



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2022, 4:30 PM

In person at City Hall Room 203 - Council Chambers.

Virtual attendance also available 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: David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Paul Martzke, Rebecca Derenne, Brian Johnson, Susan Ley, Excused: Ian Griffiths

Susan Ley joined at 4:31 pm during Item E1.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the June 15, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the May 18, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Paul Martzke to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 22-17) Consideration with possible action on a design review for chimney work at 628 Lawe Street.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

Susan Ley arrived at 4:31 PM.

2. (COA 22-19) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new porch located at 711 Porlier Street.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to approve as requested with the condition that the treated wood is painted. Motion Passed.

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

3. (COA 22-22) Consideration with possible action on a design review for new window signs located at 228 N Adams Street.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

4. (COA 22-25) Consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement driveway and porch located at 722 S Monroe Avenue.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ron Dehn to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

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

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to approve as requested and refer to staff to make the decision if the column is repairable. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

3. Staff Update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, July 20, 2022.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Meeting to order. And note that this meeting contains Zoom information, instructions, comment form. Roll call. It looks like everyone is present except for Ian, correct? No? Yeah.

- And Susan.

- And Susan. And Susan, at this moment. Okay. Item number C, approval of the agenda. Do we have a motion to approve tonight's agenda?

- I'll do that.

- So moved.

- Do we have a second?

- Second.

- Okay. All in favor.

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, and without objection, it carries. Item D, approval of the minutes from the May 18th meeting. Do we have a motion to approve those, or do we need comment or motion to change?

- So moved.

- [Paul] I'll second that.

- Okay. All in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Is there any nays? Okay. The ayes have that as well. Let's move on to item number E, regular business. Number one, Certificate of Appropriateness 22-17. Consideration with possible action on a design review for chimney work at 628 Lawe Street.

- [Jason] So if I may?

- Jason.

- [Jason] 628 Lawe Street, it's a corner property in the Astor district. It is technically a contributing building in the district, but I don't know that it should have been. That's a longer story for a different time. Anyway, the chimney has been replaced. On the left you see a pink brick chimney. On the right you see a red brick chimney that has taken its place. So we need a COA for this work that has been done. The recommendation is to approve the COA. Keeping it brief here.

- And would anyone like to make that motion?

- [Brian] Move to approve.

- To approve, yes, correct. Do we have a motion to approve that recommendation?

- Yes. Sorry, that was a motion, Ron.

- Okay.

- I'll second that.

- Okay. All in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Does anybody object? Okay. The motion carries. Item number two--

- [Stephanie] Excuse me, just to note, Susan is at the meeting now, just for our minutes.

- Oh, okay. Okay. So we have everyone, but Ian?

- [Stephanie] Yes.

- Okay. Item number two, Certificate of Appropriateness. Consideration with possible action on a porch located at 711 Porlier Street.

- [Jason] So there's a porch, as you may have guessed. It's going to be reconstructed. And here, just to quickly review some photographs, at the top left you see a large porch on the left side of the house. It had, at this point, in 2019, received new wooden steps and railings. You see that at the bottom left again. Returning to that top left photograph, in the right hand portion of that, there's a small porch, which we have an enlarged view in the bottom right of the slide. This is now being replaced. And so you see turn spindles with railings top and bottom, and a little sketch of what they're proposing to build here at the top right. But what I'm recommending is a conditional approval. No problem replacing it. It's all relatively modern. The issues here is that in the past we've pointed out that pressure treated and unpainted wood is an inappropriate look. So I'm recommending that you call for it to be painted. And also in the past, we've pointed out and discussed that the balusters, the spindles, if you will, should not be face mounted into the railings, but rather should be mounted into the bottom side of the upper rail and the top side of the bottom rail. So recommending approval with the condition that it's painted and assembled in a more historically sympathetic way. Thank you.

- Yeah. I would point out that Alder Galvin, before the meeting, this is in his area, and he said both, he supports that motion, and he said that the resident did as well. So I just kind of wanted to pass that along. So I would make a motion to approve

- [David] I'll second that.

- Ron you're muted.

- Thank you for that, Brian. Sorry about that. So we had a second, we had a motion and a second. All in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay. Motion carries. Item number three, Certificate of Appropriateness 22-22. Consideration with possible action on a design review for new windows signs located at 228 North Adams Street.

- [Jason] So contributing building in the downtown district. The short version of the story is that they want to do basically peel and stick letters. And I'm good with that. So recommending approval

- Move to approve.

- [Rebecca] Second

- I guess all in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Is anyone opposed? Motion carries. Item number four, Certificate of Appropriateness 22-25. Consideration with possible action on a design review for replacement driveway and porch located at 722 South Monroe

- [Jason] 722 South Monroe has been on the agenda for the last two months, I think anyway. This time we're discussing a driveway at the rear of the property. So that's the north west side. Yes?

- West side, yes.

- [Jason] West side, along Spring Street. So driveway. And then second subject is porch components. And that one, maybe we, maybe I have a small issue with. So recommendation is to approve repaving the driveway and widening it to suit. I don't have any issue with that. On the porch components, I think the request is to replace with identical or nearly identical. Here we're talking about the columns, the balusters, the rails. I don't think it's really been demonstrated that the material here is beyond repair, and given the Secretary of the Interior Standards requirements/guidance that you repair rather than replace, I would recommend that it either be repaired or demonstrated to be irreparable before we approve replacements. So thank you.

- I see the, it looks like the applicant's here So I would move to open the floor.

- I'll second that motion. All in favor?
- [Commission Members] Aye.
- Okay. Motion carries, open. Brian, go ahead. Sorry.
- Robin, this is your item, right? You're muted Robin.
- There we go. Yes, it is my item.
- Yeah, I just wanted to give you an opportunity to speak to it.
- Yeah, and I guess we're okay with trying to repair the parts. Originally 20 years ago, we had the spindles hand-turned, and some of those spindles are deteriorated and need to be replaced. But we're certainly willing to try to repair the wood, as recommended. I guess we didn't realize that that was a possibility.
- Okay. Jason, if I could just ask, what would be, from your perspective, if we said that we wanted to see an applicant try to replace it, what kind of, I guess, proof or evidence would you need that attempt has been made?
- So, backing up a bit, it's news to me that maybe the spindles are only 20 years old, in which case I'm not concerned. The assumption here was that they were 120 years old.
- No, they, I'm sorry.
- No, that's great. I mean, between--
- Yeah, they were the square up and down ones. We tried to replace with some original ones that we found. There weren't many, and we had them hand-turned to match.
- So replacing replacement material is fine by me, as long as they still continue to match. In the case of the columns, I haven't invited myself onto the property to pick away at the columns, and I'm not going to either. The usual thing to show that they're irreparable, I guess, is, hmm... Based on the photographs that I've seen, it would appear that they could be scraped and patched up with some WoodEpoxy type material. It's a two part thing that you mash together and stick it in there and sand it down. It's kinda like Bondo.
- Okay.
- That would be probably a more economical and preferred method here. If the thing is rotted out from the inside, and it's just a matter of time that a good stiff wind takes it down, then, yeah, we'd hope to see some proposed replacements that very closely match the dimensions of the existing columns.
- Okay.
- We've had items like this before where we wanted the attempt to repair versus replace. And what

we had done is just, I think that the conditions were, that staff could make that assessment with the property owners. I think for one we had a contractor do the assessment, but only 'cause it was a rough. But other than that, typically, either you guys can just approve as you would like to, or you can add a condition that kind of gives staff, like another step, like if we deem that it's not repairable that then they can do the replacement based on your recommendation. So that's an option as well.

- Okay. Motion to close the floor.

- So moved.

- I'll second that.

- All in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Anyone opposed to that? Okay. The floor is now closed.

- Motion to approve the recommendation and refer to staff to make the decision about whether or not the column is repairable

- [Paul] I'll second that.

- I think that sounds good. All in favor?

- [Commission Members] Aye.

- Anyone opposed to that motion? Okay. The motion carries. With those recommendations, I should say. The motion carries with those recommendations.

- All right.

- All right. Item number from F, Information. Staff level COA applications.

- [Jason] We may have mentioned this one last month, I'm not sure, it was right on the cusp. 631 South Quincy, contributing in Astor. It's a new roof. If you look at the little image on the right, you see there's a flat roof section in the rear of the house. That is what we've approved, a replacement on the flat roof at the back. Moving on, 628 Lawe, you may recall from an earlier discussion today, it's got a red chimney now instead of a pink one. Well, anyway, they want a new roof too. I don't know if they've already got that on or not, but we approved a new asphalt shingle roof for this one. This was also a roof and gutter work. So it's basically a, same roof, asphalt shingle, same gutters, again, as what's on there. Here roof, again. There's some leaking areas in flat spots and in the valleys. The replacement is identical shingle material, and a membrane where it's flat. The porch railing on top of the porch. So the second story porch stuff. Owner proposes replacing it with identical material, which really, I guess, falls into an area of ordinary maintenance, since it's all replacement material in the first place. I didn't really have a good reason to deny such a thing. So we don't have historic photos showing us what the original would've looked like. So, it's same for same at this point. So we approved that.

- I love that house.

- Yes.

- Yeah.

- It's beautiful.

- Yeah.

- [Jason] We have two raze/repairs. If I can move on?

- Sure, absolutely. Yeah.

- [Jason] First one, 509 North Ashland. Not in any district. Probably a cute Victorian cottage back in the day, but less cute today. Next one, 1695 Badger Street. I don't recall what's wrong with either property but they have a raze/repair ordinance. I guess, based on my experience, a lot of these don't come down to the razing part. So anyway, I had no reason to get too upset about this one.

- I don't know. That's funny. Item number three, staff update

- Not much of an update. We are still waiting for our phases two, three, and four from Legacy Architecture for that final report. Once we have that, it'll be sure to email that out to you. It'll be on our website. We are still in the process of getting our walking tour maps, the story maps, on our website. We've found some challenges with that, but they'll be up as soon as possible. And to note, our revolving loan fund that Jason and I administer, typically we only see like two applications a year. We are on application number seven. So we are actually at the point where we can't administer anymore, or else we're not gonna have the revolving part of the loan fund happening. So we have four executed, one on my desk, and then two more applications that are coming in right now. So it's been a very popular program this year, which is awesome to see. A lot of them have been using the tax credit program as well, which is what we want people to be using. So really good progress with that program this year.

- Great.

- [Paul] Stephanie, does that mean that the fund is then capped for the remainder of this fiscal year? Does it start over in '23 or?

- Well, we only had one starting pot of money of \$100,000. So the idea was if we do two a year, it will self replenish without anyone having to pay theirs off early. Quite frankly, neither of us have any clue how much is left in that fund, but there is enough to do more if we get a project that we see a need for, that needs to fill that gap, to get the tax credits or something. So there's some flexibility with it, but to retain that flexibility, we're gonna have to say this is closed for the rest of the calendar year. We do it with a lot of our other funding programs in my department, especially if they're revolving, to make sure that there's still a pot of money in case something comes up that you're definitely, we need to help fund this. So we'll see.

- Stephanie, I, right, when we have these, something that I've learned through this process is that we obviously have these requirements for homeowners. Some that may have the means to make repairs based on the ordinance, others not. So I really think it's important that we have that revolving loan fund sufficiently funded to be able to do these loans. Has staff considered anything like borrowing from the Wisconsin Trust Fund, ARPA, anything like that to try to replenish that balance?

- Well, up until about two months ago I didn't think that we needed much more money, but people are really liking it. So I think that we're gonna use this as evidence that we need to either budget for this as part of our regular budget. We could possibly dip into some CDBG funding, because a lot of our historic districts are in eligible areas. Or we could put it in an ARPA request to say, just give us another base chunk of money that we can revolve. 'Cause we originally got this from the excess Stadium Tax dollars. So it was kind of a similar thing, like extra money that we hopped on. So I think that's a great idea, Alder, to maybe do an ARPA request for some more money.

- Yeah. And I think you might run into a little bit of challenge with ARPA, because it's gotta be spent. And I know there's been some concerns that if it's a revolving thing, it may not meet requirements. But rather than getting into the details of that right now, what I would suggest to you is that I'm willing to be an advocate for something somewhere. If you need me, let me know.

- Okay.

- Because again, I'm just, I'm uneasy about folks that maybe don't have the means to make these repairs the way that we are. To make them. And so I tend to be a proponent for wanting to find solutions.

- Definitely. That's why the fund was set up. So we agree

- [Paul] And Alder Johnson brings up an interesting point, in that some people are probably more capable of doing some of these things than others, from a financial standpoint. With the revolving loan fund, is there any stipulation when you apply for that? Is it income based? Is it based on the size of the project? Or is it just if you apply, you're going to get the loan?

- It has to be something that is COA eligible, or something that can pass the sniff test with a COA. And it has to be, there's preference given to anything that also applies for tax credits. But we don't have any income eligibility tied to it at this point. And it is not based on the size of the property. So those are things we can start to consider, if we wanted to change or amend some of those program requirements. At this point, we wanted to make sure that it was open to everyone, because rich people can also have big houses that are a pain in the butt. So we'd have to be a little bit more diligent with that if we wanted to go that route.

- Yeah. If I could add too. When we started that I did a little bit of research to see what comparable revolving loan fund programs were around the country. Green Bay's, there aren't a whole lot of them, but Green Bay's is certainly the smallest capitalization that I came across. Most identical programs have at least a quarter million dollars capitalization, or more. And we thought we'd give it a shot, right? Just see what happens. And this is where we're at.

- Wow.

- Okay. Let me know how I can help.
- Okay. Yeah. We'll definitely look at the expansion of this and see how we want to move going forward.
- Anyone else on that subject? No? The date of the next meeting is Wednesday, July 20th, 2022. Anything anybody would like to add before we adjourn?
- You run an efficient meeting, Ron.
- Well, like I said, there wasn't much objectionable in the.
- Yeah. No fist fights.
- And thank you for your research there, Jason, because that really helps us along when you put forth those points like that, in a way that makes sense.
- Definitely.
- It really does.
- Yeah. I agree. When I read all of that beforehand, it's really helpful to read Jason's notes.
- I agree.
- Yes, definitely.
- [David] Ron, unfortunately it is not a record.
- Yeah. Like I said, I wasn't shooting for one.
- [David] Well, I think you were for a little bit.
- Well, to be fair, I think that the staff stuff took longer than the action stuff, so that might be our fault.
- Well, you guys have been busy.
- [Paul] The filibuster is still alive and well, and I will use it if I have to.
- That's right. Thanks, Paul.
- Next time.
- Thanks for that reminder. Okay. Do we have a motion to adjourn?
- Move to adjourn.

- Motion to adjourn.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor?
- [Commission Members] Aye.
- Bye.