



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 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: Susan Ley, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Rebecca Derenne

Absent: Ald. Brian Johnson, Ron Dehn

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the September 21, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Susan Ley to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the August 17, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Rebecca Derenne, seconded by David Siegel to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 22-33) Consideration with possible action on a design review for window, awning, and stucco work at 131 S. Washington Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Rebecca Derenne to approve as requested. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

2. (COA 22-35) Consideration with possible action on a design review for partial window replacement, door replacement, and concrete work at 410 Porlier Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to open the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Susan Ley to close the floor. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve as requested and ask that the applicant submit a 2nd COA for the remainder of the project work. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, 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, October 19, 2022.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to adjourn. Motion Passed.
Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Yeah.

- This is the Wednesday, September 21st, 2022 meeting of the Landmarks Commission. We will start with the roll call. Ron is absent. Alder Johnson is absent. Ian Griffiths, present.

- Here. Susan Ley, present.

- Here. David is present, and Rebecca is present.
- Here.
- Stephanie, do you know if Alder Johnson is gonna join us?
- I thought everybody would be here, so I'm going to absent till proven otherwise.
- Maybe he's just a little bit late. Moving on to item C on the agenda is the approval of tonight's agenda. Does anybody have any changes or corrections for the agenda?
- No.
- Hearing none, I would ask for a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve is presented.
- Second. All in favor,
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Any nays? Motion carries. Next item is item D, approval of the minutes from the August 17th, 2022 meeting in the Landmarks Commission. Does anybody have any questions, comments, or corrections regarding those minutes? Hearing none, looking for a motion to approve.
- Motion to approve.
- Second. All in favor,
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Any opposed? Carries. And we're on to item E, regular business. First item is item E1, certificate appropriateness 22-33. Consideration with possible action on a design review for window awning and stackle work at 131 South Washington Street. Jason, you wanna give us a briefing on this one?
- [Jason] 131 South Washington Street is more commonly known as Al's Hamburger. It shown in these two historic photos, one probably from the 60s at the top, and the sliver of it down below, in the late 30s. The one at the top, just pointing out, it's a little white stucco building. You see a door, you see a window, you see a window with an awning, a fabric awning, and then some sort of trim color or chrome like piece around the top where the coping would be. Down in the bottom photo, you see some tile coping along the front in a two-tone paint scheme, perhaps. Anyway, that's neither here nor there. Next page, we're looking to replace the window, which itself is a replacement already, but perhaps about the same size as what had been there. Replacing the window with a sliding two part window, adding a new awning which has been added, and then potentially refacing the entire building with stucco. And on that point, I want to point out that the national

registered nomination paperwork specifies the finish texture in that stucco as a fine, worm finish. So I put some random verbiage to that effect here on the right. It's a thing, the worm finish as opposed to some other type of finish. And of the worm finishes, this one's a fine, not a medium or course pattern. So moving ahead, next slide, recommendation is to approve the stucco work provided that they repeat the fine worm finish, approve the awning, noting that it's already been installed, and approve the new window that has yet to be installed. Thank you.

- Any discussion?

- Are you here for this item?

- [Faint Voice] No.

- Okay. Sorry, we have someone in the public here.

- I guess with the installation of an awning, does that require a building permit?

- I don't know, I'd have to ask.

- I'm just wondering why it wasn't flagged or how...

- I'm guessing not. Usually things that aren't structural don't require the permit, but either way with the approval of the COA, it would go the other direction. We could always the inspection officials. So if they did need one, it would come about then. From what I understand, the work was started and then I found out about it.

- I mean, generally if something's in the ride-away, which it would be over the sidewalk, it would require approval. I'm just curious as to how it didn't get flagged.

- Yeah, I'm not sure that that has a hold harmless agreement from DPW. I don't know if that's been executed at this point, so I will follow up with them tomorrow.

- Yeah, just makes our job a little harder, if there is something that we don't approve of that gets done then been done, we're back to historic preservation commission with no teeth. Just an observation.

- I'd like you to cherish that observation as we press into the next COA, and again, next month too.

- It's been a rough few weeks here at the office.

- Question I guess, Jason, it wasn't clear to me, photos that you had... I guess the question is simply, this building has looked like this for a long, long time, is there any photos or any knowledge of what the property looked like originally? Or I guess to ask the question differently, is this building no longer historically accurate, because of the renovations through the years?

- Sure, I should have covered that earlier. Sorry. To back up, the building is considered to be a contributing property in the downtown historic district. As to how exactly I got Shipo to agree with that, I can't say. Notably, the building suffered a pretty intense fire within the last 15 or so years. And so much of what we see today is effectively a reconstruction of the building that it used to be. And the interior of course is thoroughly gutted and redone.

- Yeah.

- So I recognize and acknowledge that the building is largely reconstructed by the letter of the law and National Register consideration. It's a contributing property, so we need to evaluate any proposed changes as though those changes might have an impact, not just to the district, but to the building itself. The reality of course, is that the building itself I'm surprised was contributing, but I did what I could so they could get tax credits if they wanted them. That's the key towards that. So, yes. The oldest picture that I was able to find, if I troubled Stephanie to open up that PowerPoint again, it's the picture where we see the building in the 1930s. The building is originally built in the 20s. I'm gonna bet anyway, that that picture at the bottom right, more or less accurately reflects the as-built condition of the building. And here we see what was probably stucco with a two-tone paint job, and tile coping visible at the top front facade. If you look then at the 1960s photo, above that, you see basically what we see today, recognizing that the door is no longer in the doorway. They've recessed the door now. I think they've kept the same sign that hangs over the roof line. And I think that's been reinstalled or reproduction of it anyway. There's not a whole lot of character defining features to the building, except that it lacks a lot of character defining features and is therefore a character defining feature. So you've got a doorway, a window opening and a sign, I suppose.

- They really sell... I shut the picture off.

- Oh, sorry.

- Did they really sell Pontiacs and Mercedes next door?

- Yeah.

- Next door-

- I saw that too. Yeah.

- Next door is still there. It is non-contributing because the windows have been largely bricked up. So that building's in the district, it's non-contributing. It is originally an urban automobile showroom and retail center, multistory. It's not the only one in the district. Is it Vandrive? Is that the name? There's another one.

- Yes.

- It's the initiative one building, the taller one next to initiative one is a car dealership as well.

- Well, the reason I asked the question or I went back to those photos is that it looks to me that, the facade doesn't look like the neighboring historic buildings, but it's clearly been like this for a lot longer than I've been alive. I think that it probably culturally carries significance the way it looks now. I guess my point is, is I don't see any issue with what's been brought forth to us with the proposed changes or renovations. And so I guess I would make a motion to approve.

- I would second.

- Any other discussion regarding the motion? Okay. Hearing none, I call for a vote. All in favor,

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Item E2, certificate of appropriateness 22-35. Consideration with possible action on a design review for partial window replacement, door replacement and concrete work at 410 Porlier Street.

- If I may, 410 Porlier Street is a non-contributing house in the Astor National Register District. Here again, interesting backstory. The house was built around 1948, and it's unclear as to why it was designated as non-contributing per the National Register nomination paperwork of 1979 and 1980. The writers seemed to think that the building had just been built, but as I kind of alluded to earlier by the letter of the law, so to speak, this is a non-contributing house. The COA application calls for the replacement of a number of windows. Most of the concrete work, the driveway, the front porch, and adding some concrete in the back where a gravel area was. And there's mention of a door replacement, but there is no information provided on the replacement door. So here on the left, you see a building outline, and areas in blue is where concrete has... well, the driveway and the little walkway in the front, the upper part there has been removed and replaced. Then the blue rectangle on the bottom side, the south side is a new concrete pad where gravel had been. The little sketch on the right, pardon my crudeness, and the black outline. I've loosely outlined the footprint of the house. And then in kind of a gold color, you'll see the areas in the sunroom and elsewhere where the windows have been replaced. Those windows, the original windows have been replaced with modern windows that match the size and the general appearance. The notable change there is that instead of having like a three dimensional grid or mountain work, the owner has opted just for the simulated mountains that's pressed between the two pans of glass. And again, I don't have any information on the replacement door, but skipping ahead to the recommendation, recognizing that this is a non-contributing house, and recognizing that the proposed changes won't really have a negative impact on the district, my recommendation is that we approve the replacement windows and the concrete work done. I can't really speak to the replacement door. Going beyond that too, I know that the front porch has been altered. The columns have been removed. I don't have any application for replacement columns, or indication of what those replacement columns might look like. Stay tuned for that I think. Thank you.

- I'll make a motion to open the floor. All in favor,

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay, the floor is open. Pat, looks like you're on the line. Can you give us some more information as to what the intentions are?

- [Pat] Hello? Are you there?

- Yeah.

- [Pat] Okay. Yeah, I'm not quite comfortable doing Zoom meetings, so I'll do the best I can. What question was it again?

- Well, I think we're confused as to what your intentions are with the front porch. And are you putting the iron work back or...

- [Pat] No, I actually dropped off and provided the original blueprints for the house. They show three rounded pillars on the front porch. The rod iron ones were put in place of them by the homeowner But I think because it's on the original plan, there's a definite level of appropriateness there. There's numerous things. I actually just had this house open for the Astor Park tour this last weekend. But if anybody wants to come by and see what we're doing there, but we are gonna make this house period correct as much as we financially can. Jason, I will be putting out the front pillars, and I will supply him samples, but the rod iron ones that were there were rusted off at the bottom. I won't be putting those back on. The railings on the back porches, which I know you don't, what you call... those can be sandblast and cleaned up and powder coated and redone, but the one on the front porches were just too far gone. So I'm gonna replace them with what's actually on the plan, and I will

submit that before I do that.

- Anybody have other questions for the applicant?

- I guess I have the same question that I had on the first one. How did we get here?

- [Pat] How do you get where?

- To having work done that wasn't approved by the commission before the work was done?

- [Pat] Because I'm a general contractor and this is what I do for a living and it fit into my schedule. I knew I would be appropriate with a building inspector. I didn't think this house was appropriate, because it's built in 1948. And it is a non-contributing, so I did not believe that I had to get a permit from you at that time.

- That may as be, but I don't buy it.

- Yeah.

- [Pat] Fair enough. Fair enough.

- Have a question actually for Jason. You talked about how it's non-contributing, but correct me if I'm wrong. It sounds as if that was based on an error. And if so, would this be a contributing house then if that error hadn't occurred?

- So I can speak to that as my opinion. My opinion is that it was an error. My opinion is that the national registered nomination could have been revised to change this from non-contributing to contributing, but we'll never really know that. That's my opinion.

- How would this error be addressed then?

- So there's a method to revise National Register nomination packages. It's not entirely common. I mean, it's common enough when you have to do it, but there are other properties in Astor, for example, that could benefit from being changed from non-contributing to contributing, that change being required because of an error with a nomination. The one I'm thinking of in particular is the Lustron House. I forget which road it is on.

- Porlier.

- It's on Porlier as well. The nomination prepares back in 1979 said that it was basically an abomination built in the 1940s and re-clad or something. Not recognizing that it was a Lustron home. They didn't know what it was. That particular house and the homeowner in particular, would benefit from having the nomination revised to reflect that, "Hey, the nomination was an error. This should have been contributing. We've identified it since as a highly intact Lustron home, that's historically noteworthy in its own right, perhaps eligible for individual listing even." So there is a process to do that. In the case of Mr. Jury's house, it's a little less clear cut because when the National Registered Nomination package was put together in 1979, the requirements for those nominations weren't as rigorous as what they've since become. So something missing from that nomination, which is now required, is a statement as to the period of significance for the property or the district. So the Astor neighborhood in general, they did not identify the period of significance, but probably would have been something like 1830 to 1950, judging solely based on other houses in the district that were identified as contributing. The authors thought that this particular house, Mr. Jury's house, was built the day before they wrote the nomination, when in fact it was built in 1948. So there, yes, you potentially have error on the part of the people that wrote the nomination. They thought it was newer than it is, but was the

period of significance that I'm speculating appropriate? 19 or 1830 through 1950,. Maybe, maybe not. I think they included contributing houses up to about 1950. So here it's on the cusp.

- [Pat] Well, if I may interject a little bit, one of the things I am doing with this house is I am restoring this house. It might be uncomfortable, a couple of window replacements, but most of the windows that are original to the house are being reworked and kept. The front windows and the studio and the top floor, actually open all the way out like awnings. Those are just absolutely beautiful. The hardware and everything, we're keeping those. I am doing the house in period, correct, 1948. It will be my showcase of homes in fall of 2023. We're putting old fashioned linoleum in it with the cold baseboard underneath it. All the trim work's original. All the trim work went back on the inside of the window just like it was. I asked anybody adjacent, if you wanted to set up a tour to come see what we're doing. But this will, and maybe I would look at contributing once I'm sort of done with it, because I am doing it completely retro. So that's something that I'm not saying I wouldn't be interested in, but at this time we are where we are and trying to get some work done, and trying to fix this house up. But actually is all now in pretty good shape. It was built right when it was built. In regards to the non-contributing if that's something that you're inquiring about, I'm not necessarily opposed to that.

- So Pat, what was the condition of the windows to the sunroom and why did you replace those and get rid of the original ones?

- [Pat] The same thing I'm gonna be doing with the bold window in the back. The bottom edge completely rotted out. Not only just the bottom of the sashes, but the bottom of the frames, like so filled. If anyone remembers what that house was like, you couldn't even see it. There was so many trees and pine trees. There was eight-inch round Cedar trees growing up next to the foundation. It was in terrible shape. So there was a lot of things like that. The window that I am waiting get product, is a bold window I ordered for pillar off the back. That will be all wooden construction. It'll be identical shape. But once again, on the plan, there was not a bold window. It's a flat window. So the homeowner made decisions when they were building the house on certain things. Period correctness, I know when something gets installed because I do a lot of historical around time. I know when something gets installed a certain date that everyone wants to hang on exactly that thing, but that certain particular time and date there might have been options that they chose. Just like people doing the selection process of building a home now, that is period correct, such as black windows. So every period has its time. This house in 1948 was drawn with three round pillars, not a rod iron, but the homeowner made that decision because that was made available to him for the period. And I think that's something going forward, I'd like to keep in mind because that's what I do every time I do a historic structure. I don't always go exactly the thing it has to be, but it has to be in the right time, the right material, and have the look that we're looking for. In regards to my window, one of the windows, I spent \$10,000 on windows. If I did true divided light windows, it would've cost me another \$9,800 to do that. So though is financial, why some of the people can't afford to do the windows that you folks would really like us to do. And I know that's frustrating because you wanna make it historically correct. So those are things and subjects maybe talking further down the road, but we are gonna try and do this building correct, and I will be showing it to the public, just so you know what we're doing. And I'll be living there. This is by residence. This isn't something I'm flipping or doing like this. Well, this is where I will be living. You sort of know the story now.

- I mean, it's not, Pat, that we want these windows. We are mandated to follow the guidelines of the National Department of the Interior. That's part of our role here. Your comment comes across like we wanna maintain everything. We're required as part of our obligation to sit on the commission, we have to meet the requirements of the department of the interior. I understand your question about what was selected, what wasn't. At the time, what was actually constructed? What's there currently? What is the period of significance? This one, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on which side of the fence you're sitting here, is challenging because of paperwork that was done back in '78 that maybe wasn't accurate. But like you indicated, you've done a number of projects as the neighborhood. I believe you should be aware of the requirements and obligations of this commission to bring these properties forward prior to the work being done.

- [Pat] In most cases, yes, I understand that. And this one, particularly because I thought it was a non-contributing the age of it. I didn't think it was under your jurisdiction. I just thought it was regular building inspection. And that's one thing that would help us too. Jason, we had that meeting with the building inspector. I think one department talked and the other department and things like that will help facilitate this a little bit sometimes too.

- I mean, I thought that these were gonna get red-flagged when they came through for a building permit.

- They did. I was the one who started this process. I saw the working done on online.

- [Pat] Yeah, Steph.. Steph step did start the process, that is true. We had a meeting with Jason there also.

- But it wasn't initiated at the time the building permit was pulled?

- The permit was pulled after.

- [Pat] No, I ordered the windows and I got... Then like a contractor, I had to hold my schedule and ran over there and popped the windows in because I had the time available to me, and I did not have the building permit before I started figuring I'd catch up because I know everybody down there. I was remiss in my duties on filling a billability permit in time. I will admit to that. So I went down and took care of that with Paul, and had a meeting, and we discussed what we're doing here. He double permitted me for that, and they were going forward. That's where I'm at. I'm still waiting. Actually, I'm still waiting on DPW, Department of Public Works, regarding my apron, and the tree and my ride-away that's planted in my driveway ride-away, which is another challenge. And two more departments I'm dealing with, with the city of Green Bay. Yeah, that's where I sit right now. I'm not sure where we go from here, but hopefully we can get past this. That's about it. I don't have anything else to say at this time.

- I guess I'll make a motion to close the floor if that's appropriate.

- I'll second.

- Second.

- All in favor,

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? All right, the floor is closed. Discussion amongst the committee members.

- I believe I've said my piece in open discussion here. I'm challenged with some of the paperwork not being submitted at this point. Notably, the columns, the other doors, or the remaining door I believe.

- Jason... I'm sorry, Ian. I didn't mean to interrupt.

- No, no, go ahead.

- Jason, clarification for the members of this commission. If a property is deemed as non-contributory, do we have authority to dictate the work or not?

- Yes, you do. As a general policy, I suggest that work on non-contributing properties, be evaluated with an eye towards any negative impact on the larger district.

- So I guess where I'm going is I'm trying to look back on that terrible word of precedent,

- Right.

- that this commission struggles with on a lot of these issues. And I think back to our very unanimous majority decisions we've had on a lot of projects in the past. And I guess I'm throwing out there that, in the past, if it was a contributing property, we would've been very staunch in upholding the requirements of the National Park Service for what we've approved or denied.

- Yes, you've generally approved new windows with three dimensional-

- Two divided lights.

- Well, it would be the applied grids. Yes, it would look like true divided lights, but it would truly just be two pans of glass with like a glue on grid on both sides. Correct me if I'm wrong, Ian. I think your new windows are of that type.

- That's correct. three layer system, exterior grill, glass, interior mountain spacer glass, and then the other grill on the other side. So five layers essentially.

- And then I'm also gonna throw out there then that for properties that have been noncontributory, we have allowed modification, even though it didn't necessarily suit the needs of the district in terms of the historic nature. So as an example, I believe we've approved some changes to some of the downtown business facades where we've allowed some different windows and things because those buildings were no longer contributory. Is that correct? Do everybody agree with that?

- Yeah. I mean, I think the window opening sizes remain the same. Oftentimes, the window within that maybe is an operable window as opposed to non-op operable or something of that nature. Changes but not drastic changes.

- I guess where I'm going with this is because the property was listed as noncontributory, and I'll give the applicant the benefit of the doubt that he knew that, and went ahead with the work under that assumption that I'm willing to approve the work that's been done to this point, because of that. But I would suggest that we get a second submittal next month that shows us what's going on with the columns and the doors. And so we're not just approving the stuff after the fact. That would be my hope on this. I don't know if anybody else has got any thoughts.

- Well, I concur with that with a strong expectation that next month we see a complete package.

- I agree. I feel like because it's non-contributing, with proper notice and proper plans, we can go forward, but if it was contributing it'd be different.

- Do we know if those three columns, and I wasn't clear from Pat's description. on the plan that it clustered on the porch were ever installed that way, or was it always a rod iron substitution for the three round columns that was always there?

- I don't know the answer to that. I know that rod iron was present. I know the plans called for three columns, but as to whether or not the building was built strictly in accordance with the plans, I can't answer. I also can't answer when those rod iron column might have been installed. If indeed they were retroactively put

on there, they might have been day number two put on there or something or-

- Sure.

- 1951. I don't know.

- There's no photographic evidence that we have as part of the city for that property.

- Not yet. We can dig though.

- What was the name of this home at the time? Do you know?

- Yes, we know. It is written clearly on the plans that are upstairs on the sixth floor that I don't remember.

- We might have it in the notes.

- What's in my packet, doesn't have the name on it, that's why I was wondering.

- And it's not one that I've typed out anywhere if you're looking for it, Stephanie.

- Oh.

- It's just on the blueprints that were sitting on my desk.

- Okay, then I have no clue.

- It looks like by the hand lettering on it, that may have come from our office. I may have an entire set of the original plans if it was indeed done by our office.

- So Mr. Jury's provided a set of electrical plans, and a couple of elevations. On none of the drawings is the architectural firm labeled, which is interesting. So it identifies the name of the client, but there's no John Hancock for whoever did it.

- Okay. If you could get me that name of the home, I'd like to double check my archive.

- Certainly.

- Well, I mean, in agreement with your proposal that we should get the remaining piece of information for this property and what's done is done, right or wrong, it is what it is. The fact there's non-contributing gives me something. I'd concur and second your motion.

- Stephanie is gonna ask me what my motion was.

- Yes, I am. So it's just approval as is, and then with the expectation of a second COA application coming in.

- That would exactly be it. I would make a motion to approve as submitted, and I would assume that staff will work with the applicant to get a second submission for the remainder of the project work submitted to us next month, with some sort of strong encouragement from the applicant to make sure he figures out the permitting process in the city of Green Bay.

- I would second that motion in it's entirety.

- Any other discussion? All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye. Any opposed? All right, motion carries. We're onto item F, informational. First, would be staff level COA applications.

- [Jason] I think we have two staff level COA applications to discuss, both of them involving fencing on... Yeah, not the sport either, but fences. So here, 727 through 737 South Jackson. Brief photo at the top left showing an existing fence. Bottom middle, you see where the new fence is going to be replacing the existing fence. And off to the right is an overall view of where this property is. It's adjacent to the hospital corridor. So this was approved. It's basically wood fence for wood fence. The next one is also wood fence for wood fence. But this time it's 746 South Quincy. The sketch at the top right... I'm going to surmise that the fence is basically... if we look at the aerial photo view on the left, basically follows the blue lot lines from along the side of the garage, which is labeled as house. And then around the side of the property, which has a little bit of a step in it halfway there. So this was also approved. Stephanie, I think those were the only two. Yes.

- [Stephanie] Yep. That should be it.

- Okay. City raise and repair orders and demolitions.

- We had none this month.

- Perfect. And staff update.

- [Stephanie] So at our last meeting, we had the request from Alder Galvin to look at our meeting scheduled to see if we should be meeting more often. We had received in place then on file, so action is necessary for this. But I did collect some of the data from the past three years about the meetings that we've had, how many applications were at those meetings? Was it a special or regular? Was it canceled? So this is kind of the culmination of that. As you can see, there's really no pattern to when we receive the most applications. July can happen one year, and then the next year we only have one for July. And we've never been able to not accommodate somebody's request for a special meeting. I think that this is plenty of evidence to show that there is no need to increase the amount of meetings that we have. However, if there is further discussion that anybody would like to have, we can have that here, and then I can report back to Alder Galvin.

- No, and the only thing I'd noticed, the ones that were identified as canceled had zero applicants that month. It's clear that there was no impact to the community from the canceled meeting.

- I think those numbers are compelling, and additional meetings are unnecessary. No point.

- Okay. So if we're all still on the same page, then I'll just follow up with him on that communication then.

- Thank you.

- Thank you.

- I think that's it. We sent in.

- We have a memorandum of agreement.

- Yes.

- To do more stuff.

- For the next phases of the survey. So coming up... sorry, we're just totally off on our own little world over here, phases five, six and a portion of seven are gonna be completed in the next phase update. We'll be contracting with Legacy Architecture again. They've done an amazing job so far, so we're sticking with them, just sent out the contract and that MOA today for signatures by the end of the month. So they will be starting again. As usual, they'll have a beginning public meeting that'll happen at a regular meeting. I'm guessing probably the October meeting, and then another follow up one sometime in the spring once the work is done to present all of their data. So it should be pretty much the same. I don't know off the top of my head, what those survey areas are. Do you?

- Yeah, they're on the east side. We're progressively moving further east with this one, and it's gonna be north and south sides of the east river.

- Oh, okay.

- Loosely speaking.

- So that should be about it. So that'll be starting up shortly here. And this phase, the award amount was the 36,500. So a little bit less than the last one, but these areas aren't as big. Two, three and four was a huge area to do.

- Yeah, these are monumental undertakings.

- Yes. We're all be happy when they're done, and then we can start nominating things, which will be even more fun. But I think that's it for staff update. I don't have anything else.

- Oh yeah. Yeah. With that in mind though, we need to at some point ask the commission if we should attempt to nominate somethings. We've identified a few districts and individual properties, quite a few actually.

- House on Porlier we could have nominated.

- Yes.

- I'm sorry, are we still being recorded?

- Not yet.

- Quite frankly, there are a number of buildings downtown that are I think threatened by redevelopment. That quite honestly, probably... The problem is simply their private buildings... and I don't think we can nominate a private building. Is that correct?

- We can, right?

- Yeah.

- Owner has to consent. No, not for an individual listing.

- Well, we can. For an individual nomination, owner consents will effectively keep it off the national register, but if we pursued it to its end, then the National Park Service would identify it officially as eligible. And from any federal undertaking perspective, they would treat it as though it was on the national register, but it would

not trigger the city to designate it locally and put it under the jurisdiction of the Landmarks Commission. I also have issue with doing an individual nomination at the city's expense because that would only benefit one property owner. Whereas a district would benefit multiple property owners with the tax credit stuff.

- And I think that's 50% owner consent for the nomination.

- 50% owner consent. So where we have some neighborhoods identified, those would make sense to pursue, I think.

- So do we currently have a historic district in downtown?

- Yes, 42 buildings on the east side. And then there are two separate districts on the west side, the Broadway Douseman and the... Where did I botch that? Broadway Walnut and Broadway...

- Broadway Douseman.

- Broadway Douseman.

- So if there was a building that was essentially facing demolition, this commission should be notified of that if it's in the district, or no?

- We would be if it's in the district. They wouldn't be able to pull a demo permit without it.

- Okay.

- Presuming they pulled the permit.

- Presuming they pull a permit. And then if they don't, we get to find them till high heaven so they rebuild a building. We have all those clauses in our... I mean, not that that would ever happen in Green Bay, but in theory it's there.

- So this is sort of a sidebar discussion that I'm about to ask of Stephanie and maybe Jason, but it relates to what we witnessed tonight. And really is not the purview of this commission at all, but it certainly affects us. Does the city of Green Bay need a simple... I'm a firm proponent of keeping things simple. When it comes to the permitting process, I don't feel that it is simple. I mean, our applicant tonight discussed this commission. He discussed a building permit, which is a different authority. He discussed the department of public works, which is another authority. And I think there might have been a fourth one there that I can't remember. And so, to do a simple renovation project on our residence, he's having to go through and get at least three, call them permits. But my question is simply, and I do not accept that a tractor shouldn't be capable of navigating that process. However, for a residential property owner, a private citizen, how in the world would they ever understand if they wanted to do the work that was presented to us tonight? I don't think the result would've been any different. I think you'd had half of the work done, and we'd be dealing with the same thing. I don't know where to go with this, but it feels like most people, most citizens are smart enough to know that if they're gonna do work on their home, they probably need to get a permit.

- Yes. So-

- But I guess my question is, if they make that call to City Hall, who are they talking to? Forgive me, I don't mean to be insulting here, but does everybody in city hall even understand the process and the sequence of all these permits? So we don't get into a situation like we are tonight where the work has been started.

- I'm gonna take a bold guess and assume all 900 city employees don't know the permitting process. However,

if you're gonna call and say, "I have a project I need to do, do I need a permit?" They're gonna send you to our inspection department on sixth floor. If you were the person who did things in the correct order, which we did not just see, you would've submitted for a building permit, you would've had to supply a site plan, and they would've reviewed that site plan to say, "Oh, it's historic. You need a COA. You're redoing your driveway, we have to get an apron sign off from DPW." So it gets housed in our inspection department, and they say, "Here's the four additional documents you need signed before this permit can be released." When you do it backwards, it's very confusing.

- So do you think the process you just described, do you think that's on a piece of paper somewhere that...

- It is. We have many packets available. Could it be easier, more condensed? Absolutely. Everything in government could be more streamlined. Everything could have a better pamphlet and a better whatever. We're running into a lot of issues where people just don't care. Like, most of our commissions are seeing this, where people are doing this work, and then they're going, "I don't need a permit. I don't need to talk to you, I don't want to do this." Board of appeals is feeling this, our plan commission is feeling this. Our inspection department, they're running into people constantly submitting complaints saying, "Hey, my neighbor is doing this without a permit, but I had to get a permit." And then their contractor is going, "Oh, I didn't think that they needed one, or I didn't want to get one. It's not worth it because I'm only getting fined 50 bucks, and the permit, it cost me \$2,000." So it's been a struggle this summer in particular. Jason wants to talk. I'm gonna let him go.

- Not really. I just wanted to point out that fence issue that resulted in a garage as well.

- Yes. So generally speaking, our inspection division has been very on top of when they get applications, they review them, they see if they're in a floodplain or historic district and they send them to me right away if they're historic. We just got a site plan for one of the fences that we approved. I see new garage on the site plan and I went, "I don't have a COA for that." So then I followed up with the applicant and said, "Hey, I see you have a proposed new garage here. You need to submit an application for this." That's generally how this stuff works. We review the site plans on my floor and then funnel them out to who they need. But I don't know if it's working in reverse, if DPW's getting a driveway. If they have to go inspect an apron, they're not gonna go, "Oh, I wonder if they pulled a COA. I don't know that they know about us." But...

- Okay.

- That garage was already built though too, right?

- Mm-hmm.

- Okay.

- All right. I don't accept any of the excuses that we heard this evening, because again...

- I agree.

- Actually, am kind of really... I gotta stop talking.

- Yeah.

- I will say, I just submitted my residence before this committee last month or the previous month, and took me a little while to figure out the exact steps to make sure I got it right too.

- Yep.

- And quite honestly, not sure that my contractor has pulled the building permit, committed to do the work. I'm still not quite done yet, but I have a sympathy I guess, for the regular property owner and not a lot of patients for the contractors that have come before this commission. It almost seems like we've had more problem from some of the licensed contractors, than we have regular citizens.

- I agree. That's kind of where we're seeing it from, is that either they're tired of having to pull the permits, or they just disagree with how the process works, so they just do it. So we're gonna have to figure out a way around that. I mean, we do annual letters every spring saying, "Hey, just a reminder, you have a historic house." When we get new historic property list, I send a letter that reminds them, "Hey, you just bought a new historic house, here's the process." I hope that that would diminish it, but if a contractor's gonna do it anyway... So there are some issues in our department, but yes, if you want to review some of our documents and see how it could be more efficient. I mean, I feel like even looking at our website, I know that it does not read efficiently. It's very word heavy, so you have to read for four paragraphs to even see what you would do if you had a historic property if you're applying for a permit. There are certainly some updates that could be made.

- I mean, maybe it's another education session or several to the contractor community, especially on the residential contractor scale, because those jobs turn probably much quicker than a commercial property. There are different requirements for commercial than there are residential in terms of life safety and other aspects of what we do for a day job. It's important that we've done our due diligence to make sure that people are educated, but once that's done, the ball is in their court.

- If I could just throw something in here, you guys picked up on something that's outside of my world so I didn't catch this, was that the way you admonished him for failing to get the permits. I think in and of itself that does serve a purpose to snap the leash, so to speak. I remember that happened very early on to one person downtown, and we've seen him repeatedly for several pretty minor things. And that's good, because if the word gets out there that we will take our responsibility serious, anywhere from admonishment to perhaps finding them, that also goes toward educated. For those of you that provided that admonishment tonight, I just wanna say well done because I didn't catch that.

- I mean, my two senses is, when this was the Historic Preservation Commission, I had no teeth. I sat on it for 10 years and banged my head against the wall every month. And I said eventually, "Enough, I'm done. I can't do this. I'm not giving my time to just have either the homeowner or the contractor to go off and do whatever they want anyway." When Landmarks Commission came back, they asked me to come back, on the one condition that it had authority to enact these things. If we become a commission that isn't able to do that, then this'll be my last meeting.

- Well, my disappointment in tonight is simply that the applicant certainly knows better, but the disappointment is the applicant does really good work, and clearly understands the value of historic preservation and restoration in his work. So that's the disappointment that we're sitting here at this moment with that applicant, having that discussion, because again, he sees the value of that. And hopefully he would see the value in this commission. And I'm just gonna give the benefit of the doubt that I had heard prior to tonight's meeting that that was gonna be a personal property and not just a business situation. And I'm just gonna give him the benefit of the doubt that he just wasn't thinking the whole thing through and so on and so forth. But I just found it incredibly disappointing. And yet at the end of the day, he is gonna do a nice job on the residence and it will look good when it's finished. But I do worry about the fact that we're put in a position of having to accept work that's done before it's come before us. That's the hardest part.

- Yep.

- Future precedents.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- But just as a reminder, you were not forced to accept it. If he would've brought forth something that you all thought was not in keeping with the district, you could have ordered him to remove it. I mean, I know that it's a harder thing to say after the facts but it's absolutely within your purview to do that.

- Well, I don't feel the work that he's done was necessarily detrimental to the property.

- Oh, certainly. Yeah. That's why I made the motion I did.

- Yeah. Yeah. Certainly if those windows were changed to triangle shape or round or something that was obviously very different, that's a different story. I mean, but generally the openings were of the same or similar size, and the grill pattern appeared to be of a same or similar size. Could it have been better yet? Absolutely. And that's what we're trying to go, is just from good to being great in terms of these renovations.

- Well, I don't think we need to be concerned about setting a precedent here because we did establish a precedent for calling out an applicant for failing the rule of law. You guys gave him a tongue lashing. I mean, it woke me up when I realized what was going on. So you definitely made the point that establishes a precedent. And if we see that again, I'm gonna be in front for substantial fines. I've got no problem pulling that pin, but this warning I think serves as a great precedent, and we've done it before.

- Yeah.

- Okay. I think we're at the end of the agenda. The next meeting is October 19th, Wednesday. Are there any other items that anybody needs to bring up tonight?

- I wanna apologize for my taking this over an hour. Ian, thank you for trying to hurry me up along as we asked in the past. good.

- I know you're- I guess you guys gotta your chairperson back to run these meetings. Nothing else. I'll make a motion to adjourn.

- I'll second that.

- Second.

- Bye.

- Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, everybody.