthetic or historic sense of a period of time? And then association is the direct link between the property and any people or events with which the property was associated when something happened. These are all taken of course from the National Register criteria for evaluation. And I wanted to call your attention to these seven aspects of integrity, because I need to address each one when we talk about replacing siding on a building. And I color coded it because I'm all about colors today. So if you replace the siding on a house, or if you give a, what was it, if you give a-

- A mouse cookie.

- [Jason] Mouse a cookie, thank you. It's not a penguin cookie, no. If you give a mouse of cookie. Location, there's no impact on the integrity of location in replacing the siding. As far as the setting is concerned, the setting is not impacted for that one particular house, but for every house around it, the setting is impacted. So here I'm talking about a district wide issue where vinyl siding impacts the setting of the neighboring houses. Design, similarly, some impact particularly where we're talking about replacing shingle siding with clapboard style siding. Of more dire consequence, we have materials. The integrity of materials would be severely compromised by the replacement of the siding on the house. Generally, the wholesale replacement of historic siding with new vinyl siding is sufficient to delist an individually listed house, or to convert a contributing property to non-contributing within a district. That doesn't happen automatically, but at some future point, if the homeowner wants to apply for tax credits, they may find that they are then being delisted or demoted from contributing to non-contributing. Workmanship, again, kind of a cautionary area here. The new siding effectively erases any historic exterior workmanship. Integrity of feeling, new vinyl siding is not compatible with the feeling of a 1919 house or a district notable for early 19th century through early 20th century houses. Finally, association, there is no impact to the integrity of association from new vinyl siding. So the recommendation is to deny the COA application. As proposed, the work is incompatible with the secretary of the interior standards for rehabilitation, that's echoed in the Wisconsin Historical Society's guidance for selecting appropriate materials. And yeah, the wholesale replacement of siding is typically a very bad thing for a National Register property or a National Register District. So that's what I've got, thank you.

- Thank you, Jason. Do we have a motion to open for discussion?

- So moved.

- I'll second that motion. All in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Anyone against it? Okay, the ayes have it. Yeah, Jason from where I'm sitting right now, I'm actually looking at that house across the street and I will say anyway, I understand that they need to do something with it because there's hardly any paint left on it. And what is left on it is peeling off of it. If you were there today, you would've seen that as well. Obviously, 'cause I walked over there today myself and obviously they do need to do something, but the idea of vinyl, I guess I would ask, is the homeowner present to discuss this or anyone from the property present? Do we?

- I don't see anyone.

- Okay. Well, I just wanted to add that little bit, like I said, obviously they're gonna need to go somewhere, but that particular siding, I mean, like you said too, as far as the feeling in the neighborhood and all that, I would have to add that, from where I sit, I don't think that would look quite right. So, I guess I would put forth a motion to deny the application. Do we need to close the floor? Oh, do we ask? I'm sorry, motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor to close the floor?

- [Group] Aye.

- And then I would go forward and make the actual motion to deny the application based on, what's put forth so far. There's ways to fix those tiles and ways to make that house whole. So I would put forth that motion.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor?

- [Group] Aye.

- Anyone against that motion? Okay then, the motion or the denial carries forward. So we're denying that application. Back to item F informational. We are on number two, staff level COA applications.

- [Jason] So we had a handful of them. First up, I've got 637 South Monroe, a partial driveway replacement. The portions to be replaced will be same dimensions, same material. Being colorblind, I'm sure it'll be an exact match as well. So, regardless we've approved that. Next up. This is replacement fencing on the north side of 1008 South Webster, 77 feet of fence. It's going to be replaced with basically the same stuff treated pine. I can't see it from any public right away, so I think it's where I've drawn the arrow. So that's a good thing, right? And replacing it with nice pine boards, that'll be a good thing too. Next up, a COA to replace a flat roof at 631 South Quincy. So at the top right you see a picture of 631 South Quincy and you say to yourself, where's the flat roof. Well, it's behind there. It's got a little flat roof section on the back, not visible from public right away that we've approved to replace with a new flat roof. I also, after putting together this PowerPoint presentation approved a COA for storm windows at 722-

- 702.

- 702 South Monroe. It's a big Italianate new storm windows with the restriction that they be flush mount type and painted, not anodized finish. I believe they were going to do, it's got the little soft elliptical tops to the window openings. I think they're gonna do a wood portion up there. And then the rest maybe is a metal frame,

but we'll see if there's any objections to the painted finish on the whole works. So, that's all I've got for staff level COAs this month. Thank you.

- Thank you, Jason. Item number three, review city raised repair orders and demolitions.

- There were none this month.

- Okay. Item number four, staff update.

- No real staff update other than fielding many, many, many calls about our public meeting. We will have the story maps that are intern created uploaded tomorrow onto our website. So those will be good. I'll be putting out a blast on Facebook and then emailing any interested parties. So that way they know those are available. So people are able to do walking tours the summer with those. I think they'll be very beneficial to the neighborhood associations in these areas. So if they wanted to promote any walking tours as well, they'd be able to do them on their own without needing any staff assistance. So really looking forward to that. Last month we had, at the end of the meeting, discussed wanting to have a discussion about options for how we're gonna host these meetings. So right now we're doing virtual only. Some other city meetings are doing a hybrid model where people from the commission and the public are able to either log in remotely, wherever they're at or come into council chambers at city hall. That's where Jason and I run these meetings from. So that is an option. With that, each individual would have to come with their own screen. So you'd have to bring in your own laptop. I've had whatever you're using, 'cause you'd still have to have the ability to log in to be viewed just as you would at your home. Our redevelopment authority just went back to in-person only, and I am personally opposed to that model. I think that it is beneficial to the community to have a hybrid option available, if it's not going to be all virtual. So that way people are still able to just log in wherever they're at and then give people the option to come into the building if they're more interested in doing that. So I really leave it up to you. If you want to stay virtual only or do a hybrid model, I would just ask that we determine that at this meeting, so that way I can figure out the nuts and bolts of that before June.

- Hybrid sounds good to me.

- I concur.

- I concur with that, the hybrid.

- Okay, it would give everyone the same option. You could still do it from your home or your office if you would like, but if you'd like to come in, we would have that option too. I'll just make sure that this room is secured, so that way we have it and no overlapping meetings, we shouldn't 'cause we move this meeting to Wednesday. So we wouldn't have overlapping meetings. And then if anyone doesn't have access to a laptop that they're able to bring in, we do have our old, well not old, the pads that we use for civic clerk when we first got that system. So if anyone needs that, we can certainly set those up, but it's just easier if people bring their own to this point, because I am not a tech savvy person. If those crash, they'll just be crashed. So I'll work that out with our IT department and send out an email about that and then going forward, we'll do a hybrid model and I'll have that on our agenda that it will either be within chambers or availability to log in via Zoom, good.

- Sounds good, do we-

- Oh pardon me, will we get new parking permits?

- Yes, I don't know if Lisa had already sent out an email to everyone? I said we were only meeting virtually, but if she'd already sent that out, you can update those and get your... Oh, perfect.

- Yeah, I didn't get anything.

- Okay, I'll follow up with her. But if you need a new parking pass for city hall, we'll get you set up with one.
- I got one.
- Okay.
- Okay, do we need to vote on this virtual on this motion?
- No.
- No? Okay.
- I just needed some direction before I made any-
- I'm sorry.
- Oh, sorry, I was just saying, I need a direction before I can make a decision on that.
- Oh, I see, okay. Item number five, date of the next meeting is Wednesday, June 15. I would like to just tell everybody about one quick thing. Through Green Bay neighborhoods, the Astor Neighborhood Association, we are gonna be doing a band in the park on the third Tuesday of June, July and August. June is already secure, June 21st and big mouth will be playing in the park. The friends of mine, I know him so we talked him into it.
- There we go.
- Come there. There's gonna probably most likely be food trucks present. We're not sharing this widely because we don't wanna keep the crowd reasonable because with the city, if you get too big a crowd, then you need police, you need other things as well. So, we're trying to keep this manageable within the neighborhood. I do believe July is the chocolate tears and then August is gonna be a jazz band, Chris Salerno. So again, they're all kind of set. What we're waiting for is to find out if we get the funding that we applied for. We are gonna sponsor the first band though out of our own pockets with the association. So just wanted to share that with everybody. So kind of keep your eyes and ears open or look at the Astor website and you'll see more about it, this neighborhood association. So with that, do we have a motion to adjourn?
- Motion to adjourn.
- Okay, and do we have a second?
- [Group] Second.
- Okay, all in favor?
- [Group] Aye.
- Anybody opposed? All right, goodnight, everybody.